

A GOOD IDEA IN THEORY

Inclusion as English subject teacher students see it

Master's Thesis

Petra Juulia Niskanen

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
December 2013

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Petra Juulia Niskanen	
Työn nimi – Title A GOOD IDEA IN THEORY: Inclusion as English subject teacher students see it	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro Gradu-tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Joulukuu 2013	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 146 sivua + 4 liitettä
Tiivistelmä – Abstract	
<p>Inklusio on aiheena moniulotteinen. Sen pyrkimyksenä on luoda tasa-arvoisempi yhteiskunta, sisällyttää kaikki oppilaat perusopetuksen piiriin tukitoimia lisäämällä, sekä vähentää erillisen erityisopetuksen määrää. Opettajien asenteita inklusiota kohtaan on tutkittu suhteellisen paljon. Syystä tai toisesta aineenopettajien suhtautuminen inklusioon on ollut negatiivisempi verrattuna muihin opettajaryhmiin. Opettajaopiskelijoiden mielipiteitä on tutkittu lähinnä luokanopettajaopiskelijoiden keskuudesta.</p> <p>Tämän tutkielman tarkoituksena oli selvittää englannin aineenopettajaopiskelijoiden käsityksiä inklusiosta sekä asenteita inklusiivista opetusta kohtaan. Aihetta lähestyttiin useasta eri näkökulmasta, jotka pohjautuivat tutkimuksen teoriakehykseen sekä aiempiin tutkimuksiin. Tutkimuksen kohteena oli kahdeksan aineenopettajaopiskelijaa Jyväskylän yliopistosta. Heidät jaettiin kahteen ryhmään, joista toisessa opiskelijat olivat suorittaneet pedagogiset opintonsa ja toisessa opinnot olivat kesken. Ryhmien käsityksiä ja asenteita vertailtiin keskenään sekä opettajankoulutuksen merkitystä eroihin ja yhtäläisyyksiin pohdittiin.</p> <p>Haastattelut osoittivat, että opiskelijoiden suhtautuminen inklusioon teoriana oli positiivinen. Kuitenkin käytännön huolet ja epävarmuus saivat opiskelijat epäilemään inklusion onnistumista käytännössä. Inklusio koettiin vaikeaksi selittää, sillä opettajankoulutus ei ollut tarjonnut tarpeeksi konkreettista lähestymistapaa ilmiön selkeytymiseksi. Ryhmien väliset erot olivat pieniä, mutta siitä huolimatta opettajankoulutuksen voidaan sanoa antaneen jo opettajankoulutuksen suorittaneille opiskelijoille enemmän tietoa aiheesta. Tämä ryhmä osoitti kuitenkin myös enemmän käytännön huolia inklusiiviseen opetukseen liittyen ja suhtautui inklusion täten kielteisemmin kuin pedagogisia opintojaan vielä suorittavat opiskelijat.</p> <p>Tulosten perusteella voidaan sanoa, että opiskelijat eivät kokeneet saaneensa tarpeeksi tietoa inklusiosta opettajankoulutuksessa ja olivat sen vuoksi huolissaan tulevasta työnkuvastaan. Epävarmuus aiheutti myös negatiivisia ja varauksellisia asenteita inklusiota kohtaan.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords : subject teacher students, attitudes, inclusion, teacher education	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository: Kielten laitos	
Muita tietoja – Additional information: -	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 INCLUSION	9
2.1 Defining terminology and phenomena.....	9
2.2 History of inclusion.....	14
2.2.1 History of inclusion in Finland	14
2.2.2 History of inclusion in other parts of the world	15
2.2.3 Salamanca Statement	16
2.3 Inclusion in schools today.....	17
2.3.1 Laws concerning inclusion.....	17
2.3.2 The National Core Curriculum and special support system.....	18
2.3.3 Statistics	20
2.4 Advantages and challenges of inclusion	21
2.4.1 Advantages and views of successful inclusion	22
2.4.2 Possible challenges of and arguments against inclusion.....	23
3 TEACHER EDUCATION	26
3.1 Teacher education in Finland.....	26
3.2 Teacher education and language teacher education at the University of Jyväskylä	28
3.3 Teaching and inclusion	31
4 AIM OF THE PRESENT STUDY	37
4.1 Motivating the study	37
4.2 Aims of the study	38
5 DATA AND METHODOLOGY	41
5.1 Reasons for choosing the method	41
5.2 Semi-structured theme interview	42
5.3 Participants.....	43
5.4 Data collection	44
5.4.1 Piloting.....	44
5.4.2 Interviews.....	45
5.5 Method of analysis	48
5.5.1 Content analysis	49
5.5.2 Transcribing and analyzing the data of the present study.....	50

6 FINDINGS	53
6.1 Defining inclusion.....	53
6.1.1 Defining inclusion.....	54
6.1.2 Inclusion in schools today.....	58
6.1.3 Support given to students.....	60
6.1.4 Support given to teachers.....	63
6.2 Attitudes towards inclusion.....	69
6.2.1 Opinions on inclusion	69
6.2.2 Opinions on segregated special education	75
6.2.3 Experiences of special education in the past.....	77
6.2.4 Experiences of special education now	80
6.3 Advantages and challenges	84
6.3.1 Advantages in general.....	85
6.3.2 Advantages to the work of teachers	87
6.3.3 Challenges in general.....	89
6.3.4 Challenges in the work of teachers	93
6.3.5 Difference between the work of elementary school teachers and subject teachers	98
6.4 Teacher education	103
6.4.1 Teacher education and inclusion.....	104
6.4.2 Sufficiency of education on teaching students with special needs	108
6.4.3 Ideas for improvement	110
6.4.4 Expectations (group A only).....	113
6.4.5 Responses to the statement	114
6.5 Differences and similarities in views between groups A and B	120
7 DISCUSSION	123
8 CONCLUSION.....	138
 REFERENCES.....	 142
 Appendix 1: Background information form.....	 146
Appendix 2: Theme interview schedule	148
Appendix 3: Illustrations of the data analysis (tables 1-4).....	149
Appendix 4: Extracts translated into English	159

1 INTRODUCTION

Inclusion is a way of seeing learning and teaching in a new light. It questions the two separate branches of education, basic education and special education. Inclusion, as the name suggests, aims at providing a school for all and including each student with or without difficulties so that all could study together in the same classroom with their peers. Inclusion also aims at bringing the necessary support to students so that unnecessary transfers outside the classroom could be avoided.

Inclusion as such has been studied a lot. Inclusion in schools in Finland has been studied in many ways as well. Previous studies have mainly focused on elementary school teachers and their views of inclusion. Subject teachers have not been studied as much as other teachers, although some studies concerning practicing subject teachers' views of inclusion have been conducted. However, it seems that subject teacher students have not been taken into account, not to mention language teacher students. What the findings of the previous studies have in common are fairly skeptical views of inclusion in general, uncertainty about the absolute necessity of inclusion and teachers' worries about the lack of resources for inclusive education in schools in Finland. A review of the studies on attitudes towards integration and inclusion from year 1984 to 2009 shows that teachers have been skeptical of the idea even before inclusion became an international law due to the Salamanca Statement (1994) and for a long time afterwards.

The work of language teachers is challenging. For example, the target language in lessons is foreign, which alone creates pressures on interaction between a teacher and students. When students with disabilities or learning difficulties are included in the same classroom with average students, the challenges multiply. However, different sources state that teaching pupils with special needs in an inclusive classroom does not require a unique set of skills (Woolfolk 2007; Saloviita 2012; Peterson and Hittie 2010). Successful teaching in an inclusive environment is possible by combining good teaching practices and sensitivity to all students (Woolfolk 2007: 509). Students with any kinds of disabilities need to learn the academic contents as well as be full participants in the classroom. Teachers in Finland are highly educated and have all the necessary means to work with a heterogeneous group (Saloviita 2012: 19). The curriculum can be adapted

not only to students with special needs, but to all students. In doing so, the teacher is more effective and makes sure each student is really learning (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 122-123).

Researchers in the field strongly favor the idea of inclusion for various reasons whereas teachers have many practical concerns that prevent them from promoting inclusion without reservation. The present study aims at finding out whether future subject teachers view inclusion as negative as the previous studies suggest or whether their views are more positive. Eight English teacher students were interviewed in order to find out:

- their understanding of inclusion in general
- their attitudes towards inclusive education
- their opinions on the advantages and challenges of inclusion
- their opinions on teacher education and education on teaching students with special needs
- and differences in views between those who had completed their pedagogical studies and those still completing them.

The present study begins with two separate theory chapters. Chapter two focuses on explaining the concept of inclusion from different perspectives. Firstly, the definition of inclusion and a short review of the history of special education in Finland and other countries are explained. Secondly, the current situation and legislation in Finland are described and compared to the situation in other parts of the world. Finally, the last part of the chapter reviews the advantages and challenges inclusion could bring about. Chapter three then focuses on reviewing teacher education. Firstly, it explains the situation nationally, and secondly, describes the education locally at the University of Jyväskylä. The studies in education are reviewed in general and a closer look is taken at the pedagogical studies for teachers. The last part of chapter three outlines previous studies on teaching and inclusion. The previous studies are summarized in a mostly chronological order from the past to the present, however, following a certain thematic pattern.

From chapter four the focus moves towards the present study: the research questions and the reasons for conducting the present study are described in chapter four. In

chapter five the methodology for data collection and data analysis are explained and justified. Chapter six reports the findings and in chapter seven these findings are discussed. In the final chapter limitations of the study are taken into account and a set of ideas for future studies are suggested.

Next, chapter two will next to review the theoretical background of the present study. First, inclusion in general is defined.

2 INCLUSION

Inclusion is a multidimensional phenomenon. Therefore it is important to define it with care. The first section of the chapter offers various definitions of inclusion that can be found in the literature. The second section outlines the history of inclusion in Finland and in other parts of the world. This involves a movement from segregated special education to more integrated models. The third section explains the Finnish education system from the perspective of inclusion. It also deals with statistics of special education and the reasons behind the numbers. Finally, the fourth section reviews advantages and challenges that inclusion could bring about.

2.1 Defining terminology and phenomena

In literature the term *inclusion* is explained with the following ideas:

1. People who are different are accepted as members of the community with the capacity to contribute as well as to receive (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 6).
2. The practice of including everyone – irrespective of talent, disability, socioeconomic background, or cultural origin – in supportive mainstream schools and classrooms where all students are met (Karagiannis et al. 1997: 3).
3. Inclusion is above all an idea; a philosophy; a way of thinking about education; and a *modus operandi* against discrimination as well as in theory as in practice (Väyrynen 2001:13; Biklen 2001: 56)

Even though the definition may seem simple and easily understandable, the reality is something else. As can be seen people have different terms and meanings when they are talking about inclusion in different contexts, which makes the whole idea rather complex (Väyrynen 2001: 13). Therefore, it is important to define the terms that are linked to inclusion in order to understand the complexity of the phenomenon.

When talking about the phenomenon of inclusion a division into three different stages, *segregation*, *integration* and *inclusion*, is often used (Saloviita 2012; Peterson and Hittie 2010; Kavale and Forness 2000). Firstly, *segregation* means sending people who are considered being different into special institutions. The people are sent away because they are not accepted in the surrounding society. On many occasions the rationale has been to protect the wider community, and other students from unwanted influences (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 7). Secondly, *integration* means focusing on students with disabilities of any type or level and organizing some sort of special education just for those individuals. However, learning together in a classroom without sufficient support cannot be called integration until all the necessary support services in a normal learning environment are granted for the student with special needs. Otherwise this type of integration could be called “economy integration” (Moberg et al. 2009: 81). Many people assume that inclusion primarily means educating disabled students or students with special needs in mainstream schools (Ainscow et al. 2006: 15). This, however, is not the case. *Inclusion* means allowing all students to attend a regular school and altering the education to all students whether disabled or not (Kavale and Forness 2000: 279). Thus, inclusion could be referred to as “full integration” (Saloviita 2012: 7).

A slightly different division is called “the four stages in human response to others perceived as different” (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 6). The first stage is called *extermination*, which means extinguishing people who are different in order to protect the society. The second stage is called *segregation*, and the meaning of the term is the same as explained above. The rationale for segregation is primarily to protect the society, but also allowing special students to be with “their own kind”, and providing a specially designed environment based on the unique needs of a group. The first stage is without a doubt considered illegal, and the second stage is not acceptable either, but societies still have difficulties in dealing with difference (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 5). The third stage is called *benevolence*. In this stage (which is basically what could be referred to as *integration*) people who are different are accepted but not seen as full participants of the community. They are considered to need help, assistance or charity in order to survive in everyday life. In a way, they are only tolerated instead of being really accepted. The fourth and final stage is called *community*. This term basically means the same as *inclusion* where people who are different are accepted as equal members of the community and their contributions are appreciated and valued (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 6).

As is evident, inclusion and the stages preceding it are often referred to by different terms. In addition to using different terms, it is worthwhile to note that the context in which inclusion is talked about makes a difference as well. One example of this is called “the six approaches to thinking about inclusion” (Ainscow et al. 2006: 15-25). The reason for this division is that inclusion may be defined in different ways depending on the situation, country or culture. The six approaches are outlined as follows:

1. Inclusion as a concern with disabled students and others categorized as “having special educational needs”.
2. Inclusion as a response to disciplinary exclusion.
3. Inclusion in relation to all groups seen as being vulnerable to exclusion.
4. Inclusion as developing the school for all.
5. Inclusion as “Education for All”.
6. Inclusion as a principled approach to education and society.

The first approach illustrates the usual assumption that inclusion is primarily about educating disabled students in mainstream schools. This categorization, which focuses solely on the “disabled” or pupils with “special needs”, might result in ignoring the other ways in which the participation of all students could be improved. The second approach means inclusion as a result of including students with disciplinary issues in mainstream schools and normal education. The third view of inclusion takes into account all students that are in risk of discrimination, such as children with behavioral problems, or girls who become pregnant very young. Inclusion as developing the school for all is a different approach to inclusion because it strives to create a new education system that values diversity. This is done by criticizing private schools, parents selecting schools for their children based on the learning results, and schools that are funded by private supporters and sponsors¹. “Education for All” is the movement by UNESCO in the 1990s which took a stand for all the children all around the globe that had been denied access to education, including, for example, all girls living in the poorest regions. Finally, the last approach to inclusion emphasizes the fact that inclusion is not a single act but it involves a change in values, actions, plans of actions, practices within schools, and policies that shape the practices.

¹ It is worth pointing out that these sorts of issues are mentioned in a text which focuses on the British education system.

The ways to talk about inclusion are various, but inclusion discourse is also a multidimensional issue (Dyson 1999, as quoted in Naukkarinen 2000: 1-6). The first type of discourse is called *justice- and ethics-orientated discourse*. It focuses on criticizing the traditional view of special education (segregation). This type of discourse can be seen in official records, such as in *The National Core Curriculum* (NCC 2004, for example). However, even though the discourse is often rather strong, the actual execution may not be that visible. For example, in his article Saloviita (2009b) criticizes the high and growing proportion of segregated special education in Finland even though inclusion is stated as an important goal in the official documents. In addition to Finland, this phenomenon has taken place in Portugal. The changes in the school system have been non-existent or rather slow even though the discourse has been strong (Freire and Cesar 2003: 342). The second dimension is called *efficiency discourse*, and it also criticizes special education because it is not as an effective and economical solution as inclusive education. The third dimension is called *political discourse*. This basically means the changeover from traditional special education to inclusion as a political event. According to Dyson (1999, as quoted in Naukkarinen 2000: 1-6), there is a need for a political battle in order for inclusion to succeed. In Finland the political field has not raised the issue of inclusive education and therefore the development towards it remains slow (Saloviita 2009b: n.pag.). Finally, the last one is called *pragmatic discourse*, and it focuses on how inclusive education can be put into action. In short, these different types of discourse have been developed to show how inclusion is understood and discussed by different parties in the society.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that *inclusive education* encompasses the idea which is stated in the *UNESCO's Policy guidelines on inclusion in education* (2009). It states that schools and learning centers should be organized so that all boys and girls, students from ethnic and linguistic minorities, rural population, those affected by HIV and AIDS, and those with disabilities and difficulties in learning have a possibility to get education. The same guidelines push for providing learning opportunities for all youth and adults as well. The fundamental idea is that exclusion has to be eliminated because of negative attitudes and a lack of response to diversity in race, economic status, social class, language, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and ability. Thus, inclusion is a scrutiny of the present goals, contents and their adaptation according to the circumstances (Väyrynen 2001: 18). Teaching should be flexible and cater for all students with respect and equality. Also, according to Naukkarinen (2000: 1-6), *inclusion* and *inclusive*

education are new ways of thinking about the whole education system because they question the two separate branches of education: the regular one and the special one. They also challenge the medical-psychological point of view where students are separated into two different categories: normal or average students and students with special needs. *Inclusive education* literally includes each student in the regular classroom together with their peers of the same age regardless of their differences, and appreciates every student's unique needs and qualities. Ainscow et al. (2006) have summarized the idea of inclusion in the following way:

“Inclusion is concerned with all children and young people in schools; it is focused on presence, participation and *achievement*; inclusion and exclusion are linked together such that inclusion involves the active combating of exclusion; and inclusion is seen as a never-ending process. Thus an inclusive school is one that is on the move, rather than one that has reached a perfect state” (Ainscow et al. 2006: 25).

Inclusion is, or should be an ongoing process in the school community, or to place the matter into a wider context, in education policy (Väyrynen 2001: 17; Naukkarinen and Ladonlahti 2001: 102). The education system has to adapt to the reality of the students with special needs, not the other way round.

These different ways of defining and talking about inclusion are only a fraction of many more in the field. The purpose here was to describe the complexity of the phenomenon and show how the same idea can be explained in various ways depending on the situation. As Ainscow et al. (2006: 22-23) point out, one should keep an open mind about what one means when talking about inclusion while doing research. Above all, without a clear view of what one means by inclusion, one could not support it or form a fair judgment about it. Thus, defining the meaning makes a difference.

In the present study inclusion is understood as a school for all, where students with special needs are all students and not just the ones with certain medical diagnoses. The quote from Ainscow et al. (2006: 25) also encompasses the idea the researcher has chosen to follow in the present study.

In the next section the history of inclusion is shortly outlined from 100 years back in time to the situation today.

2.2 History of inclusion

The history of inclusion has had many different phases in the last 100 years. The next few sections review the phases before talking about inclusion, first in Finland and then in other parts of the world. Finally, the major step towards talking about inclusive education as the official view over special education, the Salamanca Statement (1994), is explained.

2.2.1 History of inclusion in Finland

One version of the history of inclusion in the Finnish education system is summarized in this section. Before the post-industrial phase the segregation of people with disabilities was a common practice (Saloviita 2009b: n.pag.). Special institutions were built for the ill and incapable, and once a person was sent in, he or she was likely to never get out again. It was not until the 1960s that a shift from industrial to post-industrial society took place and societal values changed. New rehabilitation programs were founded and the persons who until that time had been placed in institutions had now the chance to receive treatment in public services. Two different special education classes were established: auxiliary classes for pupils with learning disabilities and separate classes for pupils with emotional and behavioral problems. In the 1970s the whole education system changed and special education got a great deal of attention. Part-time special education was created and a new profession, that of a special education teacher, came into being. Despite the benevolent idea of integration, in reality it was still considered conditional and depended on the readiness of a person.

In the 1980s local municipalities were given the right to organize special education as they wished. The state provided support for individuals who needed special education depending on the type and severity of their disabilities. People with disabilities were categorized in much more medical terms than before but it was not until the 1990s that people really began to receive different medical labels for their problems. A good thing about labeling was that now a disabled person was no longer “stupid” but “ill” and in need of rehabilitation (Saloviita 2009b: n.pag.).

The next section shortly reviews history of inclusion in other parts of the world. The review shows how similar steps have been taken in other countries as well.

2.2.2 History of inclusion in other parts of the world

In this second section, a short version of the history of inclusive education in the UK and the U.S. are outlined. Additionally, rather a different kind of history in Italy is described in the end of the section.

In the 1940s it was a common practice in the UK to test and assess children at the age of 11 (Blackhawkings et al. 2007: 5). They were then grouped according to their similarities and differences. There were three options: grammar school for the talented and secondary modern school for average students. The third option was to attend technical vocational school, which was not considered an academic option. Without a doubt those with learning disabilities or other problems did not get a chance to attend a grammar school. In the 1960s 80 per cent of the children attended secondary modern schools, but unfortunately they often received low grades due to lack of professional teaching, teachers and other factors. In the 1970s the majority of students dropped out of school at the age of 15, when it was legally possible. However, those attending grammar schools usually continued their studies until the age of 18 and had a chance to apply for university or professional training after taking the A-levels (A-levels is similar to the Matriculation Examination in Finland). This created a gap between academic and non-academic education possibilities. Only in the late 1980s was this type of division system abolished and all students started to be tested in a similar manner.

In the U.S., like in Finland, industrialization changed everything (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 12-20). People who could not take care of themselves were sent to poorhouses. Half a century later, however, poorhouses were strongly criticized and special institutions were established and the training of specialists for the purposes of these institutions began. These were small asylums first, with fairly good conditions. In the beginning of the 1900s the trend changed from small to large institutions housing thousands of people. People living there had terrible conditions and were given extremely inhumane treatment. In the 1960s these types of institutions were again strongly criticized, several appeals were sent to court and as a result, the conditions in the asylums were substantially improved. After the Second World War parents of children with disabilities made a strong public statement concerning the education of their children. It was not until the late 1960s that the Congress took action and started funding special education. Yet, all children did not get educated. The 1975 *Education*

for All Handicapped Children Act was a groundbreaking law enacted by the United States Congress and gave all children the right to receive free public education. It is worth mentioning that in the U.S. racial segregation took place at that time as well, and Afro-American citizens were treated as unfairly as those with disabilities. By the 1980s a system called “resource rooms” for those students with mild disabilities had been established. Researchers soon noticed that the system did not work as it was supposed to. It pulled the students with disabilities away from regular classes and often stigmatized them. The movement towards inclusive education began when parents and professionals took a stand and started to criticize the special education system. Finally, a sort of integrated education was developed, where students with disabilities still had special classes but were attending a regular school and took part in certain activities, such as lunch hours, together with the rest of the students. In the late 1980s the actual idea of inclusive education was established and it is now considered a common practice in some schools in the U.S.

As it can be seen, only in the late 1980s and 1990s has the movement towards inclusive education moved forward in the countries reviewed. However, there are western countries where this usual trend has not been followed. Italy is a good example of an education system with inclusive education without even actually talking about inclusion as such (Saloviita 2012: 9). As early as in 1977 special education classes were abolished and all students had the opportunity to attend basic education classes. Trained special education teachers and personal syllabuses are used to assist students with disabilities, and the system is said to be working well.

The next section will take a step further from explaining the history before inclusion to the events that made inclusion reality.

2.2.3 Salamanca Statement

The discussion about inclusion as such began in 1994 when the government of Spain and UNESCO co-organized a world conference on special needs and education (Saloviita 2009b: n.pag.; 2012: 5-6). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education* (1994) was the first big step towards inclusion. It aimed at creating a worldwide consensus on future directions for special needs education. In short, the purpose of the conference was to promote inclusion and provide

governments and organizations help and support in doing so. The basic idea of the framework, which follows the statement, is that the educational system should be designed and financed so that children with special needs could attend a regular school. This would decrease discrimination and increase tolerance towards all human beings. The statement and the framework based their main ideas on the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948) and the *World Declaration on Education for All* (1990), as well as the *United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities* (1993). These documents clearly state that every child has the right for education regardless of his or her individual differences, and the purpose of the Salamanca Statement was to affirm and renew the existing regulations. A total of 92 governments and 25 international organizations signed the statement in June, 1994. In 2006 the tenets of inclusion got the status of an international law, when the *UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* was held (Saloviita 2009b: n.pag.; Saloviita 2012: 6).

In Finland the Salamanca Statement was taken into account and Finland was one of the 92 governments to sign it (Saloviita 2009b: n.pag.). However, as mentioned earlier, the movement towards inclusion and inclusive education has been slow. The next section describes how inclusion is referred to in legislation and the national curriculum in Finland.

2.3 Inclusion in schools today

As was mentioned about the justice- and ethics-oriented discourse (Dyson 1999, as quoted in Naukkarinen 2000:1-6), the execution of the guidelines concerning inclusion may be visible in official documents, but not perhaps in reality. In this section the laws and guidelines concerning special education in Finland are reviewed and later statistics from Finland are compared with the situation in other countries.

2.3.1 Laws concerning inclusion

According to *The Constitution of Finland* (11.6.1999/731) and *Perusopetuslaki* §30 (21.8.1998/628; 24.6.2010/642) the premise for organizing special education in schools is that each pupil has the right to receive teaching in agreement with a curriculum, the right for student counseling, and the right to receive sufficient support for learning and school attendance as soon as a need for special support manifests. Each school is

responsible for describing the methods for the support of learning and school attendance in their local curriculum.

2.3.2 The National Core Curriculum and special support system

The special education system in Finland has been renewed in recent years. It is not important here to go into detail in explaining the old system. Instead, the following section will explain how special education is organized and the idea of inclusion is taken into account in Finnish schools today.

The National Board of Education (OPH) has formulated the *National Core Curriculum* (NCC 2004) for a framework and guidelines in education. In 2010, amendments to the existing curricula were published (Amendments to the NCC 2010). The amendments were made to officially meet the idea of inclusion. It is a thorough description of all the changes that have taken place in supporting students with special needs in schools. It states that special support is given to pupils who have declined prerequisites in growth, development and learning due to a disability, illness or function deficiency. Also those individuals with psychological or social difficulties and pupils who are at risk of having learning difficulties are included in this support system.

In Finland the special support given in schools is divided into three steps, and it is called the tripartite support system (Amendments to the NCC 2010: 10-23). The idea behind this division is that the measure of support is planned individually according to the need for support. In short, each student is not in need of similar or as intensive support as everyone else receiving special support. The most important matter about the new support system is the idea of early intervention and giving support as early as possible. Another important idea is that the student is sent to a special class only if there is no other option left. The first step, *universal support*, is meant for every student. It is characterized as being pre-emptive and the majority of students in Finnish schools go under this form of support. The second step, *intensified support*, encompasses 5-15 % of the students. The support is of regular type and/or different forms of support can be given at the same time. The third step, *special support*, is given to only a few per cent of all students. This form of support is comprehensive and systematic. Special support also requires an administrative process before a student can receive it. The intensity and length of each of the steps increases by degrees. *Individualization* is a part of the special

support and it means that the goals, content, methods and evaluation of teaching and learning are planned so that they meet the needs of an individual student. By individualizing the curriculum the student has better chances in achieving a pass in some or all subjects.

Differentiation is a method used as a means of support (Amendments to the NCC 2010: 8-9). It includes making individual plans or curriculum for those in need of some kind of support. However, the plans should follow similar curriculum of an average student (Moberg et al. 2009: 65-66). In practice *differentiation* can mean slightly different goals, contents, methods and evaluation for each student. Differentiation can also mean using various teaching methods, various tasks and versatile teaching in general which will benefit all students and not only those with special needs (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 363).

Special education strategy (2007) is a document published by the Ministry of Education. It is a long-term development strategy for the field of special education in Finland. It aims at increasing the possibilities of the people with special needs to attend a “neighborhood” school: the nearest school in the area where one lives. It also aims at a situation where all students have a possibility to attend ordinary teaching groups, get early support and prevention in case of learning difficulties, and get differentiation of education according to their individual needs.

Even though many things have been done to develop the field of special education in Finland, there is room for development (Special Education Strategy 2007: 54-64). For example, the administrative systems regarding special education vary greatly throughout the country and there is a need to standardize these practices. The most important issues raised in the report by the Ministry of Education were early intervention and individual support especially in the transitional periods in education. Ideas to improve teacher education were also offered. Firstly, the heterogeneity of students should be emphasized and taken into account increasingly. In practice this would mean adding more special education in teacher training. Secondly, funds for sufficient updating training should be granted.

The next section focuses on describing statistics concerning the situation of special education in Finnish schools.

2.3.3 Statistics

A review from fall 2011 on students receiving special education showed that in Finland 11.4 per cent of students in elementary level received intensified or special support (Tilastokeskus 2012). Of those students 3.3 per cent were under intensified support and the remaining 8.1 per cent under special support. The most common form of intensified support was part-time special education and in the case of special support, students had assistants and interpretation services².

The numbers of students receiving intensified and special support seemed to have increased over the years. However, in year 2010 the percentage of students receiving special support was 8.5 and thus smaller than the percentage in 2011. The reason for this is that at this point intensified support was not yet given to students so the numbers from 2010 and 2011 are not actually comparable. Nevertheless, reviewing the statistics from the year 2004 onwards the number of students under special support has risen annually.

The reasons for the slow progress of integration and inclusion are under debate. One reason for it could be that the present legislation does not consider it obligatory (Moberg et al. 2009: 94). The second reason is the school organization and its structure and history, which also prevent the progress of these new ideas. The third valid reason is the negative attitudes of education professionals in our schools. Special education teachers, however, see integration and inclusion more positively than other teachers – most likely because of their profession and knowledge of special needs. There is thus a link between the readiness for inclusive pedagogy and teacher training (Moberg et al. 2009: 97). The knowledge of special pedagogy and co-operation skills are a part of the studies in education. However, there is variation in how much the issues are dealt with in each university.

Reasons, why students are given more special support than before are also various (Moberg et al. 2009: 98). The first reason could be the rise of medicalization and diagnosing. Another reason is that the difficulties in young people's lives have increased in recent years and finally, the last reason is the willingness of the society to

² It is worth pointing out that the first time intensified support was given to students in Finnish schools was in 2011 after the amendments to the National Core Curriculum (2010).

support children and young people and their well being by increasing resources. According to Special Education Strategy (2007: 42), reasons for the growing numbers of children in special education are also various. One possible explanation that could explain the rapid growth in recent years is the changes in the compilation of statistics and new classification of disorders (new labels). Another rather interesting view is the developed modern medicine which has enabled the survival of premature infants. It is said that prematurely born infants would have a more probable possibility to receive some sort of a learning disorder. Finally, research in the field of special education has increased in recent years and therefore new knowledge for the purposes of diagnosing has been received.

Comparing the statistics from Finland to other countries may give rather a strong view that Finland favors special education increasingly, instead of giving rise to inclusive pedagogy. In the comparison of the integration of disabled children in regular classes Finland was left at the very last position of the twelve countries under scrutiny (Naukkarinen and Ladonlahti 2001: 97). USA and Italy were ranked the first and second best.

However, an opposing view to the comparison between different countries and their development in regard to special education has been stated by some researchers (Väyrynen 2001: 17). The comparison is claimed to be fruitless since there are significant regional differences to take into account. For example, it would be impossible to compare the situation in Malawi to Finland, or another Third World country to other welfare states.

This section reviewed the situation regarding inclusion in Finnish schools today. The next section focuses on the advantages and challenges of inclusion.

2.4 Advantages and challenges of inclusion

This section reviews the discussion about inclusion. On the one hand, inclusion is seen as an advantage to the larger community but on the other hand, the challenges are thought to be rather extensive. The challenges arise from the concerns teachers have of their abilities to cope with inclusion. These concerns can be seen in the articles in

newspapers and journals, which is why some of those are summarized in the end of the section.

2.4.1 Advantages and views of successful inclusion

Different studies have shown that *special education classes* have not offered remarkably better learning results compared to organized special education in general education classes (Halvorsen and Sailor 1990, as quoted in Saloviita 2009a: 28-29). On top of that, students with disabilities studying in a regular classroom may have more opportunities for academic and social progress with proper support and systematic teaching included in the process (Smith and Ryndak 1997: 87). Some explanations for this are that, firstly, special education classes are rarely homogeneous: pupils of different ages with different learning or other difficulties are studying in the same classroom instead of a special education class with pupils of the same level in their studies (Saloviita 2009a: 28-29). Secondly, special education classes are not seen to provide positive role models or examples. A great deal of learning is due to an example given by peers in the classroom. The third explanation, which may seem rather harsh, is that pupils are expected to do less in special education classes. This may be caused by the next possible explanation, that the focus in special education classes is more on controlling students' behavior than on actual teaching. The fifth and rather controversial claim is that special education teachers do not master all subjects as well as subject teachers do, which might result in worse learning results in many fields. Finally, special education classes are claimed not to prepare students for real life in society.

A common fear often stated when talking about inclusion is that the learning of average students in an inclusive classroom would be disturbed by special education students. However, studies have shown that this fear is groundless and inclusive education has positive effects on all students (Staub and Beck 1994; 1995, as quoted in Saloviita 2009a: 32). The average students in inclusive education have learned to appreciate and accept difference and, moreover, learned to work together with everyone. Their self-esteem has been seen to grow because they have been able to help their disabled peers. Inclusive education has also given rise to a higher moral and views of equality. Finally, all students have made friends with each other regardless of their condition, disabilities or differences.

How is it possible to succeed in inclusive education from a teacher's point of view? Many strategies have been offered and the following are the most common ones. First of all, continuous dialogue and instructional planning of the studies together with families, school and teachers is necessary in order to find out the best ways to support a student with special needs in an inclusive classroom (Saloviita 2009a: 130; Falvey et al. 1997: 121). Teachers have the responsibility to create a good learning atmosphere in the classroom which includes creating a social code of conduct, building a safe and supporting environment for learning and, in addition, plan lessons well beforehand and monitor that the plan is followed throughout lessons (Falvey et al. 1997: 118-119). For this reason, successful inclusion requires sufficient allocation of resources (Naukkarinen and Ladonlahti 2001: 97). Teachers should use learner-centered teaching methods and treat pupils as individuals rather than as a group of students (the Finnish word for this is *'eriyttäminen'*) (Saloviita 2009a:131-133). In addition, individual assessment where possible disabilities or problems in learning have been taken into account is vital (Falvey et al. 1997: 119-121). Teachers should use various teaching methods to meet the needs of their students and their different learning strategies: group or team work, project work, using games and computers as means for teaching and learning. Even teachers of different subjects could try teaching together (Saloviita 2009a: 133). Also, students with disabilities should be granted individualization of learning and teaching. This means giving individual support that helps the student to learn the academic material. For example, a form of individualization is giving more time to take a test if a student reads in a slow pace, or giving the opportunity to use technological devices for certain tasks. This kind of support may be short-term, continuous for a specific activity or continuous in all fields (Falvey et al. 1997: 128). However, it is claimed that more time could be used to developing teaching *in general* and decreasing obstacles instead of focusing only on students with special needs/diagnosis (Väyrynen 2001: 27).

2.4.2 Possible challenges of and arguments against inclusion

Some of the challenges and arguments were already overruled in the previous section, for example, the claim that special classes meet the needs of the children with special needs better than normal classes; or that other students in normal classes get distracted by a student or students with special needs. These claims can also be found in an article by Saloviita (2012) where he discusses (and overrules) thirteen common arguments against inclusion. In addition to the two arguments already mentioned, it is claimed that

bullying will decrease if a student with special needs is sent to a special class. It is also a usual concern that teachers in regular classes do not have the expertise to meet the needs of a student with special needs. The costs of inclusion are much discussed, too: it is claimed that integration is too expensive or, quite the opposite, that integration is created only to cut costs and not to help children with special needs. Integration is, according to the statistics, more inexpensive than a segregated system, but in spite of this it is strongly criticized. A very common phrase when talking about inclusion is that it is a beautiful ideal but will not work in practice, which means that it is impossible to get all the necessary support into a regular classroom. In addition, it is supported by a claim that all preparation should be made carefully before moving into anything new. Without proper preparation this argument can be valid. For example, in her study Seppälä-Pänkäläinen (2009: 91-97) gives an example of a school where individual teachers had successfully included individual children with special needs into their classrooms before integration or inclusion were talked about in general in the end of the 1990s. It had required rather a strong personal commitment and help from a special education teacher, school assistants and other professionals but nevertheless, the findings were promising. Teachers in the study commented that it was a chance for personal growth as a professional when one had to critically evaluate and change one's own teaching methods. However, when the structure and policies of the school were changed into more integrative ones, the situation changed. The students were no longer included in the regular class the whole time. Instead, small special groups were created and separate study areas built for those with special needs, which meant the students had to move from one group to another several times during a school day. Although inclusion was the goal of the changes made, less inclusive practices were the result of it. In spite of the statistics which now showed that all students in the school were integrated into normal education classes, the reality was something else. Because the changes had been made so rapidly, the idea of inclusion was lost somewhere along the way. Returning back to the list of arguments, Saloviita (2012:24) states that teaching is a practice where one learns by doing. Inclusion is learned by doing as well. The individual teachers in Seppälä-Pänkäläinen's study had experienced this and been successful in creating inclusive practices.

Some believe that integration should be case-specific because inclusion is not suitable for everyone (Saloviita 2012: 25-29). To support this claim, it is said that the quality of teaching is more important than the place of teaching. One should also acknowledge the

negative sides of inclusion. Finally, one usual claim is that teachers are worn out by inclusion because it causes more work. This was reported for instance by *Opettaja* (Nissilä 2004) where Sakari Mogerg from the University of Jyväskylä was interviewed regarding three large-scale studies on teachers' attitudes towards integration and inclusion. Elementary school teachers were seen to wear themselves out because of inclusion. They felt that they were expected to take care of special education in addition to their own work. Their greatest concerns were lack of specialized skills and resources such as teaching material, special equipment and overall know-how. One explanation of the exhaustion was that teachers might care excessively about high-quality teaching and efficiency because they want to have the same high standards that our school system has had for years.

In another article, or a column to be precise, in *Opettaja* (Nordlund 2005), a headmaster of a school in Northern-Häme questioned the ever-increasing transfers of students under special support. He was worried about the rights of an average student when all the attention is paid on students with special needs. He also claimed that inclusion may not be a solution for all problems. He stated that everyone does not have to learn everything the same way as the others. The surrounding society has become too permissive, which was seen as the source of many behavior problems and other issues that often are a cause for a transfer under special support.

The Trade Union of Education in Finland (OAJ) has been one of the opposing parties in the discussion about inclusion. In their statement regarding the amendments to the NCC they were worried of the consequences of inclusive education (Trade Union of Education 2009). They stated that teachers' workload would increase considerably and funds should be granted in order to compensate for the extra work teachers and other education professionals have to do for inclusive education. They also demanded that studies of special pedagogy were added to teacher education curriculums.

Turun Sanomat (24 April, 2012) also reported that inclusion has not worked as it has been supposed to work. In the article a consultant from the Trade Union of Education told that the union receives worried notes from an increasing number of teachers. The worries concern the number of students with special needs that have been integrated into the already large groups, which in their opinion stands in the way of quality

teaching. The union also accused municipalities of integration for the sake of cutting costs.

These sorts of arguments and challenges prevent progress towards successful inclusion, at least according to Saloviita (2012). Inclusion is seen as a good idea in theory because of its aims for equality and indulgence but for several reasons the execution is thought to be too difficult.

The second chapter has taken a closer look at inclusion from different perspectives. Next chapter will move on to the second theory chapter and describes teacher education in general and at the University of Jyväskylä.

3 TEACHER EDUCATION

In this chapter the teacher education in Finland is first reviewed, after which teacher education and language teacher education at the University of Jyväskylä are outlined. This is done because all of the participants in the present study were language teacher students at the University of Jyväskylä. Finally, teaching and inclusion is discussed and some previous studies reviewed in the end of this section.

3.1 Teacher education in Finland

Proficient teachers, high-quality teacher education and school system are recognized and respected widely and they are considered one of the trademarks of Finnish society. The quality of education in Finland is ensured by high-quality teacher education in the university level and competence requirements for teachers decreed by statutory regulation (Opettajien työ Suomessa 2010).

The majority of teachers in Finland have graduated from a university (Curriculum of Teacher Education 2010-2013). The studies consist of a lower and a higher university degree. In early education the lower degree is sufficient for the proficiency to work as a teacher in a kindergarten with children under 7 years of age. Kindergarten teachers can also work as pre-school teachers after graduating from a university. Elementary school teachers work in elementary schools with children from 7 to 12 years of age. They have completed a degree program in teacher education. The studies consist of the

pedagogical studies for teachers, the multidisciplinary school subject studies and possible minor subjects. Subject teachers can work on any level of education, varying from elementary school to adult education. They have completed degree program/programs in that subject/those subjects they are going to teach in their future job as a subject teacher. However, they have to complete advanced studies at least in their major subject. In addition, they have to complete the pedagogical studies for teachers offered by a Department of Education and only after this do they receive the qualification of a subject teacher.

There are two ways of receiving the qualification of a subject teacher: a student can be chosen directly to a teacher education program or apply for the right to study later during the studies. In order to be chosen directly to the teacher education program one has to apply for the major subject and the pedagogical studies at the same time when applying to the university (Curriculum of Teacher Education 2010-2013).

Special education teachers and student counselors are also educated in universities. A special education teacher can work either alongside with an elementary school teacher or a subject teacher, or in a separate classroom. An elementary school teacher specialized in special pedagogy works only with student groups that have special needs. Usually special education teachers have qualified both as elementary school teachers and special education teachers but there are other ways of receiving the qualifications as well. For example, subject teachers can study special education in order to qualify as special education teachers. Student counselors work in various fields from elementary school to adult education. Their studies consist of a master's degree in education, which includes the pedagogical studies for teachers and the school counselor studies; or a higher degree in whichever subject and after completing the pedagogical studies, the qualification studies for school counselors (Curriculum of Teacher Education 2010-2013).

Special education is a part of regular teacher education in Finland but the proportions vary according to each department (Special Education Strategy 2007: 49). Because of the variation, the preparedness to work with children with special needs also varies. For example, in teacher education for elementary school teachers, simultaneous practice lessons are done together with a student of special education. In subject teacher training this is rarely possible. Also, as teacher training schools (also "teacher's colleges") do

not have special classes, it is difficult to get a chance to visit a special class and observe lessons in special classes. It is also stated that each student should be able to visit a state-owned special school during one's studies, but this is not obligatory in all universities, for example in Jyväskylä. For this reason, or because of the growing number of children with special educational needs, teachers are increasingly attending updating-training in special education during their career (Special Education Strategy 2007: 50). In the training, attitudes of the education personnel and management are developed. The preparedness to co-operate with professionals in the field of education, as well as with parents is also improved. Teachers without studies in special education have the possibility to receive support if students with special needs are integrated into their classrooms (Special Education Strategy 2007: 28). Some municipalities and cities offer a service where special schools in the area work as resource centers, where educated and experienced personnel specialized in special education share their knowledge with teachers in normal schools. There is also a possibility that a position of a special education coordinator is appointed, and the person in this office is then in charge of the development of special education in the area.

So far teacher education has been described in general. The next section will take a closer look on how teacher education is organized at the University of Jyväskylä.

3.2 Teacher education and language teacher education at the University of Jyväskylä

At the University of Jyväskylä the structure of teacher education at the Faculty of Education is divided into three branches: The Department of Teacher Education includes a degree program in teacher education, a master's degree in school counseling, pedagogical studies for teachers (basic and subject studies) and the qualification studies for school counselors. Second, the Department of Education offers studies in adult education, early childhood education, education and special education. Finally, Teacher Training School (Norssi) works as a training school for future teachers in Jyväskylä (from elementary to upper secondary school).

The purpose of the pedagogical studies for teachers is to give a future teacher the necessary means to become a professional in planning, implementation, evaluation and development of teaching (Curriculum of Teacher Education 2010-2013). According to

the curriculum, after completing the studies a future teacher understands the concept of a lifelong learning in the work of a teacher, and that changes in the society affect the school world constantly. Because teachers work in various fields of education the emphasis is on active citizenship, social equality, inclusive education and understanding cultural differences.

The subject department is responsible for the studies in the school subject, for example English. The Department of Languages offers various courses in order to provide a subject teacher student with a comprehensive view of the structure and use of the language, literature and culture of the language area and good communication skills. There are also courses focused on learning and teaching languages, which are specifically tailored for language teacher students.

The subject teacher's pedagogical studies by the Department of Education consist of 60 ECTS credits, of which 25 ECTS credits are included in the basic studies and the remaining 35 ECTS credits in the subject studies (see figure 1). For those individuals who have been chosen directly to the teacher education program, the basic studies are scheduled for the first and the second year of studies. The subject studies are scheduled for the fourth year of studies. Those who apply for the right to study the pedagogical studies for teachers later in their studies follow a similar path but often in a slightly different schedule.

The basic studies in the pedagogical studies for teachers (25 ECTS credits) introduce the field of education from the perspectives of philosophy, history, psychology and sociology (KTKP101-KTKP103). The course in *sociology of education* (KTKP103) deals with topics related to family, childhood, adolescence, adulthood, schooling and teaching. Inclusion as a phenomenon is first mentioned during the course. The course in *theory and pedagogy of guidance of learning* (OPEP410/411) deals with themes such as the foundations of school education and multiculturalism. The first *instructed orientating practice* (OPEP510) is the last part of the basic studies. During the practice subject teacher students are given support in their career choice and they learn to observe the class community, learning environments and diversity of pupils. The basic studies as a whole aim at orientating the student into the world of education by exploring it from different perspectives.

Figure 1. A summary of the pedagogical studies for teachers

BASIC STUDIES IN EDUCATION 25 op
<i>Theme 1. Introduction and orientation to the field of education</i>
The common basic studies in education (the Faculty of Education) (15 op)
<i>Subtheme 1.1 Cultural foundation of education</i>
KTKP110 Philosophy, history and anthropology of education 5 op
KTKP102 Educational psychology 5 op
KTKP103 Sociology of education 5 op
Education studies in the teacher education programme (10 op)
<i>Subtheme 1.2. Guidance of growth and learning</i>
OPEP410/411 Theories and pedagogy of guidance of learning 5 op
OPEP510 Instructive orientating training 5 op
SUBJECT STUDIES IN EDUCATION 35 op
<i>Theme 2. Guidance of learning and learning organization</i>
OPEA110 Teacher's ethics and educational philosophy 4 op
OPEA210/211 A developing individual in a group 4 op
OPEA310 Teacher, school community and society 3 op
OPEA411 Advanced subject pedagogy 6 op
OPEA611 Research methodology and communication 3 op
OPEA510 Instructed basic training 5 op
OPEA520 Instructed advanced training 7 op
OPEA530 Instructed specializing training 3 op

The subject studies in the pedagogical studies for teachers (35 ECTS credits) consist of several different study blocks. The purpose of the studies is to give a student a comprehensive view of learning and teaching as a multidimensional phenomenon. The course called *a developing individual in a group* (OPEA210/211) focuses on the individuality of learners; difficulties in learning and adaptation; inclusion; multiculturalism; and also trains and prepares a future teacher to face possible difficult situations in the school environment and provides means for creating better interaction between people. According to the curriculum, after completing the course subject teacher students have an understanding of co-operation among professionals and, above all have the ability to instruct heterogeneous groups. The first *instructed basic practice* (OPEA510) deals with similar themes as it focuses on individualizing the aims and contents of teaching, observing pupils as individual learners and members of the group. During the practice subject teacher students learn that there are various learning environments and different working methods. *Guidance of learning and the learning organization* (OPEA411) is a course, which focuses on examining teaching and learning from a subject-pedagogical perspective. *Research methodology and communication* (OPEA611) focuses on research in the field of education and encourages subject teacher students to think about the idea of teachers as researchers of their work. The course in the *teacher's ethics and educational philosophy* (OPEA110) deals with possible ethical conflicts and multiculturalism in education. During this course each student writes their

own teaching philosophy in which they examine themselves as teachers and important philosophical issues in a teacher's work. The course on *teacher, school community and society* (OPEA310) deals with the essential legislation from the perspectives of a teacher's profession and school community.

Two instructed practices are included in the subject studies (OPEA520 and OPEA530). Each practice emphasizes slightly different aspects of teaching but the main purpose is to give a student an increasingly deepening knowledge about education, and the necessary practice to become a skilled and professional teacher. In addition to the various contents of the courses in pedagogical studies, the subject teacher students are given the opportunity to learn co-operation among teachers from other subjects. Subject teacher students from different subjects are grouped into mixed groups (*sekaryhmä* in Finnish) that work together in many of the courses mentioned.

The two previous sections have described teacher education as it is organized in Finland and more precisely at the University of Jyväskylä. The next section focuses on reviewing previous studies on teaching and inclusion.

3.3 Teaching and inclusion

This section summarizes findings from the previous studies concerning teaching and inclusion.

As was mentioned earlier, teachers in mainstream schools deal with competing priorities (Deidre 2009: 177). While they are responsible for educating a vast diversity of learners they are also held accountable for teaching according to the national curriculum and achieving certain outcomes. For example, dyslexia is a language deficiency which means significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of writing, reading, speaking, listening, reasoning and mathematical abilities (Lukihäiriön määritelmä n.d.). It has become one of the best-known and widely studied cognitive syndromes. However, the results are inconclusive concerning the causes and treatment of dyslexia, which have made teachers wonder what they could do to help a learner with dyslexia. They are in need of practical models in addition to research findings.

Difficulties in learning languages have been studied a lot (Leons et. al 2009; Deidre 2009; Nijakowska 2010). When teaching languages the focus is on the language itself.

Teachers should have knowledge of different language deficiencies and learning difficulties so that they could offer their students positive learning experiences. It has been found that problems in learning a foreign language arise when moving to a post-secondary foreign language class. In one particular study the purpose was to observe teaching in a special school for students with language difficulties and seek information that would be helpful for those individuals who have difficulties in learning a foreign language (Leons et al. 2009). The findings of the study showed that the methods of teaching were surprisingly straightforward. Teachers made careful curricular choices and were conscious of the pace of learning. They claimed that students were more likely to fail if they had to master too much information in too short a period of time. Teachers in the study also had a built in support for students with weak language processing and they used a lot of multimodal and multisensory teaching methods. They had structured the activities for success, which meant that each student had a possibility to succeed and have proof of their development in learning. A lot of technical teaching aids were used, for example, to ensure that a student received immediate feedback, or to help a student to self-pace some tasks. The students were taught different learning styles and strategies to become more systematic in their learning. Routines were also created. A lot of one-on-one instruction and tutors were used in the school under observation, which also enabled the teachers to see possible problems. One major factor was to make learning fun and the learning environment as supportive as possible. By understanding the individuality of each learner and giving instructions and tasks according to the readiness of the learner, a large number of the students developed their skills as learners.

A teacher of inclusive pedagogy should also value the variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds the learners bring to the classroom. The main task is to engage each student with the activities despite the possible language barriers between the student and the teacher (Stoop Verplaetse and Migliacci 2008: 11). Multiculturalism is one of the challenges of teaching in Finnish schools. Children from culturally and linguistically diverse families may have educational needs just because they do not speak the language of instruction in schools (Deidre 2009: 49). There might also be significant cultural differences, which have an effect on their school performance. For example, they might not know how to read because of a lack of opportunities for education in their home country. It is worth noting that in cases of migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and/or unaccompanied children social or emotional difficulties caused by a trauma or something equivalent are also a real concern.

The execution of inclusion is difficult if education professionals in schools are reluctant to work for it (Biklen 2001: 78). Teachers have to have faith in and commitment to the idea of inclusion in order for it to succeed (Naukkarinen and Ladonlahti 2001: 113). Finnish researchers have noticed this and therefore attitudes towards it and views of inclusion have been studied extensively. As early as 1984, Moberg conducted a large-scale study of 743 teachers around Finland. The purpose of the study was to find out the attitudes towards physical integration, and the reasons behind these attitudes. The findings showed variation in the attitudes: the quality of the disability was one of the major factors in defining teachers' attitudes. The teachers in the study were concerned about the lack of their skills and knowledge when it came to students with special needs. Also the usefulness of integration was discussed. Interestingly those teachers with more experience in teaching were more critical of integration than their novice colleagues. Over ten years later, Häkkinen and Vanhatalo (1997) studied elementary school teachers' attitudes towards integration. The negative attitudes of teachers, in the recipients' opinion, made integration almost impossible. The teachers studied were most receptive to the idea of integrating students with difficulties in speech or reading, or exceptionally talented students. In this case, instead of causing more critical views, teaching experience caused a different perspective on the challenges of integration. In the experienced teachers' opinion the challenges were practical, such as lack of assistants, time and resources, whereas the younger teachers were more concerned with their lack of sufficient knowledge, and issues concerning attitudes. The inexperienced teachers were also less eager to integrate students with behavioral problems or students with difficulties in speech.

Also Ollqvist (2001) conducted a study on elementary school teachers' views of integration in general, and moreover, integration of students with different kinds of disabilities into basic education classes. The study was conducted by means of a questionnaire, which 37 teachers filled out. The findings revealed that most of the teachers had positive views of integration, although they had doubts about their abilities of teaching students with special needs. They also worried about possible disruptions caused by students with behavioral difficulties and the lack of time and resources. Some disabilities such as behavioral difficulties or mental disabilities were considered more challenging than others, for example, exceptionally gifted students (includes also

students with Asperger's syndrome³, to name one) and students with language difficulties. According to teachers in the study, in order for integration to be possible assistant teachers, adjustments to the physical learning environment and more resources (for differentiation) were much needed. Also smaller teaching groups were mentioned. Positive about the findings was that most teachers believed that integration in basic education classroom had a positive effect on, for example, the social skills and self-esteem of the students with special needs.

Mäkinen and Vuohiniemi (2001) conducted a study where attitudes towards integration of four groups were studied. The participants of the study were special education teachers, special education teacher students, elementary school teachers and elementary school teacher students. The attitudes of the four groups were also compared with each other. In this study, as in many previous ones, elementary school teachers were most critical of integration compared to the other three groups. The reasons for this were the lack of resources and the concern over the quality of teaching. The students with less pedagogical problems, such as those with problems in speech and reading were seen to fit into a normal classroom better than other students with special needs. It was stated that there is quite a variety of different views and attitudes, which would indicate that attitudes towards integration depend on many different issues. The attitudes of teachers are also extremely individual. In this study the more positive views of teacher students were explained by the lack of actual teaching experience, which may have brought about the idealism in their answers.

Salomaa (2008) conducted a study similar to Ollqvist's (2001). She studied teachers' views of having a student using sign language integrated into basic education. She interviewed or surveyed 22 teachers who had a student using sign language in their class. The teachers were also observed during lessons. In addition, she received 130 answers to a questionnaire from elementary school teacher students, subject teacher students, and special education teacher students. The findings showed that there were differences in opinions between elementary and secondary level teachers. The elementary school teachers thought integration was successful whereas the subject teachers believed that the student using sign language was not noticed enough, which interrupted successful integration. The subject teachers' and teacher students' views of

³ Children with Asperger's syndrome are often extremely interested in specific matters (Aspergerin oireyhtymä n.d.)

integration are interesting in the light of the present study. It was alarming that the participants who worked as subject teachers were the ones who claimed that they did not have enough information about possible teaching aids. Furthermore, they found that they did not have enough knowledge of the overall situation of the student using sign language; they assumed it was good, since none of the students had complained. The elementary school teachers had a significantly better idea of their students' situation and how they were coping in the classroom. However, a high number of the teachers, which also included other than subject teachers, said that they were worried about the amount of work, the abilities of the students using sign language, and their own competence to work in an integrated classroom. The subject teacher students were the ones who had the most negative views of teaching students with special needs because of a lack of sufficient information about special education during their studies. Moberg (2001) had also received similar findings when he conducted another large-scale study with 1824 participant teachers some years earlier. The subject teachers strongly discounted the idea of inclusive education whereas special education teachers had the most positive attitude towards it. The common reasoning was that without sufficient resources the teaching of students would suffer.

Kokko (2005) too studied teachers' attitudes towards inclusive schools. She collected a large pool of data with answers to questionnaires from 47 subject teachers, 70 elementary school teachers, 59 special education teachers and 23 head masters in the Jyväskylä region, which means that the findings could be generalized to show the attitudes of teachers working in Jyväskylä. The findings of the study showed that the subject teachers had the most critical view of inclusive schools, but the elementary school teachers were also more critical than the special education teachers and the head masters. Also the connections between the attitude towards integration and the age, sex and teaching experience of the teachers were studied, but surprisingly no connections were found. The only difference between teachers was that some of them had more critical attitudes than others, which often was linked to negative experiences concerning students with special needs. The reasons for the critical views and attitudes were that weaker students cause more disturbances in the classroom and do not participate in the activities as much as others. The critical teachers disagreed about the amount of support and help compared to the positive teachers. It was stated that the possible reason behind the critical views was the pessimistic attitude of the teachers and the situation could be changed by simply reconsidering their own attitudes (Kokko 2005: 56).

However, in a study by Niemenmaa and Niemenmaa (2006) teachers and teacher trainees had positive attitudes towards students who were considered “different”. In this study the focus was on all students that somehow differed from the mainstream or stereotypical Finnish student and therefore was somewhat different from the studies that have focused only on students with special needs because of some sort of deficiency or learning difficulty.

Pinola (2008) too (as well as Ollqvist (2001) and Salomaa (2008)) studied elementary school teachers but the focus was more on their attitudes towards integration and inclusion. It was found that those teachers who had a positive attitude towards integration had positive experiences of working with children with special needs, which also was the case in Kokko’s (2005) study. They had a clear idea of the concepts of integration and inclusion and no trouble defining the terms. The teachers with negative attitudes also had experiences of working with students with special needs, but the experiences had been unpleasant ones. Those teachers who had a neutral attitude had none or little experience of working with students with special needs. The reason for the negative or neutral attitudes, in the light of this study, was the uncertainty or false information of the definitions of integration or inclusion. However, all teachers felt that they were in need of more support and information no matter what the attitude towards integration and inclusion was.

Similar findings have also been found abroad. Five comparative case studies done in Portugal showed that communication barriers and lack of in- or pre-service education when working with students with special needs were real concerns for the five teachers that were interviewed (Freire and Cesar 2003). The concerns were fairly similar to those of the teachers interviewed by Pinola (2008).

Finally, Arnala (2009) conducted a study about co-operation between special education teachers and English teachers in secondary schools (grades 7-9). The study was conducted in Central Finland and a total of seven English teachers were interviewed. The findings showed that there was a need for co-operation between education professionals in secondary schools because subject teachers felt that they lacked information, skills and time in teaching pupils with special needs. The idea of co-operation was seen in a positive light, essential even, but the work in practice would have needed more time and resources. Each participant in the study said that there was a

need for more practical knowledge of special pedagogy. This type of knowledge should have been emphasized in teacher training. When asked about inclusion, some of the teachers had none or little knowledge of its definition. The overall opinion was that inclusion encompassed extremely good values and ideas in theory but in the present system putting ideas into practice was seen almost impossible. In the light of English learning, the teachers had noticed that several students had problems in learning, especially in understanding the structure of the language, writing and vocabulary. However, some teachers mentioned their common uncertainty about whether a student had some sort of a deficiency or just another reason for the problems in learning. In spite of this, most teachers believed that in order to learn the language it was necessary to hear the language in use and learn to practice it among others and thus, they were against sending a student with special needs to a special education class.

To sum up, the previous studies on inclusion deal with the effect it has had on teachers, teachers' attitudes towards inclusion and their feelings of coping. The attitudes of teachers seem to vary quite a lot. Researchers have rather positive views of inclusion whereas many teachers have fairly critical views. The concerns over lack of knowledge, quality of teaching and sufficient support were common factors when reading through the studies about the matter.

This section concluded the theoretical background of the present study. The following chapter will explain the reasons for conducting the study and describe the aims and the research questions of the present study.

4 AIM OF THE PRESENT STUDY

In this chapter the reasons for choosing the particular topic and participants are explained. In addition, the aims of the study and the exact research questions can be found in section 5.2.

4.1 Motivating the study

Attitudes towards inclusion have been studied every once in a while over the years, and for some reason the findings have been similar. Inclusion is seen as a good idea, but making it happen in practice is thought to be almost impossible. Teachers, and

especially subject teachers, feel that they do not have the skills or resources to teach in an inclusive classroom and thus have strong negative feelings towards the whole phenomenon.

As mentioned earlier, there is a link between the readiness for inclusive pedagogy and teacher training. The education on special pedagogy and co-operation skills are a part of the studies in education but the amounts vary (Moberg et al. 2009:21). For this reason it is important to study the views of those individuals who are completing their training at the very moment and see how they feel about the phenomenon in general, and the means the teacher education program offers.

The teacher education curriculum was revised at the University of Jyväskylä in 2005, and separate study modules in special pedagogy were removed. For this reason every lecturer of the Faculty of Education were sent to updating training which dealt with inclusive education. The training lasted for several years. Due to the intensive training, inclusive education was integrated into almost every study module in the present teacher curriculum (Saloviita 2009c: 361). The teachers who had been studied in the previous studies were complaining about their lack of skills and knowledge when it came to inclusion. Elementary school teachers and subject teachers are usually unwilling to teach pupils with special needs (Moberg et al. 2009: 73). Thus, it is important to see whether the attitudes have changed after the changes in the teacher education curriculum. It is also necessary to find out what the future subject teachers think about inclusion in the foreign language classroom and whether they feel capable of teaching an inclusive classroom.

4.2 Aims of the study

The main purpose of the present study is to discover how future language teachers define and understand inclusion in schools, and what their attitudes towards inclusive education are. There are five sets of questions, which the present study attempts to answer:

1. How do foreign language teacher students understand and define the term *inclusion*?
2. What are their attitudes towards inclusion in schools?

3. In their opinion, what are the advantages and challenges of inclusion?
4. In their opinion, does the teacher education provide sufficient information on special education and inclusion?
5. Are there significant differences in views between those who are still completing their pedagogical studies for teachers and those who have finished their pedagogical studies?

The first research question aims at finding out how foreign language teacher trainees understand and define the term *inclusion* and whether there are significant differences in definitions between those individuals who are still completing their pedagogical studies and those who have completed them. Special interest is placed upon the terminology and practical examples the trainees use and give when defining the phenomenon. It does not go without saying that each participant would have a fully prepared definition of inclusion, or that they would even have experiences of working with pupils with special needs. Therefore it is necessary to explore their understanding of inclusion before moving on to other issues.

The second research question seeks to find out what kind of attitudes the teacher students have towards inclusion in schools. It is of interest to explore the reasoning of the attitudes the participants should have and see if they can be linked to their own school experiences, or to some other events in the past. Personal experiences can be expected to have an effect on the attitudes and thus, seeking an answer to the second research question has its place in the present study.

The third research question investigates the advantages and challenges of inclusion in future foreign language teachers' opinion. The aim of the question was to test the participants' views and see whether they could come up with more positive or negative ideas. This could also reflect the participants' attitudes towards inclusion.

The fourth research question seeks to find out whether the teacher education provides enough information on special education and inclusion in the subject teacher students' opinion or not, and especially, how the trainees justify their opinions. Teacher education can be seen as a great force influencing the thoughts and practices of young teacher trainees and it is therefore important topic to discuss about.

Finally, the last and fifth research question focuses on the possible differences in views and opinions between the two groups. It is extremely interesting to see if there is a drastic change in the views between those in the middle of their studies and those finishing their studies. On the one hand, if the views and opinions change from negative to positive, what could be the reasons behind it? Has the teacher education program succeeded in providing enough information on inclusion? On the other hand, if the attitudes change from positive to negative, how could that be explained? Has the teacher education program caused the decline or are there other contextual features involved? After answering all the five questions there should be a much clearer view of how future teachers see and feel about inclusion.

Based on the previous studies reviewed in chapter 4 some possible outcomes can be suggested even though the present study is not quantitative in nature. Yet, it is interesting to explore the idea. One such assumption is that foreign language teacher trainees at the University of Jyväskylä may have mixed feelings towards inclusion in schools. The first reason is that subject teachers have only so much time to spend with one group and one of the core ideas of inclusion is maintaining continuity among groups so that inclusive teaching works properly (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 156). Hence, subject teachers do not have time to differentiate and provide sufficient support for each individual in the classroom. The second reason is that teacher students do not have the needed knowledge of special education and the uncertainty may affect future teachers' feelings. However, the possibility of receiving completely different findings was also taken into account, and the assumptions did not have an effect on how the present study was conducted.

The present study is a qualitative descriptive study where eight language teacher students were interviewed about their opinions on inclusion and their attitudes towards inclusive education. The interviews were semi-structured theme interviews with four main themes, which also structured the analysis. The data was analyzed by using content analysis. As a result, by analyzing the data offered by teacher students, one was able to draw conclusions about their understanding and attitudes and moreover, the reasons behind certain attitudes towards inclusion. With this knowledge it is possible to start developing an idea of how to change the possible negative attitudes. In addition, it is possible to evaluate the state of teacher education and have a fair ground for constructive feedback.

This chapter described the aims and the research questions of the present study. The next chapter will review the methods of data collection and analysis.

5 DATA AND METHODOLOGY

In this section the methodology and methods of the present study are explained. The reasons for choosing the particular method are explained in the section 5.1 and the latter parts deal with describing the data collection methods, participants of the present study and the means of analysis.

5.1 Reasons for choosing the method

The present study is an empirical qualitative (phenomenographical) study. The reasons for choosing the framework are the following: the data is collected in a natural setting (compared to a fixed laboratory setting); humans are being the instruments in the data collection; the data analysis is multifaceted and detailed; qualitative methods are favored in the data collection; the target group is chosen appropriately instead of using random samples; the research plan is flexible and can be modified throughout the process; and finally, cases are considered unique and the data is analyzed accordingly (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 164). Also, in qualitative research statistical generalization is not of importance because the idea is to describe a certain phenomena and, what is more, to understand certain behavior (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 85). Phenomenography is a data collection strategy which is interested in people's conceptions of issues (Metsämuuronen 2006: 174-175). People may have rather different views of an issue due to their educational background, age, sex or experiences, to mention a few.

The semi-structured interview was chosen because of its adaptability and the possibility to investigate motives and feelings (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 34-35). Interviews are the most usual methods of data collection, along with questionnaires, observation and data based on documents (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 71-74). The advantages of conducting an interview in comparison to the other data collection methods are various. Firstly, it is flexible. It was obvious in advance that the answers to the research questions in the present study would be multidimensional and multifaceted, and a questionnaire alone would not have reached that depth. During an interview the researcher has a possibility to repeat questions if necessary, ask additional questions and above all, to help avoiding misunderstandings. What is more, the participant and the

researcher have direct verbal interaction with each other, which is the main reason for the flexibility of an interview (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 204).

The next section describes semi-structured theme interviews in more detail.

5.2 Semi-structured theme interview

Semi-structured interview (also “thematic interview”) has a set of certain themes that are discussed with participants (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 47-48; Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 75). It is a matter of opinion whether there is a set of detailed questions or not. The questions can be presented in a random order and the questions can be altered or omitted. The themes, however, are the same for all participants. In a thematic interview the focus is on people’s interpretations of issues, the meanings they give to the surrounding world and how the meanings are constructed in interaction. The idea is to receive answers that are meaningful in the light of the framework and research problem of the study.

Interviews can be conducted as individual or group interviews (Dufva 2011: 135). The advantage of an individual interview is that it might be easier to talk about issues one does not remember straight away, or issues one is afraid of telling to a whole group of people. The interviewer also has a better possibility to focus on that one particular person’s thoughts, compared to a group interview. In the present study an individual interview was seen a better choice due to these reasons.

Naturally, there are limitations to the method: interviews take time and resources and moreover, bias is a possible problem (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 74). In order to avoid bias interviews have to be recorded and transcribed properly. The preparation for an interview requires careful planning and also training for the role of an interviewer (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 206-207). There is a possibility for a variety of misinterpretations as well: interviews are always culturally bounded, context and situation bounded and the participants often have a tendency to produce socially favorable answers.

To sum up, the researcher chose to use a semi-structured theme interview as the method of data collection. The decision was made because of its flexibility and suitability for the purposes of the present study. The next section describes the participants who took part in the theme interviews of the present study.

5.3 Participants

The participants of the present study were eight English teacher students studying at the University of Jyväskylä. The reason for choosing the particular target group is to provide insights to subject teacher trainees' views of inclusion. In the previous studies subject teacher students have not been taken into account as much as basic education teacher students, for example. Only language teacher students were chosen so that the focus of the study could be limited to a language classroom context.

When planning to use interviews as a primary data collection method, a researcher has a possibility to choose the participants who most likely have some knowledge of the matter and therefore, have more to say about it in the actual interview (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 74). The chosen participants are also more likely to give their permission to use the data from their interviews for the study. In the present study a selection method called "elite selection" was used in order to make sure that all the participants would produce enough data (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 86). In the elite selection procedure the researcher knows the participants' social skills or other abilities beforehand and is therefore able to carefully evaluate their suitability for the purposes of the study. Even though some method literature advises not to interview a friend or a familiar person (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 72), in this case familiarity was seen as an advantage.

The participants were asked to take part in the research by e-mail. Since the researcher was familiar with all eight candidates, it was rather easy to get in touch with the persons in question. The participants answered within a week of the request and all eight interviews were scheduled for the second week of December (week 50) in year 2012.

The eight participants had the right to study English and pedagogical studies at the University of Jyväskylä. Only one of the participants had not followed the direct selection procedure, but applied for the right to study pedagogical studies later during his studies. Four of the interviewees had completed their basic studies in the pedagogical studies for teachers. The rest had completed all their pedagogical studies. The reason for choosing participants who would fit into the two groups was to find out how pedagogical studies in the subject level might affect the language teacher trainees' opinions on inclusion.

In group A, where all four participants were still completing their pedagogical studies, there were two women and two men. The participants were fourth and fifth year students, ages 21-26. Only two of the participants had been working as a substitute teacher and the others had only experienced teaching during training lessons in the basic studies. None of the participants in this group had taken studies in special pedagogy.

Group B, of which all had completed their pedagogical studies, there were three women and one man. They were all fifth year students. They were 23-26 years of age with varying experiences in teaching. All four of them had been working as a substitute teacher before, during or after completing their pedagogical studies. None of the four participants had taken studies in special pedagogy but one was studying in a master program for elementary school teachers.

A common feature among the interviewees was that they all wanted to become teachers for three main reasons: teaching is social and interactive work, there is an opportunity to make a difference and the prospects of employment are much more positive for teachers than other language professionals.

In the next section the process of data collection is described in more detail.

5.4 Data collection

The data collection was performed during the last two months of 2012. The data collection was completed in a few separate stages. The preparations and the actual data collection are introduced in the following sections.

5.4.1 Piloting

Piloting is necessary and important part of the thematic interview. It is a way to test the structure of the interview, the order of the themes and the design of the questions (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 72). For this reason one pilot interview for the present study was performed in November 2012. The participant was a student of English, which made this person a suitable choice for the purpose. The interviewee was informed to ask as many clarifying questions about the questions made by the interviewer as he could imagine during the interview. This was done to make sure each theme and question was easily understandable. The researcher also found room for development

whilst interviewing the pilot person. The pilot interview took over an hour but approximately half of the time was spent discussing possible improvements and altering, for example, the wording of questions and the order of the questions, as well as adding some clarifying questions under some of the themes. The warm-up questions were also generated during the pilot interview. The pilot interview gave the researcher good insights into the possible problems that would have otherwise arisen in actual interviews. The pilot interview made it also possible to inform the participants about the structure, themes and length of the interview, which gave them a possibility to prepare themselves for the event.

5.4.2 Interviews

The interviews took place during week 50 in 2012 in various locations in Jyväskylä, in a café or at a participant's home, whichever was most suitable for the participant. Each interview was conducted individually and the language used was Finnish, since all the participants were Finnish. The researcher decided to use Finnish in the interviews because personal opinions and ideas are usually expressed more fluently when using one's mother tongue. As mentioned, the participants had received information about the topic, main themes and length of the interview beforehand so it was easy to begin the interviews straight away. It is recommended and ethical that interviewees get to know the topic and even the questions beforehand so that they have the opportunity to become acquainted with the idea. This is done because the main idea of the interviews is to gain as much information from the participant as possible (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 73).

The researcher had printed a background information form for each individual, in which they filled in their sex, age, the duration of their studies at the university and the subjects they had studied. Additionally, they had a possibility to shortly write down their previous work experience in the field of education. The participants also gave their permission to use the data from their interviews for the purposes of later studies by signing the form. It is important that the participants are aware of the aims, methods and possible risks of the study in understandable terms (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 131). For this reason, the participants were informed about the purpose of the interview well beforehand and asked to give their permission in writing. The background information form can be found in Appendix 1.

Each interview began by explaining the participant the idea of the study, and the structure of the interview. The interview was divided in four different themes under which the researcher had generated sets of key questions. The interview schedule can be found in Appendix 2. Before moving into the actual themes a few warm-up questions were asked about the participant's experience in teaching and the reasons for applying for teacher education to begin with. After a short discussion the interview moved on to the actual themes. The first theme concerned the concept of inclusion. This theme was addressed by asking the interviewee his or her definition of inclusion. The participant was given a chance to explain the phenomenon as they wished, either theoretically or with clarifying examples. After the definitions were given, the participant was asked to tell how inclusion was evident in schools, and to be more precise, in language classrooms. Next, the participant was to give his or her ideas about special support for students nowadays. Finally, support for teachers was discussed. The aim of these questions was firstly, to get insights into the actual knowledge the teacher trainees have on inclusion and different forms of special education in Finland. Secondly, the possible differences in views between the two groups were supposed to become visible.

The second theme dealt with attitudes towards inclusion. Before beginning a discussion about the second theme the interviewer emphasized that this section dealt with personal views and not so much general opinions on inclusion. Now the participant had a possibility to give his/her personal opinion on inclusion, integration and segregated special education and give reasons for his or her opinions. In addition, the participant was asked to share his or her own school memories, especially how special education was arranged when the participant had attended school. The interviewee was finally asked to compare his or her views of special education in the past to the situation now.

The third theme covered challenges and advantages of inclusion. The participant started by listing his or her opinions on the advantages of inclusion in general. Next, the same issue was discussed focusing on the possible challenges. The focus was narrowed down step by step adding more precise questions about advantages and challenges in the work of teachers, then the work of subject teachers and finally the work of language teachers. Finally, the interviewee was asked to compare the work of elementary school teachers and subject teachers to each other from the perspective of inclusion. The participant was encouraged to repeat the same answers if they should fit into many different fields. They were given the alternative to pass some parts if they could not find anything to say

about it. The purpose of these questions was to find out the views of inclusive education held by the interviewees in more precise terms. More importantly the aim was to see if the challenges would overrun the advantages.

Finally, teacher education at the University of Jyväskylä was discussed. This theme was the only one with separate question patterns for the two groups. Those participants who had already completed their pedagogical studies were asked to reflect upon the matters teacher education had taught about inclusion or teaching students with special needs, and decide whether he or she thought it was sufficient or not. The participants were also given an opportunity to give suggestions for improvement if they found their education insufficient. For those participants who were still completing their studies the first question concerned matters taught so far and the others their expectations of their future pedagogical studies.

The last part of the interviews did not deal with a particular theme as such, but worked as a conclusion to the discussion of inclusion. The participants of both groups were asked to react to the last remaining question, or to be more precise, a statement:

“Jokainen opettaja pärjää inklusiivisessa luokkatilanteessa aivan tavallisilla, monipuolisilla opetustekniikoilla, jotka jokainen oppii tavallisessa opettajankoulutuksessa”

“Every teacher is capable of coping in an inclusive classroom with ordinary, versatile teaching techniques that each will learn in the ordinary teacher education”

The statement was created on the basis of the definitions given by various researchers (Woolfolk 2007; Saloviita 2012; Peterson and Hittie 2010: 363). The participants were also asked to give reasons to their reaction. The aim of the statement was to sum up the idea of inclusion once more after the participants had had time to think it through during the interview; and give a possibility to express additional ideas about the phenomena.

Throughout the interviews the participants were encouraged to give their own, honest opinions about the issue and interrupt or add information at any point of the interview. The atmosphere during the interviews was relaxed and comfortable even though the topic of the discussion was not that simple. The fact that the interviews were recorded was not seen as a problem either and it did not cause any tension between the researcher and the interviewees. This was probably due to the fact that the researcher and the

participants were familiar with each other and there was no need to be nervous about the situation itself. The discussions went smoothly as if they were casual conversations between friends. The time used in casual conversation before and during the interview is not misspent because it is a crucial part in creating the trust between the participant and the interviewee (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 90). Trust is much needed in this type of interviews.

The interviews were recorded with a professional recorder in order to record every discussion properly. It was also done to avoid bias. Recording is a common practice when performing thematic interviews (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 92). It is the only way to avoid unnecessary breaks because the interviewer can focus on listening to the interviewee instead of writing exhausting notes. The advantage of recordings is that it captures easily the tone of voice, words emphasized, gaps and other nuances in the speech of the interviewee, although the main interest in the present study was the content of the interviews.

The sections above described the methods of data collection in the present study. The next section focuses on the methods of data analysis first, by explaining what content analysis is all about and second, by explaining the stages of the analysis in the present study.

5.5 Method of analysis

Qualitative analysis has a few common main features (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 136). The analysis often begins already during the interviews. While interviewing, the researcher has the possibility to take note of similarities and differences in the answers and make observations about other occurrences. Qualitative analysis is also often in a verbal data form, compared to quantitative analysis which is presented in numbers. The researcher uses reasoning as a means in the analysis, either inductive or deductive. Inductive reasoning means that the researcher begins with specific observations and moves towards broad generalizations. Deductive reasoning, in contrary, has theoretical themes, which are tested with the help of the data. In other words, it is a method of moving from broad theory to specific conclusions. The methods of qualitative analysis are various and there is not one correct or superior technique for it. Because the data collection method in the present study was a thematic interview it was rather a logical

choice to use content analysis as the method of analysis. This method will be explained thoroughly in the next section.

5.5.1 Content analysis

Content analysis is used to describe conceptions in phenomenographical research (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 14). It is a basic method used in qualitative research (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 91-113). There are a few important issues to be remembered when beginning to use this method. Firstly, one cannot report every single detail. Many interesting points in the data of the present study had to be left out because they were not related to the research problem. Many researchers find the analysis of thematic interviews rather a painful and time-consuming process because of the abundance of data (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 135). Secondly, it is worthwhile to figure out beforehand whether one is looking for similarities or differences because it has an effect on the process and the findings of the analysis. Finally, one should start analyzing the data straight away so that important details would not be forgotten.

The ways to analyze the data are various. In the present study dividing the data into themes was seen as the best choice because the main focus was on what had been said about each theme chosen (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 93). The analysis of the data is easier if the data collection method has been a theme interview. The themes also structuring the analysis have already been used so they do not have to be created from scratch. Transcribing the interviews is done before the analysis and the written notes work as an instrument for structuring and describing the data.

Theory-driven content analysis was chosen because of the nature of the data (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 96-103). In theory-driven analysis the theory or theoretical framework is used to assist the analysis of the data so that connections can be made to the theoretical framework. The previous information on the topic is acknowledged but in the end the main purpose is to present new and fresh ideas. In short, the categorization of the data is based on the theoretical framework of the study and the analysis is guided by a theme or themes. The first phase is to create a framework or a structure for the analysis. By doing this it is easy to see which issues in the data fits within the structure and which issues are left out. It is a matter of opinion and depending on the means of the analysis whether new themes are created from the points that do not fit in the

original structure. In short, content analysis is described to take place in three different phases (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 107-120). The original data is reduced by condensing the information into simple statements. Next, the statements are clustered into higher and lower subcategories. Finally, the data is organized under clear themes and their subcategories. In other words the data is conceptualized. The size of the data is thus reduced and the important information it contains has become more evident.

To sum up, content analysis was chosen for the method of analysis. Content analysis was seen as a logical choice since the method of data collection was a theme interview. The next section will describe the stages of content analysis in the present study.

5.5.2 Transcribing and analyzing the data of the present study

The recorded data was transferred into a computer and substantially transcribed one at a time. Each interview was given a code number: M (male) or F (female) and a random number from 1 to 8, since there were a total of 8 participants. The number does not indicate the order of the interviews of any other relevant matter whatsoever. Also letters A (the group that was still completing their pedagogical studies) and B (those who had completed their pedagogical studies) were added in order to facilitate the comparison of the two groups. The interviews were transcribed using fairly simple methods. In this case the speech was slowed down four times the normal speed and the interviews were written down word for word. The researcher had made some notes during the interviews which made it easier to remember small details from the interview sessions. These were, for example, hand gestures or certain expressions on the participant's face, which could be then added to the transcript if seen necessary. The original transcripts were coded with line numbering beginning from 1 in each new page of the transcript. Coding was seen as a convenient way of tracking down where each excerpt used in the text in chapter 6 was taken from. Finally, each excerpt had an identification code that looked like the following: *M8-A, 2, 23*, where the first part indicates the interviewee, the second part the page of the transcript, and the last part the line where the excerpt can be found. The excerpts used in the text were also translated into English. The rough translations can be found in Appendix 4.

Because the analysis was based on the content of the interviews, transcription was not as detailed as it would be in a study focusing on actual discourse analysis. Thus, only a

limited set of transcription conventions was used. The transcription conventions used in the transcripts are the following:

Overlapping speech	/ /
Loud speech	CAPITAL LETTERS
Speech in English	Bold
Interrupted word or phrase	discontinuous wo-
Gap + falling intonation	.
Gap + rising intonation	,
Unclear speech	(xx), (xx)
Unclear phrase	(something)
Other comments	((laughter))

(Adapted from Dufva 2011: 145)

In addition, square brackets ([-]) were used in the excerpts summarized from the original transcripts to signal a longer pause, or irrelevant part in between words. Nothing essential was left out of the excerpts since usually a pause or an irrelevant talk or disturbance was caused by a discourse marker or comments such as ‘joo’ (*yes*) and ‘hmm-m’ made by the interviewer.

After each interview was carefully coded and transcribed the analysis was ready to begin. It is important that the researcher reads the material several times in order to see it as an entity rather than individual thoughts (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008:143). This is why the transcripts were printed and read through several times. Usually in data analysis cross-checking the material is recommended in order to find out if some vital information is missing or if mistakes have been made (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 221). Notes and underlining were made while reading through the transcriptions in order to check and finally, to structure the data. The data from the interviews was divided under four themes that had been created already for the interviews. After this the statements were divided into main categories, which also were used in the original interviews. This is illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2. An illustration of the main themes and main categories

<p>1. Defining inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Definition - Inclusion in schools today - Support given to students - Support given to teachers
<p>2. Attitudes towards inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opinions on inclusion - Opinions on segregated special education - Experiences of special education in the past - Experiences of special education now
<p>3. Advantages and challenges of inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advantages in general - Advantages in the work of teachers - Challenges in general - Challenges in the work of teachers - Difference between the work of elementary school teachers and subject teachers
<p>4. Teacher education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher education and inclusion - Sufficiency of education on teaching students with special needs - Ideas for improvement - Expectations (group A only) - Responses to the statement

Finally, more precise subcategories were searched and found in the data. An example of the whole series of steps used in the analysis of the present study can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3. An illustration of the steps of the analysis

THEME 3: ADVANTAGES AND CHALLENGES

Extract	Simple statements	Subcategories	Main categories
from the original interviews	condensing the information	grouping ideas into smaller entities	category invented for the theme interviews
(251) Joo, no tietysti kielten opettaja työssä aina nyt on haasteena kun on niin eritasoisia eritaustaisia oppilaita (M7-A, 10, 21)	Language teachers work is always challenging	Already challenging	CHALLENGES IN GENERAL

As mentioned in the previous section, content analysis usually follows three different phases: condensing the information, clustering the data and finally conceptualizing the data. Since a theory-driven analysis was guiding the analysis of the present study, themes and main categories were invented on the basis of the theoretical background before the analysis. Hence first, an extract from the original interviews that illustrated a particular main category was chosen. Secondly, the information from the extract was

condensed to a simple statement. Finally, suitable clusters called subcategories were created under each main category. A more thorough illustration of the analysis can be found in Appendix 3.

In the next chapter the findings of the analysis of the data are presented.

6 FINDINGS

In the following sections (6.1-6.5) the findings of the present study are reported. Extracts from the interviews are embedded in the sections to illustrate the observations. The four main themes were originally invented for the theme interviews. The findings, too, are divided into separate sections according to these four main themes. The research questions to which the present study has sought to find answers are presented in the beginning of each main section. In order to facilitate reading through the findings the main themes and headlines of the categories have been written in **bold** letters. *Italics* has been used whenever there has been a need to further explain a Finnish term used in the extracts. Illustrations of the analysis and the formation of the main categories, with the original excerpts can be found in Appendix 3.

Although the present study is of a qualitative nature, each section closes with a short summary of the number of participants who brought up each new point. Some comparisons are made between the two groups, A and B. Group A consisted of the participants who were still completing their pedagogical studies for teachers and group B of the participants who had already completed them. The division in the end of each section was made to facilitate the comparison of the two groups in section 6.5. where the differences and similarities are drawn together.

6.1 Defining inclusion

The first research question sought to find out how the subject teacher trainees understood and defined inclusion in general. Even though inclusion is mentioned in the syllabus of the pedagogical studies for teachers it was not certain that each participant would come up with similar answers. The first main theme, **defining inclusion**, consisted of four different main categories: **defining inclusion**, **inclusion in schools today**, **support given to students** and **support given to teachers**. Each of the main categories were divided into several subcategories which were drawn from simple

statements summarizing the original extracts (see figure 4). Each subcategory will be presented in the beginning of a new section.

Figure 4. Theme 1: Defining inclusion

I. DEFINING INCLUSION

DEFINING INCLUSION	INCLUSION IN SCHOOLS TODAY	SUPPORT GIVEN TO STUDENTS	SUPPORT GIVEN TO TEACHERS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No definition ▪ Opposite of track system ▪ One group for all students ▪ No segregation ▪ Familiarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uncertainty ▪ Students with special needs as a part of the school community ▪ The work of teachers ▪ Negative effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not visible ▪ Support given by special education experts ▪ Individualized studies ▪ Small groups ▪ Adjustments to the learning environment ▪ Tripartite support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No idea ▪ No resources ▪ Help from the school ▪ Help from experts ▪ Help from technology ▪ Needs, hopes and wishes ▪ Guesses

6.1.1 Defining inclusion

Various definitions of what inclusion could mean were found in the data although similarities were evident as well. The various definitions were divided into five subcategories. These subcategories were **no accurate definition, opposite of track system, one group for all students, no segregation** and **familiarity**.

Defining inclusion in one's own words turned out to be a difficult task. Inclusion was considered to have something to do with special pedagogy but an **accurate definition** was not always available. Uncertainty about what could be considered inclusion and what not came out even though there was an idea what inclusion could mean in theory. This issue was discussed in extract (1):

(1)⁴ no ehkä just sekin et mitä sekin mitä sillä haetaan oikeesti sillä inklusiolla, et haetaanko sitä silleen tulee just valtavia tommosia et on tosi monta. [-] erityistarpeellista oppilasta, et tosi vaativia ryhmiä vai tarkottaakse sitä et siellä ois muutama. [-] et se jotenkin mun mielestä ei se oo mistään vaiheessa kauheen selvää ollu (NI-B, 11, 31)

It had not been clear so far if inclusion meant having many students with special needs in one group, which would make these classes extremely demanding, or if it meant having just a few students with special needs integrated into the normal group.

⁴ See Appendix 4 for the rough translations of the extracts

An inclusive class was seen to be in sharp **contrast to the old-fashioned track system** (in Finnish *tasoryhmä*), where students were grouped according to their skills in subjects such as mathematics, languages or mother tongue. This was expressed in extracts (2) and (3):

(2) vähän niinku tämmösten tasoryhmien vastakohta. (M3-B, 2, 33)

(3) et voijaan jo ajatella mun mielestä että suomalainen peruskoulu integroi jo nyt jonkun verran koska meillä ei oo mitää tasoryhmiä eikä sen puolesta lajiteltu mutta sitte tavallaan et mihin se on menossa (inkluusio). (N1-B, 2, 35)

It was thought that the Finnish school system was already integrative. The reason for such a claim was that the track system had been abolished a long time ago because it had been regarded as discriminating. Integration in the light of inclusion would then mean something more because abolishing the track system did not count as inclusion.

Inclusion was also understood as **having just one group for all students**, as illustrated in extract (4):

(4) No siis, inkluusio mää käsitän sen sill- sillä lailla että. se tarkoittaa sitä että et ryhmä on niinku on vaan yks ryhmä. Tai että. öö esimerkiks koulussa erityisoppilaita pyritään pitämään siinä siinä omassa luokassa mahdollisimman paljon. (N4-B, 2, 27)

It was further explained as having all students in the same classroom but the actual definition of what kinds of students were included in the classroom varied. Uncertainty about the kinds of students included was expressed, as extract (5) illustrates:

(5) No kun mä en tiedä oikee vastaus, oikeata vastausta tähän kysymykseen, mut mä väittäisin että tää liittyy siihen että sisällytetään erilaisia oppijoita. luokahuoneeseen (M8-A, 2, 22)

Uncertainty was expressed by using phrases such as "mä en tiää oikeata vastausta, mut.." (*I do not know the correct answer but..*) and "mä väittäisin" (*I could argue..*) and then offering an explanation of the situation.

The definition was also elaborated from milder to more difficult cases of inclusion. Extract (6) presents an example of this type of division:

(6) no ehkä lievimmässä niinku tavallaan mielessä se tarkoittaa sitä vaan että meillä on eritasoset kaikki samassa niinku ryhmässä, ja sitte ääripäässä se tarkoittaa sitä että meillä on oppilaita jotka on niinku. joilla on eri diagnooseja ja tarvii sitä henkilökohtasta tukea ja ohjausta nii heitä on useampia. tai sitte että on joku kehityksellinen vamma tai joku tämmönen tiedollinen tavallaan heikkous (N1-B, 2, 27)

In the mildest case inclusion meant having students of different levels studying in the same group, whereas in the most severe case there were many students with various diagnoses or disabilities included in the normal group, who were also in need of individual support. Students with learning difficulties or disabilities were thought to be integrated with normal students (or as referred to by the participant, “keskivertoisten”, *average*) in other answers as well, as discussed in extracts (7) and (8):

(7) ne oppilaat joilla o oppimisvaikeuksia tai. ilmeisesti myös lieviä kehitysvammoja niin yhdistet- tai laitetaan sinne norma- norm- okei normaalien lasten. voi ei tost tulee joku ((nauraa)) öö. tavallisten lasten kanssa sinne samaan luokkaan [-] Tai sellasten keski-keskivertoisten niinku että. et ne yhdistetään (N6-A, 3, 17)

(8) Mun mielestä inklusio tarkoittaa sitä. että oppilaat on esimerkiksi yhdessä samassa tilassa. samassa luokassa opiskelee. jos jollain on esimerkiksi jonkun sortin vamma tai oppimis- oppimisvaikeus. [-] Tai muu vastaava. vaan että sillon, jos on semmonen täysinkluisio niin sillon kaikki on. kaikki on niissä samoissa luokkahuoneissa sitte toki voi olla. Tai pitäisikin olla erityisopettajia avustajia. mitä kaikkea mutta niin että ketään ei eroteta. (N5-A, 2, 20)

In a fully inclusive situation (referred to as “täysinkluisio” by the participant in extract (8)), where students with disabilities or learning difficulties were integrated into the normal group, there should be a special education teacher or an assistant present. The main idea was that no one is separated from the main group.

Immigrant students who are integrated with Finnish students were mentioned in addition to having students with learning difficulties in the same classroom, as pointed out in extract (9):

(9) sellaset asiat mitä mä mietin siinä et integroidaan. esimerkiks erilaisia oppijoita tai oppimisvaikeuksis-, [-] oppilaita joilla on oppimisvaikeuksia [-] Niin samoihin ryhmiin sellasten oppilaiden kanssa joilla ei todetusti sellaisia ole. [-] Tai sitten että integroidaan maahanmuuttajaoppilaita. suomenkielist- äidinkieltään suomenkielisten oppilaiden kans samaan luokkaan käytännössä siis. näin mä tän koen. (M7-A, 3, 27)

Immigrants were thought to be integrated with those students whose mother tongue is mainly Finnish and therefore they could be seen as a part of inclusive practices.

The view of an inclusive classroom was that there is one classroom where all students are grouped to learn together regardless of their differences in their learning skills, as illustrated in extract (10):

(10) No. Minun käsityksen mukaan se tarkoittaa eritasoisten. oppijoiden niinku sisällyttämistä samaan ryhmään eli [-] Eli heikot oppilaat hyvät oppilaat ja keskitason oppilaat ja oppimisvaikeuksiset oppilaat kaikki toimii samassa ryhmässä toisiaan ja sitten niinkun auttaen tavallaan vaikuttavat toistensa oppimiseen eli. (M3-B, 1, 33)

All students could benefit from having students of different levels studying in the same classroom. The students could help each other and in that way have a positive effect on each other's learning.

It was emphasized that inclusion means the opposite of **segregation**. This means not having separate special classes at all or that no student is separated from the main group. The idea of not having special education classes at all in an inclusive model was expressed in extract (11):

(11) miun mielestä inklusio on siis sitä että. että ei oo niinku siis erityisluokkia opetuksessa et ei oo niinku erityisluokkia (N6-A, 3, 16)

Another perspective to the same issue was not separating anyone from the main group. This was mentioned in extract (12):

(12) Ettei ne erityisoppilaat olisi erotettu omiin luokkiinsa omien opettajiensa kanssa vaan ne tekis samassa tilassa [-] töitä samaan aikaan (M8-A, 2, 29)

Students with special needs would not have to work with their own teacher in a separate space but they would all work together in the same classroom.

Finally, inclusion was thought to have its basis on **familiarity** between students and teachers, as illustrated in extract (13):

(13) mun mielestä kuitenkin niinku inklusio lähtee siitä perusajatuksesta sitte että sä opit tuntemaan. [-] ja sen tuntemisen ja sen vuorovaikutuksen kautta. ja sitä kautta sä sitten teet sitä just noita arkisia asioita ja osaat mukauttaa, (N1-B, 11, 6)

When a teacher and a student knew each other well enough there was a possibility to meet the special needs in an accurate way in everyday situations and know how to properly differentiate teaching.

Summary: The findings of the first part concerning theme '**defining inclusion**' showed that various definitions were given. Inclusion was thought to have something to do with special pedagogy but the more accurate definitions varied all the way from uncertainty (⁵Group A: 2/Group B: 1) to other matters. It was, for instance, considered the opposite of the old-fashioned track system (Group A: 0/Group B: 2). The most common definition included an idea of having one group for all students regardless of the

⁵ (Group A: 1/Group B: 1) refers to the number of participants from groups A and B who brought up each new point

students' background or skills (Group A: 4/Group B: 3). Segregated special classes or segregation of students from the main group were not favored (Group A: 3/Group B: 0) and finally, inclusion was based on a teacher's knowledge and familiarity with a student's special needs (Group A: 0/Group B: 1).

6.1.2 Inclusion in schools today

The second main category dealt with how inclusion could be seen in practice in schools today. Four separate subcategories were created on the basis of the participants' answers. These were **uncertainty, students with special needs as a part of the school community, the work of teachers and negative effects.**

Uncertainty about the situation in schools today was expressed so that either there was no clear idea about the current situation, or only vague ideas and beliefs about it were offered, as in extract (14):

(14) mä en tiää miten se miten paljon se näkyy inklusio nykyään kouluissa mutta [-] mä en tiää miten paljon se sitten se niinku toteutuu nykyään ainakin siitä paljon puhutaan mutta että. et miten se sitten käytännössä on ni en oikeestaan tiää. (N4-B, 2, 34)

There had been a lot of talk about inclusion, which would mean that it is used, but the teacher trainees did to seem to have an idea of the current situation in schools.

Students with special needs were believed to have the same individual rights as everyone else in the school community, which would mean that they had become a **visible part of the school community.** This point is described in extract (15):

(15) Joo. no näin mitenkä mä se ymmärrän on se että. jokainen yksilö. on oikeutettu opiskelemaan kautta oppimaan samassa. tilassa ympäristössä. [-] Apua ((naurahtaa)) Siis. Jokainen yksilö on oikeutettu. (N2-B, 5, 23)

These rights included the possibility to study in the same environment as all other students. Thus, inclusion was thought to make students with special needs more visible in the school population. This idea is discussed in extracts (16) and (17):

(16) Öö. No se ylipäänsä näkyy ihan siinä oppilas niinkun aineksessa. Et vaikee selittää mitenkä se siellä ilmenee mutta siis se että oppilaat joilla on jotain erityistarpeita niin niitä ei. sillä lailla piiloteta pois näkyvistä (M3-B, 3, 22)

(17) luulisin että. et pyritään just mahollisimman paljon pitämään niitä erityisoppilaitaki siinä omassa luokassa [-] Et on vaan se yks opettaja sille koko. tai tai ehkä on siinä myös erityisopettaja mukana mutta että et se. et ne erityisoppilaat sais olla koko ajan siinä omassa ryhmässä. (N4-B, 2, 35)

Students with special needs were not hidden from sight by having them to study in their separate classrooms just because they were in need of assistance or individual attention. They were also allowed to stay in normal classrooms as much as possible and possibly receive individual help from a special education teacher there.

Inclusive practices could be seen in the daily **work of teachers**. It was seen to be visible in the language of instruction that is used in the classroom, if there were immigrant students included, as illustrated in extract (18):

(18) Täs tuli mieleen lähinnä siit mun harjotteluluokassa. oli oppilaita joiden äidinkieli ei ollu suomi. [-] että ehkä siinä mielessä näkyy. siinä kielessä mitä siellä tunneilla käytetään. (M7-A, 4, 6)

Teachers were also required to offer equally challenging tasks to all students and design fair evaluation methods for students of all skill levels. Teachers also ought to learn how to read their students needs, as discussed in extract (19):

(19) opettajan työssä se sit näkyy et pitäis osata lukee niitä oppilaita et millasia asioita ne tarvitsee ja mitä. mi- miten niitä. mikä niitä vois kehittää. (M7-A, 4, 14)

The work of teachers was thought to be more demanding these days, as expressed in extracts (20) and (21):

(20) ni on sitten se että tavallaan yhen tai mus-. mulle se merkitsee jotenki sitä että yhen ihmisen pitäis pystyä aika moneen (N1-B, 2, 36)

(21) noo osataa esittää niinku vaatimuksia ja semmosia niinku tavallaan. et ku tiedetään niinku lähtökohtasesti aika paljon asioista mun mielestä et niiku tiedetään erilaisista oppijoista ja tollasista niin niinku tietoo on hirveen paljon, oh tavallaan siellä teorian. tasolla, mutta sitten niinku sen pohjalta esitetään niinku vaatimuksia opettajille ja sille kouluhenkilökunnalle (N1-B, 2, 40)

Because of the vast theoretical knowledge of different learning styles and issues affecting learning in general, a lot of expectations and demands are thought to be placed on teachers. The idea, or even fear, that one person should be able to do so much arises from these expectations.

Finally, in addition to the points mentioned above, **negative effects** such as whether inclusion could cause disturbances and increased restlessness in schools was speculated, as in extract (22):

(22) Ja. no sitä mä en tie nyt mut nyt tuli mieleen et voikse näkyy esimerkiksi jonkinlaisina häiriöinä käytöshäiriöinä tai. niinku. sen opetustilanteen. et häirit- voisko se häiritä sitä opetustilannetta jollain tavalla (M7-A, 4, 18)

Summary: The findings from the second part discussing ‘**inclusion in practice in schools**’ revealed that inclusion in practice was either difficult to describe because of lack of knowledge or experience (Group A: 0/Group B: 1) or many ideas about it could be offered. All in all students with special needs were seen to become a more visible part of the whole school community (Group A: 0/Group B: 3) and have the same rights as all the other students. The work of teachers was thought to have become more demanding and challenging because of inclusion (Group A: 1/Group B: 1) and it could even cause some negative outcomes, such as disturbances and increased restlessness (Group A: 1/Group B: 0). Much of this, however, was only speculation.

6.1.3 Support given to students

The third category was about the kind of support students with special needs were thought to receive in schools. It consisted of a total of six different subcategories: **not visible, support given by special education experts, individualized studies, small groups, adjustments to the learning environment and tripartite support.**

So far support given to students with special needs had **not been visible** and furthermore, this had seemed strange, as illustrated in extract (23):

(23) ei kyllä juurikaan oo näkyny. mun mielestä. [-] Ei ei näy ja nimenomaan sitä mä oon ihmetellyki et ei oo ollu missään luokassa ei oo ollu kouluavustajia ei oo ollu erityisopettajaa (N5-A, 3, 2+11)

The schools, which the teacher trainees had visited when working as a substitute teacher, for example, had not had school assistants or special education teachers in the classrooms, or at least the trainees had not been aware of these. This had been strange since in inclusive schools and classrooms one would have expected to see all kinds of learners with specialized support.

Support for students with special needs was seen to be given especially by **people specialized in special education** even though it had not been always visible. This was discussed in extract (24):

(24) Niin tota on se et siel on erityisopettaja. sit on oppilaita jotka. käy esimerkiks jotain tiettyä ainetta mikä on heille haastavaa tai missä se homma ei ehkä muuten toimi [-] Ni et käyvät sitten tekemässä tavallaan jotain aineita opiskelemassa sen erityisopettajan kanssa [-] Eikä välttämättä käy joka tunti vaan aina tarpeen vaatiessa. [-] Tietysti sitten on myöskin myöskin oppilaita joilla on henkilökohtasia avustajia tai muita. (N5-A, 3, 24+32)

Students were seen to receive occasional help from a special education teacher in a subject which causes them difficulties and this might be done outside a student's own classroom. Students might have individual assistants in the classroom as well. Nowadays there might be two adults in the same classroom working together as well, either a teacher and a special education teacher, or a teacher and a school assistant. Extract (25) gives an example of this kind of a procedure:

(25) Hmm, no ainakin varmaan siis erityisopettajat ja niinku kouluavustajat, et niille. niille jotka tarvii sitä tukea niin niille on sit joku joko määrätty joku kouluavustaja tai sitte. tai sitte tota. et ne menee erityisopettajan kanssa tekemään tehtäviä [-] /vaik/ siin ihan siin luokassa mutta se et se erityisopettaja keskittyy sitte siihen (N6-A, 4, 30)

Students with special needs could also have an individualized curriculum, study plan or otherwise very individualized methods of studying. The **individualization** of teaching was thought to be a very strong and visible form of support that is given to students with special needs. Teachers were seen to use differentiation to teach simultaneously a very heterogeneous group. This was done especially to meet the various needs of those students facing difficulties in learning. This idea is illustrated in extracts (26) and (27):

(26) käytännössähän se luokassa tarkoittaa sitten sitä että siellä on oppilaita joilla on erityistarpeita ja heitä pitää eriyttää niinkun auttaa. Siinä luokkatilanteessa niitten [-] vaikeuksien kanssa ja sitten ja. Eriyttäminen on varmaan se niinkun käytännön toimi aika voimakas (M3-B, 2, 36)

(27) No sitten on varmaa jonkinlaisia. öö. tavallaan räätälöityjä. OPSeja [-] niinkun että tavallaan räätälöidään sitä. opetusta se- sen oppilaan valmiuksien taitojen mukaan. (M7-A, 4, 32)

The individualization and differentiation could also mean just modified tasks or more time to complete tasks and exams compared with other students, as discussed in extracts (28) and (29):

(28) Siis. se että annetaan esimerkiks. Öö helpompia tehtäviä, ihan semmosia perusjuttuja. [-] Niin ehkä just jotakin hel- helpotettuja. tehtäviä (N4-B, 3, 19)

(29) Erilaiset suoritustavat jossain tavo-. Joissain tapauksissa niinkun esimerkiksi josson lukihäiriö niin saattaa olla et tentis on enemmän aikaa /tai/ [-] Tai siis kokeessa. Tai sitte joissain tapauksissa ei tietenkään tarvi tehdä joissain aineissa kokeita ollenkaan vaan ne voi suorittaa jollain aivan muulla tavalla (M8-A, 3, 9)

Depending on the student the tasks might be easier or shorter and there could be even alternative ways of compensating if completing an exam in a certain time is impossible. Teaching in **small groups** was considered a way of offering special support as well. Extracts (30) and (31) present examples of this:

(30) *Että et ois mahdollisimman paljon semmosta pienryhmäopetusta että kaikki kaikki ois yhdessä. (N4-B, 2, 30)*

(31) *Jaa tietenkin pienemmissä ryhmissä rauhallisempi työympäristö, öö (M8-A, 3, 9)*

Smaller groups were thought to provide a more peaceful learning environment and a possibility to still work together as a group.

In addition to small group activities other **adjustments to the learning environment** were suggested. A possibility to study in an individually designed learning environment in the classroom was offered so that segregation could be avoided. Examples of these kinds of forms of support are given in extracts (32) and (33):

(32) *sitte niinku tavallaan niissä ehkä toisenlaisen tapauksen voijaan niinku sermillä eristää siinä samassa luokkatilassa ja. tehä semmosta omaa tilaa missä saa työskennellä (N1-B, 3, 8)*

(33) *Sitten varmaan on jonkinlaisia niinku tiloihin liittyviä tuen muotoja voisoin kuvitella. [-] Muistan joskus lukeneeni että nykyään kouluihin tehdään sellassii niinku. ehkä hiljaisia tiloja tai jotain motivaatiotiloja tai sellassia (M7-A, 4, 37+5, 6)*

Separate spaces were built to classroom with screens or movable walls so that students with, for example, attention deficit disorders could have a more peaceful learning environment. Also different kinds of motivating learning environments and quiet areas were thought to have been built to schools to provide a variety of learning environments to all kinds of learners.

Although the practical forms of support, such as adjustments to the learning environment or differentiation in teaching, were the most often mentioned matters, a support system regarding the whole field of special education was also brought up: universal support, intensified support and specialized support. This **tripartite system** was illustrated by a participant in extract (34):

(34) *Muun muassa siten et. esimerkiks kun tuli nyt kolmiportainen tuki, niin niin tota. sitten eka pyritään antaa sitä yleistä tukea ja tehostettua ennenko lapsi lähtee tähän erityisen tuen piiriin et pyritään niinku pitämään hänet. mahdollisimman pitkään sen niinku muitten kanssa varsinki jos se on erityistä tukea tarvitseva oppilas. (N2-B, 6, 5)*

This type of support system was based on the idea that a student benefits from being in the main group for as long as possible, especially when receiving specialized support. The individual study plan (HOJKS) was seen as a means to define the actual practices used to support the child with special needs, as discussed in extract (35):

(35) että sittehan tietenki jos tehään. erityisoppilalle lähetään tekemään tätä. HOJKSia niin siinä se varmaan helposti pystyy sitten määrittelemään mitä mitä siellä luokassa tehään ja niinku kaikkee että. hyvin monenlaisia- [-] han niitä on (M3-B, 3, 36)

Finally, it was mentioned that a student receiving special support had options and a right to get a revised evaluation on his/her situation and need for special support regularly. The student was not forced to stay in special education for the rest of his/her school career but there was a possibility to move from one level to another if necessary. This point is emphasized in extract (36):

(36) Se ei ole se ensimmäinen vaihtoehto ja oppilaalla on aina mahdollisuus sitten. siirtyä sieltä erityisen tuen parista sitten tehostettuun tai siihen yleiseen tukeen että häntä ei niinkun leimattais sinne sitten niinku. sen jälkeen kun jos hän on saanu sen päätöksen että hän tarvitsee erityistä tukea niin sitten että hänen tulis olla siellä sitte koko loppu. vaikka peruskouluaikinsa, (N2-B, 6,27)

Summary: The findings from the third part dealing with ‘**support given to students**’ showed that the participants were aware of such procedures, even though they believed that such support was not visible in schools (Group A: 1/Group B: 1). They described special support as having other professionals specialized in special education helping students with special needs in or out of the classroom (Group A: 2/Group B: 2). Support was also seen to be provided with the individualization of teaching (Group A: 3/Group B: 2), which means procedures such as designing a modified curriculum or just individual tasks, as well as differentiation of teaching. Small group teaching was seen as a visible form of support as well (Group A: 2/Group B: 1). Furthermore, making adjustments to the learning environment was considered to support learning (Group A: 1/Group B: 2). The new official support system was familiar to some of the participants and individual study plans were seen to define the actual procedures of support (Group A: 0/Group B: 2).

6.1.4 Support given to teachers

The fourth and last main category discussed the **support teachers are given** when dealing with students with special needs. The seven subcategories found in the data were divided as follows: **no idea, no resources, help from the school, help from experts, help from technology, needs, hopes and wishes** and **guesses**.

No idea of such support was the reason for not providing an answer to the question about the support for teachers. The extract (37) provides an example of this:

(37) *Enpä tiedä mitään. [-] Joo. Ainoa tuli varmaan, no varmaan jotain koulutuksia ja kursseja mutta [-] Mut kun en tiedä niistä mitään niin se parempi vastaus on et ei varmaan mitään (M7-A, 5, 14)*

The participant would have wanted to make all sorts of guesses but thought it might be wiser not to speculate when he could not say anything for sure. Extract (38) is another example of this kind of uncertainty:

(38) *Hmm, no itse asias en varmaan tiä mistään. [-] et. et siitä niinku just sanoin et siit ei oo kauheesti puhuttu. (N6-A, 5, 2)*

The reason for the lack of a proper answer was that it had not been discussed much during the pedagogical studies and therefore only vague ideas were offered.

Also **resources** for this kind of support for teachers caused uncertainty. They were seen to be unevenly divided, which was also seen to cause inequality between schools. Extract (39) demonstrates this:

(39) *Mun mielestä ehkä aika ristiriitainen ja jopa epätasaisesti jakautunu kouluittain mä oon ite henkilökohtaisesti sitä mieltä [-] Aika paljon resursseistakin kyse (N2-B, 7, 21)*

Lack of resources to actually perform inclusion in teachers' work was emphasized in extract (40):

(40) *muistan kun inkluusiosta puhuttiin se ongelma että. ylevä ajatus mutta sitte opettajille ei tarjota resursseja sen toteuttamiseen. (M3-B, 4, 6)*

Proving sufficient resources for making inclusion happen had not been successful, according to the participants. However, it was suggested that if this type of support existed it would be **provided by the school**. This idea was presented by a participant in extract (41):

(41) *Varmaan sitä olettais in et se tulis jollain tavalla sieltä koulun puolelta tai niinkun henkilökunnalta sitten muulta henkilökunnalta esimerkiks rehtorilta. Siinä tapauksessa et tämmöset niinku inkluusiometodit otettais käyttöön (M8-A, 3, 27)*

If the methods of inclusion would be taken into use, headmasters and other members of the staff were seen to be the source of the support. **Help from professionals specialized in special pedagogy** was considered a possible form of support, too, as discussed in extract (42):

(42) *Monissa kouluissahan on mahdollisuus muun muassa koulunkäyntiavustajaan ja erityisopettajaan kautta erityisopettajiin (N2-B, 7, 9)*

Many schools were thought to have at least one special education teacher and possibly school assistants who could help teachers in inclusive classrooms. Co-teaching or joint groups where two teachers teach at the same time were seen as one form of support that could benefit both teachers and students. A notion of this was provided in extract (43):

(43) ehkä jotain opettajien välistä yhteistyötä sillai et luokassa saattaa olla kaks opettajaa ryhmien yhdistelyä (M7-A, 5, 1)

Technology was thought to be available these days and hopefully used to support teaching in inclusive classrooms, as pointed out in extract (44):

(44) Nyt tietenkin teknologia auttaa paljon niinku varmaan monissa tapauksissa (M3-B, 4, 10)

Several **needs, hopes and wishes** concerning the forms of support teachers should have when dealing with inclusion were expressed with words such as “toivoisin..” (*I would hope*), “pitäisi olla..” (*should be*) and so on. Updating training or in-service training about different disabilities and learning difficulties should be provided by the school so that teachers would know how to deal with students with special needs, as is pointed out in extract (45):

(45) mut toivosin että että koulussa. jatkokoulutettas opettajia ja annettas niille niinku tietoo ja taitoo kaikista erilaisista. oppimisvaikeuksista ja erityisoppilaista et miten kanssa miten niitten kanssa pitää niinku toimia [-] Ja tota. Ja ja just se että siellä olis niinku. työpaikalla ois aina se joku joka. joku erityisopettaja tai joku alan asiantuntija jolta pystyy sitte kysymään [-] neuvoa ja apua kun sitä tarttee (N4-B, 3, 32)

It was also suggested that there should be a professional specialized in special education, perhaps a special education teacher, to whom teachers could turn to when in need of help and guidance. Another adult actually present in the same classroom to help dealing with the variety of learners was mentioned as well. An example of this is provided in extract (46):

(46) Kyllä mä näkisin sen että. isossa ryhmässä jossa on. paljon niinkun. erityistarpeita niin sillan tarvittais sitä. sitä niinkun tota avustajaa tai tuota niinku semmosta ns. apuopee siihen tilanteessa [-] mutta kyllä mä näkisin että se ois hirveen iso hyöty että siellä ois useampi aikuinen. tai opettaja mukana (M3-B, 4, 7)

Having a supporting assistant or teacher working alongside the teacher would be helpful especially when group sizes were large. The help would not only benefit the teacher but all students as well. In case no helping hands in the classroom were available, group sizes should be reduced to a minimum. This point was expressed in extract (47):

(47) ryhmäkokoja pitäis lailla rajata nii. ei se tuu onnistumaan että jos halutaan tällasia luokkia niin kyllä se maksimiryhmäkoko pitää tippua puoleen ehkä siitä mitä se nyt on et ei siellä voi olla kolmekymmentä oppilasta ja sitte oletetaan että kaikki menee ihan hyvin. (NI-B, 3, 25)

In order to work, inclusive classrooms should have half the number of students than there is in a class today. With thirty students in a classroom, of which some are in need of special attention, it would be unlikely that all was going to work out without problems.

Finally, some **guesses** about the situation were expressed. Special education teachers were thought to remain if schools should follow inclusive policies and inclusive classrooms should not be taught by only one teacher, as was pointed out by a participant in extract (48):

(48) Ja tietenkkin kyllähän ne erityisopettajat säilyis ihan siinä inklusiotilanteessakin /todennäköisesti/ Eikä siel tarvis olla vaan niinku yhtä opettajaa. Tietenkään. (M8-A, 4, 18)

Summary: The findings dealing with **support given to teachers** showed that support given to teachers was not as straightforward as support given to students. Many participants had no recollection of, or idea about such support (Group A: 4/Group B: 1). Support was seen to depend on the resources schools have in general (Group A: 0/Group B: 3) and because of that, it was thought to be unevenly distributed among schools. Nonetheless, if this kind of support existed, it should be offered by the school (Group A: 1/Group B: 0) and special education professionals working there (Group A: 1/Group B: 2). Technology was seen helpful as well (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). Instead of certain answers the participants expressed wishes about the kind of support there could be for teachers (Group A: 2/Group B: 3). In-service training about teaching students with special needs, help from special education teachers or other professionals specialized in special education in and out of the classroom and reduced group sizes were mentioned as important factors that would help them in their work as inclusive teachers. Some participants made guesses about the availability of material packages for teachers of inclusive classrooms and believed that they would receive help from special education teachers when and if they were to teach an inclusive classroom (Group A: 2/Group B: 0)

Summary of the theme 'defining inclusion'

The first theme of the present study sought to find out how subject teacher students defined and understood inclusion. The theme was divided into four separate main categories. In this section the findings are summarized and a short comparison between the answers of the two groups, A and B, is made.

First, definition of inclusion could be seen to vary according to each interviewee's own beliefs, experiences and knowledge of the matter. None of the participants made any difference between integration and inclusion and these terms were often used synonymously. Inclusion was also seen difficult to determine because the participants did not have a clear idea about the real definition of inclusion. Inclusion was said to gather all students to the same classroom, but the more precise definitions varied from having students of different levels studying together, to having students with severe disabilities integrated into the class. Inclusion was clearly seen as an opposite to all kinds of segregation, such as not having separate special classes or not using the old track system. Inclusion was also said to base on familiarity, which meant that a teacher forms a trusting and warm relationship with the student with special needs and gradually begins to find ways which best support the student's learning.

Second, inclusion in schools today was not easily described either. Some participants hesitated because they had not witnessed inclusion being used in schools. However, with the introduction of inclusion, students with special needs were seen to become a part of the school community. The work of teachers was thought to have changed because of inclusion and possibly become more demanding than before. Speculation about possible negative outcomes, such as troublemaking and bullying, were also mentioned.

Third, when describing support given to students with special needs, some participants claimed that it had not been visible in schools. Others saw that it was given by special education teachers or other professionals specialized in special education. The individualization of teaching was mentioned as well. This included things such as modified tasks, teaching methods or even modified curriculum. Small group teaching and adjustments to the learning environment were seen to support learning of those with special needs. The official support system was mentioned by a few of the participants

and with that the means of support were said to be individually planned and designed for those in need.

Finally, support for teachers was not seen as obvious as support given to students with special needs. The majority of the participants had not heard of this type of support. They were also concerned about the resources for supporting teachers in their work as inclusive teachers. The participants believed that if this kind of support was offered it would come from the school and from special education experts. Technology was seen to offer various forms of help as well. Teachers were thought to lack resources and sufficient knowledge and many suggestions on how to improve their situation in schools were offered. These included having an extra pair of hands when teaching an inclusive classroom, expert advisors and more education on teaching students with special needs. Some guesses about the situation were made, for example, in the form of a material package for teachers of inclusive classrooms.

Interesting terms such as *part-time inclusion*, or *full inclusion* were used in the interviews especially when defining inclusion. Additionally, nearly all participants were struggling with the terminology they used when making a distinction between basic and special education.

There were modest differences when comparing the data of the first theme between group A and group B. To begin with, more members from group A had to guess when defining inclusion whereas group B had clearer answers and only group B compared inclusion with the track system. Both groups agreed that inclusion meant having one group for all students so that no one would have to be separated from the main group, but only group A seemed to believe that this meant not having special education classes at all. When discussing inclusion in schools today the answers were similar in both groups with the exception that only members of group B thought that inclusion could make students with special needs a part of the school community.

Both groups shared similar views of how support is given to students with special needs. The official tripartite support system regarding special education, which is introduced in the subject studies of the pedagogical studies for teachers, was mentioned only by members of group B. Finally, the discussion about support for teachers caused a minor division between the two groups. All members of group A admitted that they had

never heard of such type of a support and were forced to guess whereas only one member in group B did so. Group B focused on the resources and wondered if there was a possibility to get such support. Only Group B mentioned that teachers could be receiving help from technology.

6.2 Attitudes towards inclusion

The second research question dealt with attitudes the subject teacher students held towards inclusion. The main theme ‘**attitudes towards inclusion**’ was divided into four separate main categories: **opinions on inclusion, opinions on segregated special education, experiences of special education in the past** and **experiences of special education now**. These were again divided into various subcategories (see figure 5).

Figure 5. Theme 2: Attitudes towards inclusion

II. ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSION

OPINIONS ON INCLUSION	OPINIONS ON SEGREGATED SPECIAL EDUCATION	EXPERIENCES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE PAST	EXPERIENCES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION NOW
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conflicting views ▪ Positive views ▪ Sufficient resources ▪ Saving money ▪ Situation of average students ▪ Situation of teachers ▪ Effect of inclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Negative views ▪ Conflicting views ▪ Positive views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not visible ▪ Less special education ▪ Part-time special education ▪ Track system ▪ Negative experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Segregation ▪ Part-time special education ▪ Changes

6.2.1 Opinions on inclusion

The first part of the theme had to do with the participants’ own opinions on inclusion. These were divided into seven subcategories which all had a somewhat different perspective on inclusion: **conflicting views, positive views, sufficient resources, saving money, situation of average students, situation of teachers** and finally, **effects of inclusion**.

Attitudes towards inclusion could be described as conflicting. The **conflicting views** regarding inclusion meant that the participants had a positive view of inclusion in general but there was something in the background that prevented them from

advocating inclusion without reservations. These kinds of thoughts are expressed in extracts (49) and (50):

(49) Mun mielestä se on. ajatuksena. aika hieno mutta ehkä hieman utopistinen semmonen (N6-A, 5, 33)

(50) Eli, jos tiivistäis niin se on niinkuin kaunis kaunis ajatus. [-] mutta sen niinkun saavuttaminen on aika hankalaa. (M3-B, 4, 22)

As an ideal inclusion was seen as brilliant but reaching that ideal was regarded as too much of a challenge. Even the idea of inclusion had sometimes an unrealistic feel. Factors causing conflicting views were, for instance, lack of education on teaching students with special needs in the pedagogical studies for teachers, as pointed out in extract (51):

(51) Se öö. se on tosi niinku tavallaan ylevä ajatus mut ehkä opettajakoulutukses ei anneta tarpeeks niinku välineit siihen että mite sitä mite se oikeesti tehtäs (N6-A, 6, 18)

The participant would have wanted to believe in all the good things inclusion had to offer but did not believe subject teachers to have received enough means from the pedagogical studies to make it happen in reality.

In spite of many doubts about inclusion, many **positive aspects** were pointed out. Inclusion could, for example, benefit our society by teaching children about equality and respect towards one another. This was described in extracts (52) and (53):

(52) tavallaan siitä kasvatuksellisesta näkökulmasta ja siitä semmosest niinku ehkä yhteiskunnallisesta ajatuksesta että kaikki oppii olemaan kaikkien kanssa ja tukemaan kaikkia nii siinä mielessä se on niinku tosi hieno ajatus ja (N1-B, 3, 33)

(53) Tota siis ihana ideaalihan se on mä en todellakaan kun siinä puhutaan siitä tasa-arvosta ja tästä et se on siinä takana että. Jokaisen tulee kokea olevansa samanarvoinen yksilö [-] et sen takia niinku ketään ei mitenkään syrjitä tai eristetä et sillä tavalla vaikka viedään just erilliseen fyysiseen tilaan (N2-B, 8, 2)

In an inclusive school no one would be separated from the average classroom just because they were different. In addition, students would learn to value and appreciate difference and different ways of learning in a commonplace context, as expressed by a participant in extract (54):

(54) tavallaan se että jos sitä just erilaisuudesta pystytään tekee sellasta arkipäivää [-] niin se voi niinku olla vähän toivottava ja ehkä semmonen tarpeellinen kasvattava elementti niinku nykyajan lapsille ja nuorille (N1-B, 3, 37)

Learning about appreciation of one another was seen as a valuable element to all students but especially to those individuals with special needs. The students would learn

important social skills and norms when working in a normal teaching group together with their peers and above all, get a feeling of belonging to the school community. This was emphasized by a participant in extract (55):

(55) no opettajana on itse asiassa tullu aika monenlaisia tällasia erityisoppilaita vastaan että on tullu oppilaita jotka on. niinkun käy terapiassa ja on tavallaan niinkun ei välttämättä saa siellä tunnilla paljon aikaseks mut minust se on tosi hyvä et ne ylipäänsä on siellä tunnilla sen ryhmän mukana [-] ja silloin minua nyt niin paljon kiinnosta että tekeekö ne niitä tehtäviä niin paljon kuin muut. Että se. se on silleen hyvä asia et ne on siellä mukana (M3-B, 5, 34)

From a teacher's point of view it did not matter if a student with personal issues or special needs did not get as much done during lessons as the others, because the most important matter was offering the feeling of belonging to the peer group. The best thing about inclusion was thought to be getting rid of the stigma that students in segregated special classes might have had before. Extract (56) introduces this point:

(56) et minusta niinku just tää inklusiojutussa paras asia on se että on niinku päästy siitä. siitä sellasesta. stigmasta mikä niinkun tulee [-] tulee erityisluokasta tai erityiskoulusta se on hirveen niinku sellanen. aika lannistava varmaan sille ite oppilaallekin että nyt oon erityiskoulussa eihän tästä nyt mitään tule verrattuna siihen että oot niinku siinä [-] missä kaikki muutkin on (M3-B, 5, 5)

Although inclusion was seen as a highly valuable practice and more often the attitudes towards it were positive than negative, the interviewees were concerned about inclusion fitting into the reality and the many challenges it would bring along. A need for **sufficient resources** was the greatest concern of all. Inclusion without proper investment was seen to be unrealistic, as pointed out in extract (57):

(57) Mut se toteutus vaatis niin paljon resursseja. Niin paljon semmosta mikä tuskin on kauheen realistista. Et yhtäkkiä annetaan annetaan niille pääsy koulutukseen mä epäilen et siihen tarvis ensinnäkin hyvin paljon varoja. Pitäs palkata lisää opettajia koska jos joka luokassa on taas niinku. muutama. erityisoppilas niin sillon niissä luokis mun mielest pitäis olla myös erityisopettaja. (N5-A, 5, 28)

In order to work, more teachers should be hired and all inclusive classes should have a special education teacher as well. The teacher's resources alone were seen insufficient, as pointed out in extract (58):

(58) Mutta. se mitä niinkun. sitä kun on lukenu niin sitten toteutuksessa niin tosissaan opettajan resurssit on aika vähäset. (M3-B, 4, 16)

Because of the limited resources teachers have, a critical aspect on the best interest of the child was brought up. An inclusive classroom without proper resources, such as help from a special education teacher or assistants, was not seen to be the best choice for the

child even though it might create a feeling of belonging. The participant in extract (59) describes this point:

(59) Mutta sit jotenkin mullon vähän semmonen kritiikin siemen siinä [-] onks se niinku oppilaan oikeesti se niinkun ihan. absoluuttinen paras jos hän opiskelee siinä ryhmässä missä on niinku kaksikymmentä muuta ja jos hän on oikeesti niinku. vaikka vakavasti autistinen lapsi [-] Tulee esimerkiksi mieleen ja siellä on hyvin vaikka ylivilkkaita ja. tosi vaikka käytöshäiriöisiä oppilaita paljon niin mä mietin et jos varsinkaan jos opettajalla ei oo resursseja sitten [-] niinku jos vaikka ei oo erityisopettajaa tai koulunkäyntiavustajaa niin mun mielestä se on ihan niinku mahdottomuus et miten me voidaan taata sit tämän. oppilaan. paras, (N2-B, 8, 10)

It was considered to be impossible to assure the best interest of the student if the teaching group had many children with special needs, and if one teacher could not keep up with all of them.

Inclusion was also criticized for being an excuse for **saving money**. Schools were seen to be able to save a fair amount of money because there might no longer be a need to hire so many special education teachers when groups were integrated. In this scenario one teacher should be enough for one inclusive classroom, as is pointed out in extract (60):

(60) että inkluusiota ajetaan läpi mut sit mitä mä oon sen verran siitä lukuun niin. siellä tulee aina jossain vähän sivulauseessa se et ku se on niin säästämistä että ku [-] ((naurahdus)) ei tarvii sit palkata niin paljon välttämättä erityisopettajia, ja koululla jää rahaa muuhunkin (N2-B, 8, 22)

This issue was brought up because cost-effectiveness seemed to come up in every article and book dealing with inclusion. Saving money, however, should not be regarded as the main point of inclusion. Without resources worries considering the best interest of the child (in extract (59)) cannot be avoided.

A concern related to the **situation of normal or average students** was mentioned in the interviews. Average or normal students mean those who were seen to manage without special attention or aid. Inclusion was seen to take away valuable time from average students when teachers had to focus on differentiation and meeting the needs of those who were at risk of falling behind without additional support. These issues are presented in extracts (61) and (62):

(61) Mut sitte käytännössä. mä en tiää miten se niinku miten se voi onnistua. Eikä onnistukaan aina. Että on niitä oppilaita jotka tarvii sitä erityisempää tukea ja sitten niitten myötä jos ne on siellä ryhmässä niin monesti siitä kärsii myös ne ns tavalliset oppilaat (N4-B. 4, 11)

(62) plus sitte et noilta muilta oppilailta läh- tai sit et niinku et sit se vie huomiota niiltä muilta oppilailta jotka myös tarvii tukea niinku [-] et sit jos siellä keskitytään vaan niihin kahteen jotka perseilee niin sitte. kukaan muu ei saa niinku. [-] apuja eikä huomiota. (N6-A, 6, 21)

Normal or average students were thought to need attention from the teacher as well, perhaps as much as those with special needs. It was seen that when students with special needs were included in the classroom, the attention would be bound to focus on those who have it most difficult. In the worst case scenario average students might suffer from having less time for interaction with their teacher.

The situation of teachers had also changed with the introduction of inclusion. Students with disabilities are not a homogeneous group and they all need individually designed support, which could be challenging for the teacher. This is discussed in extract (63):

(63) Mut joo ehkä ehkä sinänsä että niitä oppimisvaikeuksii on kauheen vaikee laittaa niinku. et et. tai silleen et sit ku kaikki keillä on joku oppimisvaikeus laittaa siihen samaan niin onhan niilläkin sitte sitä että et ne tarvii eri verran tukee ja erilaista apua niin [-] sitte. sekin on ja sekin on varmaan tosi raskasta sille opettajalle sitte (N6-A, 7, 18)

The teacher's own abilities to teach a student with special needs caused a concern. This aspect is introduced in extract (64):

(64) tai ite ainaki koen sen silleen et mulla ei. en koe että mulla on valmiuksia. öö opettaa sellasta erityisoppilasta koska mä en oo esimerkiks erityispedagogiikka lukenu yhtään täällä (N4-B, 4, 15)

This lack of abilities was seen to be caused by the fact that one had not studied special pedagogy at the university and therefore, had no theory base whatsoever. This was also mentioned earlier when discussing conflicting views of inclusion (extract (51)). Another concern dealing with the situation of teachers was designing teaching materials for those students with a modified curriculum. Teachers were thought to have to deal with a large amount of work even without preparing additional material for students at different skill levels. This concern is discussed in extract (65):

(65) mutta sitte toisaalta niinku. kyllä mä nään sen semmosena. niinku aika isona peikkona sitten itelleni siinä mielessä että kyllä se mun työmäärää kasvattaa ja sitte kun mun mielestä se työmäärä tälläkään hetkellä ei oo mikään kauheen pieni niin sitte tavallaan että sen lisääminen niinkun et se saattaa lisääntyä huimasti kolminlinkertaistua niin se tuntuu siinä semmoselta. (N1-B, 3, 40)

Other worries concerning inclusion had to do with the **effects of inclusion**. Among these was the concern of being able to share one's time equally with all students in class, as extract (66) demonstrates:

(66) On isoja ryhmäkokoja ja tietenkin kaikkee muuta niin se on. sillee ajateltuna että mitenkä toisin tän vaikka omaan ryhmä- ryhmään sitten kun kun on [-] töissä niin se on hirveen vaikee ajatella koska jos sulla on kahen-kolmenkymmenen oppilaan ryhmä ni. sulla on siellä hyvät. sulla on siellä heikommat. mitenkä sä pystyt jakamaan sen aikas. (M3-B, 4, 17)

Large group sizes were considered problematic because sharing time equally with all students was seen extremely challenging already in the regular groups. Having enough time for individual contact with everyone in a group of 20-30 students was described as demanding, because all students were of different levels. Also the worry about the quality of education in an inclusive classroom was presented, as illustrated in extract (67):

(67) et ku kyllä mun mielestä tätä työtä tehään kuitenkin valitettavasti jonkun verran myös niinku aikataulujen ja sen opetussuunnitelmien asettamien vaatimusten puitteissa et tavallaan että mihin se sitte menee että asettaako jokainen ite jotkut omat tavoitteet. [-] et miten se sitte toimii jos jokaisella on se oma näkemys ja omat tavoitteet niin miten me voijaan niinku pitää kiinni siitä että se. koulutuksen laatu pysyy silleen tasa- [-] tasavertasena (N1-B, 4, 22)

Teaching was thought to be directed by timetables and syllabus, which makes setting goals for each individual rather challenging. The participant in extract (67) speculated that if every student had their own goals or a modified curriculum, it might not be possible to keep the quality of education truly equal for everyone.

Summary: On the basis of the findings for the first part dealing with **opinions on inclusion** it could be said that the views were, for the most part, both conflicting and positive. The conflict had to do with the idealistic view of inclusion, which did not seem to meet the reality (Group A: 3/Group B: 3). Inclusion was seen as a very positive and admirable idea because of many positive social advantages (Group A: 2/Group B: 4). The participants thought that sufficient resources played a major role in inclusion (Group A: 3/Group B: 3): with sufficient resources inclusion could work but without them there was no sense in trying to achieve it. It was said that inclusion was often referred to as an excuse for saving money (Group A: 0/Group B: 1), but this can be called speculation. The subject teacher students were worried about the situation of normal or average students if teachers had to focus a lot on those with special needs (Group: A1/Group B: 1). Also concerns about the situation of teachers were mentioned (Group A: 2/Group B: 3), because it was thought that a teacher's work had become more demanding than before. Some worries about the effects of inclusion were also

expressed, such as the ability to share one's time equally with all students in the classroom and ensuring the quality of education (Group A: 1/Group B: 1).

6.2.2 Opinions on segregated special education

The second part of the theme dealing with attitudes towards inclusion focused on opinions on segregated special education. Three subcategories were drawn from the participants' answers: **negative views**, **conflicting views** and **positive views**.

The **negative views of** segregated special education meant that the participants did not find it a good practice. Separating a group of students with a variety of difficulties into their own group was not seen to help anyone and on top of that it could be seen to stigmatize the persons in those schools for the whole of their school career. Extracts (68) and (69) share this point:

(68) ku tavallaan niillä on se oma semmonen että no et ne on laitettu sinne erikseen siin tulee vähän semmonen niinkun semmonen leima niille kaikille, [-] et sitte ja. ne tavallaan eristetään siitä koulun muusta. niinku toiminnasta. Viel pahempi ehkä sit se erityiskoulu tavallaan et sit se viedään sinne viedään viel johonkin omaan alueeseen kaupungilla ja et. (N6-A, 7, 10)

(69) tuntuu että ne ei oo. tarpeellisia ja ne on osaltaan vähän leimaavia sitten sille oppilaalle itelleenkin [-] se erityisluokka erityiskoulu. (M3-B, 4, 39)

Some **conflicting views** of segregated special classes and schools were also expressed. Special education classes were seen to have specialized and professional staff for teaching students with special needs. Nonetheless, sending a student to a special class or school and thus separating a student from the school community was considered a bad choice. This contradiction is illustrated in extract (70):

(70) No siel on tietenkin sitten ammattitaitoinen henkilökunta siihen. Niinkun niiden erityisoppilaiden tarpeita varten et siinä tapauksessa niinkun öö. Se. Se ei oo hyvä, et ne erotetaan toisista oppilaista niinkun erilliseks yhteiskunnakseen tavallaan (M8-A, 4, 11)

Another contradiction came from the urge to be a modern teacher and follow the new trends in education, even though one's own opinion on having segregated special classes was positive. Special classes could benefit some students if the stigma of special education being a punishment or a sign of weakness was successfully removed. Individuals receiving special education services should not have to feel ashamed of it. Extract (71) demonstrates this contradiction:

(71) Mun mielest on hyvä et sellasta järjestetään mutta kyllä mä kuitenkin ehkä sen ajan hengen mukaisesti. oon enemmän sen integraat-. et se se on mun mielest se suunta [-] Mitä, mihin pitäis enemmän pyrkii mutta että myöskään luopuu erityisopetuksesta [-] Mutta tota. suhtautumiseni on erityisopetukseen ihan positiivinen mutta se ei myöskään sais niinkun aiheuttaa niille oppilaille sellasta. kokemusta tai oloa tai tunnetta ylipäätään niinku kouluelämässä että se olis niinku joku rangaistus tai [-] osoitus heikkoudesta. (M7-A, 6, 31)

Special education classes that are integrated into regular schools were seen as a far better option, as discussed in extract (72):

(72) No ehkä ihan sellaseen erityiskouluun. se se ei ehkä niinkon oo välttämättä hyvä asia että ainakin se että se erityis- jos on jossain pienryhmässä oppilas niin että se on ees sen tavallisen koulun yhteydessä [-] Että et on niinku jonkinlaista kontaktia sii- niihin tavallisiin. tai siihen tavalliseen op- tavallisiin oppilaisiin mutta tota. Öö. kyllä se joissain tapauksissa semmoset pienryhmät ja on on tarpeellisia. (N4-B, 4, 30)

Even though special education classes were seen as a better option than sending students into special schools, part-time special education and integration were seen as the best possible choice for individuals with special needs. However, studying in a separated place was thought to be sometimes best for a student because not all are capable of working in a large group. This point is discussed in extract (73):

(73) Että oon sitä mieltä että et ei ei ei niinku voi poistaa vaan kaikkia. tai että tarvitaan niitä pienryhmiä ja erityisopetustakin. Et se ei se ei onnistu siinä isossa ryhmässä kaikille (N4-B, 4, 23)

Positive views of completely segregated special education were also expressed. Not having a problem with segregated special classes was explained by the fact that their own experiences of special education were from the time when there had not been inclusive classrooms, and those students having difficulties in learning had had their own classes. In special education classes children were thought to receive the kind of support they needed, which would not have been possible in a normal classroom. A participant discusses this in extract (74):

(74) no mä en kyllä niinku. näe siinä mitään ongelmaa tai että en oo niinku kokenu sitä että. koska ite on ehkä kasvanu sen sinä aikana kun ne on ollu niinku tullu ja ollu niin kyllä mun mielestä niinku se toimii ihan hyvin et oli erityisluokka siellä oli lapsia jotka tarvi enemmän tukea ja näin mut sitte taas ei se jotenki kouluarjessa niin paljon näkyny et ne oli ihan samalla tavalla välitunneilla ja kaikissa muissa mukana. mut tavallaan et siellä pystyttiin antaa sitä semmosta. tarvittavaa tukee mihin taas ei ehkä normaaliluokassa pystytä (N1-B, 4, 16)

The students in special education classes were thought to have the possibility to participate in common school activities such as breaks, lunch hours and other school events even though they were studying in a separate classroom. In a way they were still considered a part of the school community.

Finally, a worry about the best interest of the child was again expressed if special education classes no longer existed. These worries were expressed in extracts (75) and (76):

(75) en nää niitä henkilökohtaisesti syrjivinä vaihtoehtoina jos ne on sen lapsen oikeesti paras. Mä lähen aina siitä jotenki ajattelemaan et mikä sille lapselle on niinku vilpittömästi parhainta [-] Eikä se et miten se näyttäs niinku yhteis-. jotenki. Se on kuulostaa ideaalina hienolta et kaikki ollaan [-] niinkun tasa-arvosia kun sillon me ollaan samassa luokassa ja kaikki saa käydä sosiaalisia suhteita toistensa kanssa, mut sit se että. jos ei oo sille lapselle vaan niinkun hyväksi. (N2-B, 9, 3)

(76) ja just et siellä näkee sen että sellasilta lapsilta niin niiltä. uupuu tavallaan sosiaalisista taidoista aika paljon ryhmätyötaitoista aika paljon [-] niin mun mielestä sitte. ((huokaus)) no sit niitä pitää harjaannuttaa just pienemmissä ryhmissä[-] ja tavallaan semmosessa tilanteessa jossa on niinku. tilaa ja aikaa käsitellä ja hoitaa niitä tunteita ja on aikuisella aikaa, [-] ja niinku on semmosta. mahdollisuutta semmoseen kahdenkeskeiseen vuorovaikutukseen. et siihen mun mielestä tällä hetkellä niinku suomalainen koulu niin ei sitä. siihen ei vaan niinku oo aikaa. (N1-B, 6, 9)

As an ideal having all students studying in the same classroom was considered a very good thing but it was seen to lose its meaning if the child does not benefit from staying there. Especially children with behavioral problems often lack social and group work skills and are, in fact, in need of smaller groups where they could be trained with an adult who really had time to focus on one-on-one interaction with the child. In Finnish schools this individual attention was seen to be non-existent.

Summary: The findings of this second part dealing with the participants' opinions on segregated special education revealed three different views: negative (Group A: 1/Group B: 1), conflicting (Group A: 3/Group B: 1) and positive (Group A: 1/Group B: 3). The negative views were caused by a stigmatizing effect of segregation. The conflict was caused by the fact that special education classes had professional staff who knew how to teach students with special needs, but the idea of separating students from the school community was not seen that good of an idea. The positive views had to do with the participants own experiences of working with children who were seen to benefit from training their social skills or concentration in smaller groups or completely separately from the main group.

6.2.3 Experiences of special education in the past

The third part of the second theme of the present study dealt with the participants' experiences of special education in the past. Five subcategories were drawn on the basis

of the data: **not visible, less special education, part-time special education, track system, and negative experiences.**

No recollection whatsoever of the existence of a special education class, or special education in general, was discussed in extract (77):

(77) Mulla ei oo mitään muistikuvaa minkäänlaisesta erityisopetuksesta. [-] omilta kouluajoilta (N5-A, 5, 37)

Special education was **not so visible** before because of separated special education classes and special education schools. This is illustrated in extracts (78) and (79):

(78) No, omina kouluaikoina niin. nehan oli vähän niinkun piilossa. tavallaan. Eli oli oli tarkkisryhmät, mistä niinku puhuttiin ja [-] sitten oli oli ((koulun nimi poistettu)) oli yks erityiskoulu mihinkä sitten meidänkin luokalta ala-asteella muutama. muutama siirty. Ja sitten nää tarkkislaiset kävi tällasissa niinku. kuviksessa katsassa. puukäsitöissä mukana mutta ne oli ihan sitten täysin erillään. Eli silleen. aika poissa silmistä-henkisesti että eihän ne ollu niinkun osa sitä. meidän koulumaailmaa silloin (M3-B, 5, 26)

(79) kun ne omat kokemukset on just siitä että ne kaikki vähänkin erilaiset on sitten niinku sysätty ((naurahdus)) [-] sinne yläkerran pieneen luokkaan ja [-] se siitä (M7-A, 8, 4)

Special education students were integrated with the average students in arts, crafts and other practical subjects but otherwise they were out of sight studying in their separate classes and were not seen as visible part of the school community. Also diagnoses or disorders were not spoken of in the past as much as at present. This made the situation look as if no one had learning difficulties in the past because there were no diagnoses or labels to make them visible, as described by a participant in extract (80):

(80) no en mie tiiä onks tää että ei k- onks aikasemmin diagnosoitu mut meil ei koskaan niinku. mie en muista et miun yläaste tai ala-asteaikana olis puhuttu kenestäkään silleen et jollain ois oppimisvaikeuksia tai tai että no lukioha- lukihäiriötä ehkä oli mut niitäkään en muista et mejän luokal ois ollu kenelläkään lukihäiriö (N6-A, 8, 28)

Students were possibly receiving **less special education** in the past than today because it was not so visible, and because it had not been spoken of, as speculated in extract (81):

(81) yleisesti mutta musta tuntuu että ainaki ainaki se että ku vertaa sitä että ku oli ite koulussa niin silloin tuntuu että oli vähemmän sitä erityisopetusta ku sitte taas mitä nyt on nähny ja just esimerkiks siellä kouluavustajana ollessa (N4-B, 5, 35)

Part-time special education was a common practice but students usually left their normal group when meeting a special education teacher. This is discussed in extract (82):

(82) ehkä se on menny aika samanlaisella kaavalla. Että meillä oli meijänki. jos mieltii, omia luokkia mitä on ollu vaikka yläkoulu alakouluaikana niin. siel on ollu sit ihmisiä jotka on saattanu jotku tunnit olla sitte. Sitten tuota. Tuota tuota. Erillises erityisopetuksessa. on oppilaita haettu. Erkkaope on hakenu heijät sitte erilliseen tilaan ra-. sitte niinku keskittymään (N2-B, 10, 22)

In some schools students actually had wanted to go to the special education teacher's office or classroom because the teacher was such a nice person. There students had felt that they had a possibility to do tasks at their own pace and receive individual attention, as illustrated in extract (83):

(83) Yläasteel meil tosi monet meni erkkaopele tekemään esimerkiks matikan tehtäviä [-] ja se oli vähän semmonen juttu mikä ilmeisesti on niinku monis muissakin kouluissa et koska se erityisopettaja on yleensä joku aika hyvä tyyppi, [-] niin sitte ja sit siel saa tehdä rauhassa ja siel sitä sellast niinku henkilökohtasta huomiota. (M6-B, 8, 4)

Some schools even had had **track groups** in subjects such as mathematics. Parents had been consulted first and asked for permission to take the track system into use. The students had been divided into groups according to their skills. The gifted students had got to study more demanding tasks, the average ones their own tasks and the weaker ones had received supported teaching. The system was considered a good thing because it had reduced pressures from studying a difficult subject, as discussed by a participant in extract (84):

(84) must oli tosi hyvä. Niinkun tosi hyvä järjestely et meil oli yläkoulussa esimes matematiikan opiskelu järjestetty niinku taitotasoryhmittäin [-] Se jotenki, ei ollu paineita siitä että et pitää yrittää suoriutua ja pysyä tietyssä tahissa tai. suorittaa tietyllä tavalla et jotenki [-] Otettiin sen ryhmän yksilölliset tarpeet sillä tavalla siis [-] pyrittiin paremmin ottaa huomioon (N2-B, 10, 28)

Track groups were not considered discriminating because they were believed to offer the kind of support each skill group demanded.

Negative experiences of special education in the past were also shared. There had been different kinds of special education classes that had had curious abbreviations and they had been located separately from the other classrooms. These classes often had had rather a bad reputation and the students in those classes were probably not benefiting from it. Special education classes were seen as dumping places for all students who did not fit in a normal classroom because they were seeking attention in unproductive ways, as illustrated by extract (85):

(85) no ehkä siis mä luulen et sillon herkemmin niinku tavallaan kaikki ke- tavallaa käytöshäiriöiset ja jotenki semmoset jotka jollain tavalla kipui ja haki huomiota ja

sellasta. niin et se erityisluokka tai semmonen se oli semmonen dumpauspaikka et tavallaan sinne joutuvat jos ei homma onnistu. (N1-B, 5, 20)

Special education classes had been regarded as rather mysterious places although they were thought to consist of troublemakers and bullies. Average students had not really known what special education class were and what kind of things were done in those classes, which had made them look scary and created all kinds of rumors, as described by extracts (86) and (87):

(86) Öö, mun omat kokemukset erityisluokista on lähinnä ala- ja yläasteelta jolloin ne oli tosi pelottavia. [-] Käsitys siitä niinku varmaan niinku kaikil muillakin voisit kuvitella oli siellä et ne oli ensinnäkin kaikki häiriköitä ja koulukiusaajia jotenkin. [-] Vaikeita ihmisiä, joita piti vältellä [-] sillä oli sellai tosi pelottava maine mikä ei varmaan myöskään auttanut niitä ihmisiä ketkä oli siellä erityisluokassa. (M7-A, 6, 14)

(87) Meni sillettii et jos jollain oli jotain vaikeuksia jonku aineen kanssa niin sitten mentiin sinne erityisopettajan puheille yläasteella ja sit se oli semmonen niinku mystinen paikka et ei me tavalliset opettajat ja oppilaat sitte tiedetty yhtään mitä siellä tapahtuu vaan se oli suljettujen ovien takana siellä. Eri siivessä koko koulurakennuksessa ja [-] Sit siit liikku kaikenlaisii huhuja että mitä siellä tehään ((naurahduksia)) (M8-A, 4, 33)

Summary: In the third part considering participants' experiences of special education in the past the data shows that special education had not been very visible (Group A: 3/Group B: 2) because the participants had no recollection at all, or they had just vague memories about it. Some thought that there might have been less special education in the past because it was not so visible (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). Part-time special education existed (Group A: 1/Group B: 2) but students always left their own class to meet the special education teacher somewhere private. One participant had an experience of studying in a track group in mathematics (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). Some participants had rather negative experiences of special education (Group A: 3/Group B: 1). These were caused by the uncertainty about what actually happens in special education classes, which created fear and doubts.

6.2.4 Experiences of special education now

The fourth and last part of the second theme dealt with the participants' experiences of special education today. Three subcategories were found in the data: **segregation, part-time special education and changes.**

First, it was believed that segregation still existed as discussed in extract (88):

(88) Että. varmaan aika paljon vielä tehään Suomessaki semmosta että sitten tavallaan. kuulostaa pahalta mutta eristetään ne. [-] ne sitten omiin tiloihinsa ja omiin luokkiin. (N5-A, 4, 1)

The participant admitted that it sounded bad to say that students would be separated but nonetheless this practice was thought to be still alive. Part-time special education had still been used in schools the participants had visited, as demonstrated by extract (89):

(89) Ja sitten mitä oon opettanu esimerkiks muutenkin alakoulussa niin siellä on ollu näitä vielä ihan niinku erillistä erityisopetusta että muun muassa äidinkielen tunneilla sitte. (N2-B, 10, 22)

Some schools had special groups or a kind of a special class, which was integrated with a normal class. In this kind of situation all students were members of the same class but some of them followed a modified curriculum. The best part was that the system had seemed to work, as this participant in extract (90) describes:

(90) Että. minusta se systeemi mikä on esimes yhellä koululla millä oon tehny sijaisuuksia että siellä on ns. erityisluokka tai sillai erityisryhmä. mutta ne niinku kulkee sen oman luokkansa mukana ne on sen niinkun sen luokan jäseniä ja sitten niillä on vaan niinku eriytetty se opetus tietyissä aineissa millä niillä on vaikeuksia ja minusta se on paljon niinku. parempi systeemi (M3-B, 5, 2)

Inclusive practices, such as a special education teacher coming to the normal classroom to help a student with difficulties in some subjects were seen as a part of the many **changes** the school world had faced when compared to the situation in the past. This was illustrated in extract (91):

(91) Mut. mut tota. öö. se erityisopettaja ei ollu koskaan luokassa [-] mitä miun mielest nyt on enemmän et se tulee sinne luokkaan auttamaan (N6-A, 8, 21)

Nowadays much more attention was thought to be paid on different difficulties in learning – before there had been only the good ones and the weaker ones. It seemed that special education was considered to be a much more natural matter today and the attitudes towards it were positive in general, as discussed in extract (92):

(92) must tuntuu et se koetaan jotenki ehkä luonnollisempana. Mä en tiedä johtuuks se sit ihan yleisistä asenteista et opettaja valmistaa omaa luokkaansakin siihen et se. (N2-B, 12, 24)

Teachers might have been the reason for the changed attitudes. The focus has moved to the actual learning and school attendance. The reasons behind all symptoms and difficulties were believed to be looked for more carefully today than before. It was said that when reasons for certain kind of behavior were carefully defined, support was easier to arrange, as described in extract (93):

(93) mutta sitte nykypäivänä mun mielestä se lähtökohta on se että niinku on oikeesti siinä oppimisessa ja siinä koulunkäynnissä. niinku [-] et jotenki se on se on niinku sitä on ruvettu määrittelemään sitä et mitä se on sen tuki- ne toimet mitä se lapsi tarvitsee niin

sitä on ruvettu ottaa huomioon paljon tarkemmin ja syynäämään niinku oikeesti ja niinku ettimään niitä syitä. sen sijaan että niinku aatellaan että mä en selviä tästä niin laitetaan tää erityisopettajalle niin se kyllä selviää. (N1-B, 5, 22)

Nowadays the general way of thinking about special education was thought to have changed. In the past all students who were considered too challenging or unmanageable were sent to a special education class whereas today it would not happen without a close investigation of the situation.

Summary: The part describing the participants' experiences of special education today showed that the participants believed segregation might still exist (Group A: 1/Group B: 0), and they had witnessed part-time special education (Group A: 1/Group B: 1) with the exception that the special education teacher came more often to the regular classroom to assist students with difficulties. Many changes had been seen to take place over time, too (Group A: 3/Group B: 4). These included careful investigation and diagnosis of disorders and learning disorders, focusing on the actual learning and changing the way of thinking about special education.

Summary of the theme 'attitudes towards inclusion'

The second theme of the present study dealt with the future subject teachers' attitudes towards inclusion. The theme was divided in four different parts, or main categories, which were observed separately. The findings of the second theme are now summarized, and the differences and similarities between groups A and B are discussed. Opinions on inclusion were mostly conflicting and positive. The conflict had to do with the idealistic view of inclusion, which did not seem to meet the reality, according to the participants. Inclusion was seen as a good idea because of many positive social advantages. However, many worries were raised. Without sufficient resources inclusion would be difficult to achieve and put into practice. The situation of average students was also brought up: inclusion was thought to cause a situation where a teacher would not have enough time to concentrate on the needs of those students who did not usually need that much attention. The work of teachers was regarded as more demanding than before. Concerns about the effects of inclusion had to do with the quality of education.

When discussing opinions on segregated special education, three visible views were found: negative, conflicting and positive. The negative views were caused by the stigma that segregation could cause to students in special education. The conflicting views had

two sides: on the one hand it was seen good that special education classes had professional staff working in them, but on the other hand the idea of separating students from the school community was not considered ideal. The participants who shared positive views of segregated special classes had their own experiences of working with children with special needs. Some students were seen to benefit from practicing their social skills or concentration in smaller groups or completely separately from the main group and therefore, it would be against the best interest of the child if special education classes no longer existed.

The participants' experiences of special education in the past were also various. Both groups (A and B) believed that special education had not been very visible in the past because the participants had no recollection or just vague memories of it. It was suggested that there might have been less special education in the past because it was not so visible. Part-time special education had existed but students had had to leave their own class to meet the special education teacher. One participant had an experience of studying in a track group in mathematics but against all odds, it was not considered discriminating but quite the opposite. Some participants had rather negative experiences of special education from the time they had attended school. Students in special education classes were scary and special education classes were usually set apart from other classrooms. Average students had had little knowledge of what actually happened in special education.

The participants' experiences of special education today showed that they believed segregation might still exist. They had also witnessed part-time special education with the exception that the special education teacher came more often to the regular classroom to assist students with difficulties. Many changes had also been seen to take place. They included careful investigation and definition of disorders and learning disorders, focusing on the actual learning and changing the way of thinking about special education. Special education was not as mysterious or strange as it might have been before, but it was regarded as more natural.

Group B thought about inclusion more positively than group A. However, three members of group A had conflicting views of inclusion, which means that they had both positive and some doubtful views concerning inclusion. Thus one could claim that both groups had mainly positive attitudes towards inclusion. Both groups were worried about

the sufficiency of resources, but only group B speculated inclusion being an excuse for saving money. Both groups had the same worries about the situation of average students, but more members of group B worried about the situation of teachers and their increasing workload. The effects of inclusion were only mentioned by members of group B.

Segregated special education divided opinions to some extent. Group B favored segregated special classes more than members of group A, who had mostly conflicting views about them. Both groups had members who were against segregation because of stigmatization.

There were no significant differences when observing the participants' own experiences of special education in the past and today. The only remarkable division between views was found in the negative experiences in the past: more members of group A had had them.

All in all, both groups could be said to have a positive attitude towards inclusion, but group B had more members in favor of segregated special classes.

6.3 Advantages and challenges

The third research question of the present study was interested in the possible advantages and challenges inclusion could bring about both in general and in the concrete work of teachers in the future subject teachers' opinion. Five main themes or categories were discussed and several subcategories drawn from the findings. The main categories of the third theme **advantages and challenges** were: **advantages in general, advantages to the work of teachers, challenges in general, challenges in the work of teachers** and **differences between the work of elementary school teachers and subject teachers** (see figure 6).

Figure 6. Theme 6: Advantages and challenges

III. ADVANTAGES AND CHALLENGES

ADVANTAGES IN GENERAL	ADVANTAGES TO THE WORK OF TEACHERS	CHALLENGES IN GENERAL	CHALLENGES IN THE WORK OF TEACHERS	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE WORK OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND SUBJECT TEACHERS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Saving money ▪ Preventing discrimination ▪ Increasing tolerance ▪ Preparing for people for the future ▪ Integration of immigrants ▪ Promoting socialization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Co-operation among professionals ▪ Professional growth ▪ Multiculturalism and authenticity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Already challenging ▪ Not saving money ▪ Bullying ▪ Cultural differences ▪ Adjustments to the physical environment ▪ Average students ▪ Practical concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Already challenging ▪ Including everyone equally ▪ Lack of knowledge on special pedagogy ▪ Keeping order in the classroom ▪ Differentiation ▪ Teaching from many perspectives ▪ More work ▪ Equal evaluation ▪ Co-operation ▪ Frustration ▪ Staying positive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elementary school teachers have better chances ▪ Elementary school teachers' challenges ▪ Subject teachers have less chance ▪ Subject teachers' possibilities

6.3.1 Advantages in general

The first part of the third theme dealt with the advantages of inclusion in general. Six subcategories were created on the basis of the data: **saving money, preventing discrimination, increasing tolerance, preparing young people for the future, integration of immigrants, and promoting socialization.**

One of the first advantages of inclusion mentioned was **saving money** because there was no longer a need for separate special education classes or a separate learning environment for students with special needs, as illustrated in extract (94):

(94) Öö koulu yhteisön kannalta. Ehkä. No on siinä ehkä jotku semmoset rahoitusselliset asiat ehkä. [-] esimerkiksi ettei tarvis sit niitä erillisiä tiloja ja näin pois päin niin kyllähän siit saattaa tulla jonkun verran taloudellista säästöä (M8-A, 6, 28)

Inclusion was also seen as an advantage because it could benefit students by bringing about important social advantages. (Some of the social advantages were already mentioned earlier in section 6.2.1 when the participants were describing their personal opinions on inclusion). Firstly, it could be seen as **non-discriminating activity**, as discussed in extract (95):

(95) No yleismaailmallisesti ehkä jos ajatellaan ihan näitä arvoja ja niin kyllähän se tietenkin edistää sitä. sitä ajattelua tasa-arvosta ja siitä ei-syrjivästä yhteiskunnasta ilman muuta. [-] Ollaan tavallaan samalla viivalla (N2-B, 13, 25)

Inclusive practices were seen as promoting the ideal of equality and non-discrimination because all students would have the same rights and possibilities. Secondly, inclusion was seen **to increase tolerance** among the youth and teach people to embrace difference, as discussed by a participant in extract (96):

(96) No. tää nyt menee sekä tohon yleismaailmalliseen että myöskin koulukohtaisesti. mun mielest ois hyvä että oppilaat oppis pienestä pitäen sen. et on erilaisia ihmisiä [-] On erilaisia oppilaita. siel voi olla joku joku esimerkiksi kuuro, [-] Viittomakielinen oppilas. ja silloin se ei tulis myöhemmin tavallaan järkytyksenä tai se ei vaikuttais epänormaalilta. että miks toi on erilainen. [-] Vaan et se olis tavallaan tulis siinä mukana jotain semmost suvaitsevaisuutta. (N5-A, 6, 21)

When students learned to see difference and understand that different people have different abilities, difference would not seem so strange later in life. Difference would not be seen as abnormal but could be better appreciated. Inclusion could thus increase tolerance towards all people. Seeing difference in an everyday context might also increase the possibility of **learning to live in a modern society** where all people are treated as equal and where one has to be able to work and communicate with everyone, as extract (97) points out:

(97) niin siis semmonen erilaisuuden näkyminen siellä niinku kouluyhteisössä koska loppujen lopuks sitähan se on normaalissakin yhteiskunnassa tai niinku aikuisten maailmassa et kaikki ei oo samanlaisia ja niin et silleen tavallaan ihmisii pitää silti ymmärtää ja arvostaa omana itsenään (N6-A, 9, 30)

It was stated that in "aikuisten maailmassa" (*the world of grown-ups*, as mentioned in extract (97)) one could not choose with whom one wanted to work with. People would be different regardless of whether they have disabilities or not, and they still had to be appreciated as who they were.

Inclusion was seen as an essential element of **integrating** immigrant students into the Finnish society, which could also be considered promoting tolerance, as discussed in extract (98):

(98) sitä mukaan integr- integroidaan muunmuas maahanmuuttajia yhteiskuntaan [-] Sieltä lähtien et erilaiset. tai erilaisista oppijoista nyt en niinkään osaa sanoo mutta voisinkin kuvitella että niille on siitä hyötyä että niitä ei eristetä mihinkään [-] itsekseen ja just. (M7-A, 9, 7)

Segregation was not seen such a good idea, and separating immigrant students from the main group was not considered to help anyone: neither the immigrants who were trying to adapt to a strange culture and learn how to communicate in a new language, nor the Finnish students who could benefit from learning about new cultures and hearing people talk in different languages. Finally, **socialization** was seen as a major advantage that inclusion could promote. An example of this point is expressed in extract (99):

(99) opettaminen kuitenkin niin paljon kasvattamista niin minusta se etu tulee siinä semmosessa. sosiaalistumisessa ja. niinku yhteisössä toimimisessa ja semmosessa niinkun [-] sellasessa kasvat- niinkun henkisessä kasvamisessa et jos on erityistarpeita niin ei kai- kaikkien tarvi mennä yliopistoon mut se että niinkun ne taidot mitä koulussa opitaan on kuitenkin äärimmäisen tärkeitä (M3-B, 7,1)

Teaching was seen as much educating students as teaching the theoretical subject matter, so when teaching students to work as one group, teachers had the ability to promote their students' emotional growth. The most important matters schools could offer were proper social skills and socialization, according to a participant in extract (99) above.

Summary: The data of the first part dealing with advantages of inclusion in general revealed that firstly, inclusion could be cost-effective and money could be saved when separate special education classes would no longer be needed (Group A: 1/Group B: 1). In addition to material advantages, many social advantages were found when talking about inclusion. Among these were preventing discrimination (Group A: 2/Group B: 3), increasing tolerance (Group A: 3/Group B: 2), preparing young people for the future (Group A: 2/Group B: 1), integrating immigrant students into the society (Group A: 1/Group B: 0) and promoting socialization (Group A: 1/Group B: 2).

6.3.2 Advantages to the work of teachers

The second part of the third theme dealt with the advantages inclusion could bring about to teachers' work. Thinking about advantages was taken a step further from the general perspective discussed in section 6.3.1 to the concrete work future subject teachers would do later in their life. Three different subcategories were found in the data: **co-**

operation among professionals, professional growth and multiculturalism and authenticity.

Co-operation and especially encouragement to work together among other education professionals were seen as great advantages that inclusion could have to the work of teachers, as illustrated in extract (100):

(100) no sitte kyllä se mun mielestä taas toisaalta vois. jos se tavallaan niinku tarkoittaa myös sitä että sitte koululuokassa ois vaikka useempi opettaja, niin sit se vois mahdollistaa semmosta moniammatillista [-] yhteistyötä, jaaa. tai vaikka se ei ois opettaja vaikka se ois sit joku avustaja joku tavallaan. [-] tulkki mikä lie. niin se vois mahollistaa sitä. (N1-B, 6, 27)

All professionals involved in supporting a student with special needs could work as members of a multiprofessional co-operation network: other teachers, assistants, or even interpreters. Inclusion could be a chance for a teacher's **growth as a professional**. It could have a positive effect on teachers' motivation to work because when accomplished, inclusion could bring about a feeling of success. The idea of personal growth and development is discussed in extract (101):

(101) Tietenki etuhan siinä on niinkun. siinä oppii valtavasti erilaisista ihmisistä ja niitten kanssa toimimisesta että [-] erilaisten yksilöitten kanssa toimiessa pystyy itte kehittymään ja sitä omaa työtäsä aika helposti kun näkee niinkun. näkee ne toisen tarpeet (M3-B, 8, 17)

Teachers were thought to be bound to learn a great deal about different learners and meeting special needs of their students. There was thought to be always room for development and inclusive classrooms offer an opportunity to develop as a teacher. Teachers might also be encouraged to try new teaching methods when the groups are so heterogeneous, as illustrated in extract (102):

(102) Hmm. varmaa siinä vaiheessa sit ehkä semmonen hyöty on että tulee ehkä käytetty sit erilaisii oppimistapoja vielä enemmän et et et jos jos se jos siel on monia oppijoita joitten joitten niinku tai on monia oppilaita joitten on vaan tosi vaikee istuu paikallaan ja lukee kirjaa ja niinku tehdä tehtäviä hiljaa niin sitten varmaan itekin rohkaistuu enemmän käyttää kaikkii sellasii niinku toiminnallisii oppimistapoja ja niinku keskusteluja ja erilasii niinku työtapoja. et ainakin se vois olla sitte semmonen et se ajaa tavallaan siihen käyttämään niinku mikä varmasti sit hyödyttää muitakin. (N6-A, 11, 30)

Using multiple ways of teaching would benefit all: average students with different learning styles; students with specific special needs; and teachers themselves.

Multiculturalism was seen as an advantage to teachers' work because students could have authentic examples of people from other cultures if there were immigrant students included in the classroom, as illustrated in extract (103):

(103) Öö. no etuja tietysti et jos siel luokas sattuu olemaan joku äidinkieleltään [-Jäidinkielinen. jos puhutaan vaikka englannista. Öö. mutta se nyt on varmaankin aika harvinaista. Tuli nyt ekana mieleen, Öö. no. aineenopettamiseen kieleen kuuluu kulttuurin opetus niin siitäkin tietysti sitten jos on eri kulttuureista tulevia ihmisiä niin saa konkreettisia esimerkkejä (M7-A, 10, 07)

When considering English lessons, having a person whose mother tongue is English as an authentic example of a user of English might benefit other students and thus multiculturalism and authenticity could be considered advantages.

Summary: When investigating the findings of this section dealing with the advantages inclusion could have to teaching, three main points were found. Inclusion was seen to promote co-operation among professionals (Group A: 1/Group B: 3) because a student with special needs may have many helpers around. Inclusion could also be seen as a possibility for a teacher's professional growth (Group A: 2/Group B: 2) when a heterogeneous group strives into searching for versatile ways of teaching. Finally, multiculturalism and authenticity were thought to enrich the learning environment (Group A: 1/Group B: 0).

6.3.3 Challenges in general

The third part of the theme discussed the challenges of inclusion in general. These challenges were divided into a total of seven different subcategories: **already challenging, not saving money, bullying, cultural differences, adjustments to the physical environment, average students, and practical concerns.**

The situation in schools was thought to be **already challenging**. It was even thought that inclusion might not, in fact, change the situation that much because all children are different whether they had special needs or not, as discussed in extract (104):

(104) Ja se vielä et onhan niissä ihan ihan normaaleissakin luokissa on oppilaita jotka kaipaa enemmän huomiota et ei se oo pelkästään se et siel istutaan hiljaa ja opettaja puhuu ja sit sinne tuodaan kaks erityisoppilasta ja sitte ne möykkää eihän se mene niin. Et lapset on lapsia. Ja sellasta. [-] Mut se on myöskin ihan mun mielestäki voi miettiä et toisko se inkluusio sitten niin hirveesti loppujen lopuks et eroisko se niin hirveesti siitä tän hetkisestä tilanteesta [-] Koska. aina on niitä vähän villimpiä tapauksia. aina on niitä rauhallisempia (N5-A, 8, 5)

Whereas inclusion could be thought to be used to save money, some speculation about actually spending more money was expressed, as in extract (105):

(105) no siinä missä tavallaan voijaan ajatella et ensin säästetään sitä rahaa, niin ehkä se ei säästykään koska jos opetustilat, ja. niinku yksinkertasesesti työtilat niin niitä ehkä joutuu mukauttaa, sillee että siellä vois niinku kaikki sitten saada semmosen mieluisen ja hyvän työskentely-ympäristön. niin tavallaan et kyllä se tavallaan vie myös siihen suuntaan [-] niitä tavallaan resursseja (N1-B, 7, 21)

Building proper learning environment that suits all students was seen to be a challenging and costly process that, in the end, would mean **not saving money** after all.

Some challenges were seen in the early days of inclusion, as described in extracts (106) and (107):

(106) Ja voihan se tietysti sit taas ainakin etenkin niinku aluks aiheuttaa taas sitten kiusaamista tai muuta jos siel on oppilas joka on just tullu jostain. [-] Jostain erikoisluokalta. Ja ja. Kyllähän se varmasti jotenkin sitä koulu yhteisöä muuttais mut en tiedä onko se nyt sitte [-] En osaa sanoo et oisko se negatiivisella tavalla. (N5-A, 7, 31)

(107) Hmm no siis varmaan ekaks nyt nii että koulukiusaaminen ja sitte semmonen että. Niin eli niin eli sit tavallaan se koska yläasteelaiset ei ehkä välttämättä esimerkiks oo niin maailman niinku so- suvaitsevaisimpia ihmisiä niin sit semmonen et sit jos sinne luokkaan tai ne just tehään sitä inkluusioo niin sit siellä voi tulla tosi pahoja koulukiusaamisongelmia ja sellasta. niinku halveksuntaa ja sellasta. (N6-A, 10, 4)

Integrating students with special needs in a normal classroom could cause **bullying** and rejection on the part of other students. 13-15-year-old students were not considered the most adaptive or flexible people in the world and it might be difficult for them to embrace the difference at first.

A question about taking into consideration **cultural differences** in a multicultural class or school was also raised. An example of this is described in extract (108):

(108) Öö. nää kielikysymykset. Mitä käytetään missäkin. [-] Jaa, tai että pitäskö olla äidinkielistä opetusta ja niin edelleen. Öö. kulttuurierot. juhlapyhinä esimerkiks jos /puhutaan/ [-] maahanmuuttajista. Tai en tiedä kuinka paljon Suomessa nyt esiintyy tällasta niinkun vaatetukseen liittyvää kulttuurieroos siinä mielessä niinku en oo tutustunu siihen. (M7-A, 9, 18)

There were language related issues to bear in mind, such as should there be teaching in a student's own mother tongue. Also paying attention to certain traditions considering holidays in different cultures and cultural differences in regard to clothing might cause challenges to schools.

Adjustments to the physical environment was thought to be challenging since, in addition to investing money, it must be hard to find a way of building learning environments that are suitable for all learners. This is discussed by a participant in extract (109):

(109) sit jotenki ihan semmonen tuli vielä mieleen et luokkatila. luokka on tilana. joku tarttee paljon virikkeellisyttä paljon kuvia seinälle. ihan tämmönen niinku konkreettinen mie- tuli niinkun mieleen et joku tarttee paljon niinku virikkeellisyttä[-] Jympärilleen voidakseen keskittyä. joku häiriintyy väreistä ja äänistä ja et. [-] Se fyysinen tila. (N2-B, 14, 28)

Some students need a lot of visual stimulation such as pictures on the walls whereas some students get distracted by colors and sounds, and yet, the same physical learning environment should meet the needs of all students.

In the classroom there is also a group of students who were said to be ignored when discussing inclusion. These are the so called average students. Worries were expressed about the **situation of average students** in an inclusive classroom, as illustrated in extract (110):

(110) No. tietysti se et jos sul on luokas vaikka kaksikin oppilasta joihin menee ihan hirveesti aikaa [-] Joille pitää olla. koko ajan huomauttamassa, niin sen opettajan energia kuluu kauheesti niitten. [-] Niitten. tota. komentamiseen ja niitten kanssa toimimiseen ja se voi olla et se vie sit muilta oppilailta. [-] aikaa (N5-A, 7, 20)

Students were seen to suffer if a teacher was not able to take into account their needs while concentrating on students with special needs.

Many other **practical concerns** were expressed by the participants. First, the whole idea of inclusion was said to be an invention of professors and researches, as illustrated in extract (111):

(111) ja mitä siihen tohon inkluusioajatukseen liittyy mutta sitte niinku ni ja sitte mulla on ehkä semmonen olo myös ((naurahdus)) että ikävä sanoa mutta että tosi monet näistä on semmosia niinku professoreiden ja tutkijoiden kehittämiä ajatuksia ja näkemyksiä [-] maailmasta josta ne ite on aika kaukana valitettavan kaukana (N1-B, 10, 9)

Researchers and professors were believed to live in a world quite far from the reality in schools and therefore, have little idea of what could work in practice. Also, changing an education system that has always changed slowly was seen as a challenge, as discussed in extract (112):

(112) yhteiskunnallisestikin oikeestaan et jos lähetään muuttaa tämmöstä niinku meidän vakiintunutta erityisopetusmallia [-] Niin siel on varmasti ne vanhan liiton opettajat jotka silleen haraa vastaan kaikkiin tämmösiin [-] uudistuksiin että. [-] Mutta aina on olemassa semmosia jääriä jotka vastustaa kaikkee muutosta niin se on tietysti haasteellista myös [-] Että ne arvot muuttuu (M8-A, 7, 20)

Changing an old and established practice was thought to be hard, not the least because of the people opposing everything that was against the traditional views. It was estimated to take time to see old values changing. Inclusion was also seen to require changes in matters that one might not even have realized yet. This is discussed in extracts (113) and (114):

(113) mä luulen et se vaatis aika isoja muutoksia semmosissa niinku perusasioissa mitä me ei. ehkä ees ajatella nytte [-] et mä luulen et on hirveen paljon. helpompaa pitäytyä kiinni siinä ajatuksessa ja siinä hienossa yhteisöllisyyden tunteessa ja semmosessa [-] mitä siinä niinku ja niissä positiivisissa jutuissa, (N1-B, 10, 2)

(114) et ei ei Suomessa niinku mikää muu vielä tue tätä et se on nyt jos on niinku opettajan oma näkemys asiasta, [-] niin et sä aika lailla yksin lähet vielä raivaamaan sitä tietä, ja luomaan sitä sun oman näköstä luokkaa (N1-B, 8, 33)

There seemed to be little support for practicing inclusion in Finland, according to the participants. Individual teachers were seen as the ones who were doing the work without much help from the surrounding society.

Summary: many challenges in general were found in the data. Students were seen to be already challenging without inclusion bringing in students who would be in need of special attention (Group A: 3/Group B: 0). Inclusion might not, in fact, save money because of the need to make major adjustments to the common learning environment (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). Inclusion could be seen to cause quite a lot of bullying of students with special needs, at least in the beginning (Group A: 2/Group B: 0). Also taking into account cultural differences might be challenging for schools (Group A: 1/Group B: 0). Adjustments to the physical environment were seen to cause a challenge of its own because deciding how to make it suitable for all students was found extremely demanding (Group A: 0/Group B: 2). Average students might suffer by the fact that teachers do not have time for them in an inclusive classroom (Group A: 3/Group B: 0). Other practical challenges, such as treating inclusion achievable and changing the whole education system, were also expressed (Group A: 1/Group B: 1).

6.3.4 Challenges in the work of teachers

The fourth part of the theme dealt with the challenges of inclusion in teachers' work. A total of eleven different subcategories were found in the data: **already challenging, including everyone equally, lack of knowledge on special pedagogy, keeping order in the classroom, differentiation, teaching from many perspectives, more work, equal evaluation, co-operation, frustration**, and finally, **staying positive**.

The work of teachers was regarded as being **already challenging**. The focus was especially on teaching languages (as all participants would graduate as language teachers), which was seen demanding as it is, as illustrated in extract (115):

(115) No. öö. miusta tuntuu että kielten oppiminen on muutenkin aika sellanen yksilöllinen prosers- prosessi että et niinku. et monet et tai siis et ihmiset oppii kieliä muutenkin tosi eri tahtiin [-] et niinku ne oppilaat on tosi eri tasoilla jollain saattaa olla vaik tosi laaja sanavarasto tai joku on vaikka asunu jossain ulkomailla ja oppii jo tosi tai on osannu jo tosi hyvin niinku sellasta puheentuottamista niin sitten se että on vielä niinku isompi skaala erilaisii oppijoita (N6-A, 11, 21)

The number of students in different levels in language classrooms was seen large enough, even without including students with special needs. Learning languages was seen as being an individual process which meant that students learn languages at their own pace. There might be students who have spent time abroad and have a vast vocabulary and fluent oral skills, while some students might still be learning the basics. Because of this large number of different learners, the **ability to share time equally** with all students in the classroom was a cause for concerns. Examples of this are described in extract (116) and (117):

(116) No just yleismaailmallisesti siis jos ajatellaan tasa-arvon kannalta niin sit taas se yksilöitten tarpeitten huomioiminen [-] onks se ideaali mahdollista saavuttaa kuitenkin todellisuudessa että. jokainen otetaan tasa-arvoisesti huomioon. (N2-B, 14, 14)

(117) varmaan ainakin just se että ku varsinkin monis niinku ala-asteella ja yläasteella niin kun ne tunnit kestää 45 minuuttii. niin se on vaan tosi lyhyt aika saaha kaikki tekemään niinku sitä sitä mitä pitäis [-] se että ku niinku tavallaan on niin eri tasosia niin sitten kun se 45 minuuttii menee siihen et yrittää saaha kaikki siihen samaan samaan tilanteeseen. Koska kuitenkin kouluissa tehään niinku aika paljon sellasta. niinku että pyritään pitää kaikki siinä samalla viivalla ja se on varmaan myös se inklusioajatus että yritetään pitää myös ne erityisoppilaat siin samassa oppimisaikataulussa niin sitte se varmasti tuos siihen vielä lisää haastetta (N6-A, 10, 34)

Taking into account the needs of all individuals seemed idealistic rather than realistic. Also the fact that many lessons in elementary and secondary school last for only 45 minutes causes a pressure. Keeping all students on the same line in their studies was seen considerably challenging, if that was what inclusion tried to achieve.

Finding out about various learning difficulties and disabilities was considered to cause a substantial challenge and take a lot of time, because the future subject teachers had **not studied special pedagogy**, as illustrated in extracts (118) and (119):

(118) No ensinnäkin ainakin se että jos on se joku erityisoppilas luokassa niin et ottaa selvää siitä et minkälaisia oppimisvaikeuksia sillä ja on varsinkin ku itellä ei oo minkäänlaista kokemusta. Tai tai en oo käyny niitä sitä erityispedagogiikkaa et ei oo sillä lailla semmosta teoriapohjaa hirveesti taus- pohjalla taustalla. Että tota ihan jo siitä oppimisvaikeudesta niinku et ottaa selvää siitä. (N4-B, 8, 20)

(119) Tai niinku meiänki yliopistolta valmistuu varmasti paljon semmosia aineenopettajia joilla ei oo minkälaista kokemusta erityispedagogiikasta niin heille on tosi vaikeeta sitte ottaa huomioon ne sillettii niinku tai antaa varmaan tilaa niille erilaisille oppijoille siel omassa luokkahuoneessa ja antaa sille erityisopettajalleki sitte tilaa erityisopettajalle ja erityisoppilaille ni tilaa toimia tilaa tehdä sitä omaa juttuunsa koska jos ei oo käyny erityispedagogiikan kursseja nii ei välttämättä ymmärrä että se mikä toiselle on jotain. Työrauhan häiritsemistä tai jotain semmosta on oikeesti sitä että tää oppilas vaan haluaa huomiota ja [-] Niinkun on oikeesti tosi innostunu tästä asiasta mutta kuitenkin niinkun tekee sen vaan silleen ää. Epäproduktiivisella tavalla (M8-A, 8, 4)

Taking into account all kinds of special needs and giving room to other adults working with a student with special needs might turn out to be difficult because the participants did not have a solid theory base on special pedagogy. Also seeing a difference between real problems and bad behavior might be considerably more difficult for teachers lacking knowledge on special pedagogy. Other practical concerns considering teachers' work were expressed, such as challenges of **keeping order in the classroom**, as discussed in extracts (120) and (121):

(120) Ja plus kaikki sit sellaset niinku järe- niinku ei järjestyhäiriöt mutta ehkä sellaset niinku että. jos siellä on joku jonka on esimerkiks tosi vaikee istuu paikallaan niin sitte ku siitä päivästä menee sit tosi paljon siihen väentämiseen et niinku. (N6-A, 11, 4)

(121) mutta tietenki siihen sisältyy kaikki käytännön haasteet niinku esimerkiks työrauhan säilyttäminen. (M8-A, 4, 4)

The challenges were seen to be caused by the situation in the classroom where keeping order and solving problems could take a lot of time away from the actual learning. The same kind of issue applied to the worries the participants shared about figuring out when to **differentiate** learning, as expressed in extracts (122) and (123):

(122) sitten just ehkä sen rajan vetäminen siihen että. että niinku missä tavallaan. missä tilanteessa eriytetään mikä on [-] sellasta mihin kaikki osallistuu. [-] niin tavallaan et miten se sitten näkyy inklusiivisessa luokassa [-] ja tai missä määrin, niin se just varmaan tuo haasteita niille jotka sitä vetää. (N1-B, 7, 34)

(123) jos pitää nyt opetuksen tasoo luokassa sitten mukauttaa niin paljon että. siitä saattaa jollekin olla haittaa tulevaisuudessa. [-] Et pitäskö sitten olla niinkun erityisryhmiä myös lahjakkaimmille, (M7-A, 9, 2)

Drawing the line (*rajan vetäminen* in extract (122)) to which situations require differentiation and which do not was seen challenging. Too much differentiation of teaching to meet the level of the weakest students in the classroom could even cause harm to some of the brighter students. This could be solved by creating special groups for the extremely talented students (as suggested in extract (123) above). However, because inclusion was seen as having just one group for all instead of separating students according to their skills, the challenges were seen to multiply. This is discussed in extract (124):

(124) mitä on se cp-vammasen englanninkielen oppiminen ja mitä on tavallaan fyysisesti terveen lapsen. englannin kielen oppiminen. et tavallaan et sit pitäis niinku läh- pitää miettiä hirveen monta lähtökohtaa et mistä kukakin lähtee (N1-B, 4, 3)

Teachers were thought to have to think of **teaching from several different perspectives**. It was not clear what learning English as a disabled student is compared to the average students. Also normal matters in the language classroom, such as going through a chapter from a textbook, with a variety of different learners were considered challenging. Worries about teaching languages to someone who has problems with their mother tongue (L1) were also expressed. Moreover, students whose mother tongue is not Finnish were seen to be challenging since most teaching in Finland is done through Finnish, which is the L1 of the majority of the students. This applies to teaching English as well. Teaching a foreign language for someone who might have difficulties in coping with L1 was seen to be demanding and a major challenge for teachers, as illustrated in extract (125):

(125) jos oppilaalla on [-]omankin äidinkielenensä kans tekemistä. Saatika sitten jos se oma äidinkieli ei edes ole suomi, [-] et et oo natiivi ja juurikaan ymmärrät suomea niin sitten. siihen päälle opettelemaan vielä viera- vierasta kieltä niin [-] kyllä se on mun mielestä haastavaa (N2-B, 16, 6)

All in all, inclusion was seen to cause a lot of **extra work**, as illustrated in extracts (126) and (127):

(126) mä luulen et se tuo aika paljon lisää ihan vaan sellasta niinku paperityötä. ja sellasta pyörittelyä niin sanotusti että. just se että niinku valmistat jokaiselle erikseen vaikka kokeen (N1-B, 8, 30)

(127) No opettajalle se on tietysti jonkinlainen rasite. Pitää. suunnitella kursseja erilaisille ihmisille eikä vain sille massalle. (M7-A, 9, 24)

Designing a test or a whole course in English for individuals instead of the masses was seen to cause more concrete paperwork and also be stressful for teachers. The actual

teaching, in addition to designing teaching material, was seen to be more challenging because there were so many different kinds of learners in the classroom, and teachers were forced to find and try many ways of teaching, as expressed by a participant in extract (128):

(128) Ja varmaan se just vei- veis aika paljon aikaa että. Kokeilla erilaisia tapoja opettaa. että mikä sitte toimii millekin oppilaalle [-] Että löytää semmosen niinku yhteise-yhteisen sävelen siinä (N4-B, 8, 32)

A worry about losing the opportunity to do tasks that were done together as a group in the classroom was also raised. The individualization of tasks could mean that one student did completely different tasks as the rest of the group and the possibilities to proceed at the same time might be lost, as expressed in extract (129):

(129) ja sit tavallaan että mitkä on ne yhteiset jutut mitä me voijaan tehdä. ja sit taas että mitä se aiheuttaa siihen luokahuoneympäristöön se. että tavallaan toi tekee tota ja ja toi tekee noita juttuja ja toi tekee tota juttuja ni sit tavallaa missä se on se että me tehään täällä yhdessä juttuja [-] et häviääkö se [-] sen takia että toinen ei pysty siihen mihin toinen pystyy. niin sitä. (N1-B, 4, 5)

Equal evaluation was seen to cause a considerable challenge for teachers because of this variety of different learners studying at a different pace with a possibly modified curriculum, This point is discussed in extract (130):

(130) jos jokaista kielen osa-aluetta pitäis arvioida, tai niinku ajatellaan näin et ne neljä kielten osa-aluetta muodostaa sen kokonaisuuden, [-] mut sit toi yks ei vaikka pysty niinku kahteen niistä ollenkaan. niin mistä lähetään [-] ja tavallaan että teetkö sä joka ikiselle tehtävälle semmosen skaalan. että no sää teet tän nyt tällä tasolla ja sä teet tän nyt tällä tasolla. mut sit ei meillä oo todistuksia joissa näkyy millä tasolla ne on tehty (N1-B, 9, 24)

When evaluating, for example, language skills there were seen to be four different aspects of language that were taken into account. If a student could not perform two of those aspects the teacher faced a problem, because it meant creating a whole new grading system for that student alone. A grade was to be given to the student according to that individualized system but school reports might not show which kind of grading system had been used in the evaluation, the original or the modified one. This, according to the participant, might create inequality.

Co-operation was considered challenging and time-consuming, although it was also listed as an advantage to the work of teachers. This view is discussed in extract (131):

(131) koulu yhteistyön kannalta niin kyllähän se vaatii hirveesti jos ajatellaan sitä moniammatillistakin yhteistyötä niin se että sen saa toimimaan niinku tosi kitkattomasti ja joustavasti niin se vaatii tosi paljon aikaa ja energiaa niinku ja [-] mun-

molemmipuolista yhteistyötä. Sekä opettajalta että erityisopettajalta ja tietenkin muilta niinku. avustajilta ja ketä siihen nyt ikinä voi niinku liittääkään. Ja voi olla henkilökohtasia avustajiakin joillakin oppilailla että. Että että. Ja tulkkeja voi olla [-] jos on maahanmuuttajat sehän on ihan se kirjo aivan valtava. Että sitte mitenkä ne sovitaa. (N2-B, 14, 18)

Co-operation among all professionals working with a student with special needs did not just happen, as was pointed out by a participant in the extract above. In order to work smoothly, a lot of time and effort would have to be put into creating the co-operation network where all participants agree on which kind of support is needed.

Finally, all challenges mentioned so far were seen to cause quite a bit of **frustration**, especially if a teacher felt that he/she had failed in trying to teach an inclusive class. This is illustrated in extract (132):

(132) ehkä niinku ne epäonnistumiset et sit taas voi syödä myös tosi paljon. (N1-B, 8, 27)

Keeping a positive attitude when seeing all the challenges ahead was seen rather difficult as well, as discussed in extracts (133) and (134):

(133) Se on niinku hirmu vaikee pitäs olla tosi positiivinen. pystyä ajattelemaan tosi positiivisesti että näkis siinä jotakin etuja. (N4-B, 9, 32)

(134) sit varsinki uutena tuoreena opettajana niin mä luulen että on NIIN paljon kaikkee muutakin, [-] että jotenkin ne idealismin rippeet ((naurahdus)) rupee ropisee siinä vaiheessa kun se 250 koepaperia nököttää siinä nenän edessä. (N1-B, 9, 3)

Seeing advantages in a situation where the workload could be doubled was seen challenging. Also the notion that novice teachers were having so many new things to learn in the beginning of their career was seen to reduce the urge to follow idealistic trends, such as inclusion.

Summary: The work of teachers was seen to face several challenges when inclusion was involved. A teacher's work, especially that of a language teacher, was seen to be already challenging (Group A: 1/Group B: 0). The participants were worried about their abilities in including each student equally (Group A: 2/Group B: 3). The reason for this was partly because of their lack of knowledge on special education (Group A: 3/Group B: 2). Keeping order in a classroom with all kinds of learners was seen challenging and frustrating, because time was taken away from the actual teaching (Group A: 2/Group B: 0). The differentiation of teaching, and moreover, knowing how and when to differentiate was considered a challenge (Group A: 1/Group B: 1). Finding different perspectives to teach all kinds of learners was thought to be challenging (Group A:

1/Group B: 2) and cause a whole lot of extra work to teachers (Group A: 3/Group B: 3). Equal evaluation when groups are very heterogeneous was found almost impossible (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). Co-operation, although mentioned as an advantage as well, was seen to demand a lot of time and effort and for that reason, considered a challenge (Group A: 0/Group B: 2). Finally frustration (Group A: 0/Group B: 1) and staying positive (Group A: 1/Group B: 2) in the middle of all challenges were seen as real challenges.

6.3.5 Difference between the work of elementary school teachers and subject teachers

The last part of the theme dealing with advantages and challenges discussed the possibilities teachers have to actually perform inclusion. A comparison between two occupational groups in the field of education, elementary school teachers and subject teachers, was the main topic of this discussion. The aim was to see whether future subject teachers believed in their chances in succeeding in as inclusive teachers. Four different subcategories were found in the data: **elementary school teachers have better chances, elementary school teachers' challenges, subject teachers have less chance, and subject teachers' possibilities.**

Elementary school teachers were thought to **have better chances in successful inclusion**: firstly, it was stated that elementary school teachers taught only one teaching group which meant that they would have a better possibility to succeed. This is illustrated in extract (135):

(135) No. mä näen ehkä että luokanopettajalla on suurempi mahdollisuus sen toteuttamiseen [-]. luokanopettajalla on paljon enemmän niinku mahdollisuuksia sitten oikeesti toteuttaa sitä koska se on se sen oma ryhmä ja. [-] ollaan koko ajan siellä samassa tilassa että sitten pystyy tavallaan. rakentamaan sen oman luokahuoneenkin sen ryhmän. tarpeitten mukaseks (M3-B, 9, 8)

Elementary school teachers were seen to teach always in the same classroom, which would make it possible to build a suitable learning environment for all students. Because elementary school teachers had one group to teach, they were seen to have better chances in getting to know their students individually, as discussed in extracts (136) and (137):

(136) No ehkä yks mikä on niinku kliseinen vastaus mikä tulee heti mieleen luokanopettaja ehkä oppii tuntemaan oppilaansa jollain tapaa ehkä paremmin, [-] koska

viettää ihan tuntimäärällisesti enemmän päivässä aikaa kyseisen oppilaan kanssa (N2-B, 16, 22)

(137) Ja se joutuu tietysti se pystyy myöskin rakentaa ehkä siihen ryhmään vähän erilaisen suhteen ja niihin oppilaisiin vähän erilaisen suhteen koska se on niitten kanssa paljon enemmän tekemisissä kun taas sit aineenopettaja joka pitää sen pari tuntia viikossa vaan sille ryhmälle. (N5-A, 9, 32)

As was mentioned earlier in the first theme, inclusion was thought to be based on interpersonal relationship between a teacher and students. Elementary school teachers were thought to have the ability to create closer relationship with their students than subject teachers. However, elementary school teachers could also face **difficulties**, because they are in charge of teaching all subjects whereas subject teachers have only one subject of their expertise to deal with, as expressed in extract (138):

(138) Miten erilaiset oppijat ottas sit siinä tilantees huomioon siinä- hän. Jos opettaa useampia aineita. Ja monilla oppilailta saattaa olla sillettii et ne liittyy vaan tiettyihin aiheihin- aineisiin [-] Ne heidän ongelmat niin siinä tilanteessa saattaa olla todella vaikeeta jos pitää alkaa ottaa niinku kokonaisen ryhmän kaikki tarpeet huomioon [-] Kaikissa aineissa (M8-A, 9, 11)

Subject teachers, in contrary, were said to spend just a few hours a week with the same group, have many changing teaching groups and possibly many different classrooms, and the interaction subject teachers have with their students was seen as rather fragmental, as expressed in extracts (139) and (140):

(139) Ja ylipäänsä se että aineenopettajalla on kuitenkin aika lyhyt. pieni se kontaktipinta siihen. siihen työhön [-] se on se kolme kertaa kaks kertaa viikossa [-] nelkytviis minuuttia. että. se se tuo mukanaan siihen siihen tekemiseen aika niinku pitkä saattaa kestää pitkän aikaa että pääsee niinkun tavallaan rytmiin siitä että minkälainen. oppilas on (M3-B, 8, 36)

(140) Aineenopettajalla. öö. se on sellasta aika sirpaleista se niinkun oppilaitten tapaaminen että että on sillon tällön niitä tunteja ja sitten voi. on vaikeempi tutustua niihin että. (N4-B, 10, 12)

Gaining authority over the students or at least achieving a similar status that an elementary school teacher might have for a student was thought to be much more difficult because of the constant turnover of groups, as illustrated in extract (141):

(141) Ja se että saavuttaa semmosen aseman sille lapselle siinä niinku aineenopettajana on paljon vaikeempaa verrattuna siihen niinku [-] luokanopettajaan joka on aika semmonen ehdoton auktoriteetti [-] jonka kanssa luodaan kuus vuotta tai kolme vuotta sitä semmosta niinku vuorovaikutussuhdetta (M3-B, 9, 26)

Subject teachers were also considered to have less contact with parents than elementary school teachers have, as discussed by a participant in extract (142):

(142) saattaa olla et esimerkiksi yläasteella niin öö vanhem- oppilaan vanhemmat ottaa yhteyttä luokanvalvojaan mut mut ei siihen kielen opettajaan välttämättä ja sitte. (N6-A, 12, 17)

In secondary schools teachers have their own home group and parents were seen more likely to get in touch with the teacher of their child's home group, than directly with, for example, an English teacher. That way some issues concerning problems with a certain subject might not get as much attention as they should. Subject teachers were seen to see only one side of their students' skills, and it was mentioned that underachievement in English might not always mean that a student is facing problems with the language. Some issues could be purely motivational and have nothing to do with the actual skills. This point is introduced in extract (143):

(143) Ni sitte et se niitten oppilaitten osaaminen niin siit näkyy vaan se yks osa-alue et et koska voi olla vaan joku joka inhoo enkkuu ja sit niinku [-] mut se saattaa olla tosi hyvä matikassa niin sitte et. et aineenopettaja näkee vaan sen yhen puolen niitten osaamisesta (N6-A, 12, 11)

However, **subject teachers might sometimes notice** difficulties that elementary school teachers had missed. These might have to do with, for example, some specific language related difficulties, as illustrated in extract (144):

(144) Mut sit toisaalta. Joskushan. Englannin opettaja saattaa huomata asioita joita luokanopettajalla menee kokonaan sivusuun just vaikka kielellisiä vaikeuksia et ne ei oo välttämättä näkyny. Näkyny niinkun vaikka äidinkielen opiskelussa mut sitten ensimmäistä vierasta kieltä alotettaessa tulee ilmi että (N2-B, 16, 27)

Whereas elementary school teachers were seen to have the possibility to succeed in an inclusive classroom by themselves, one subject teacher alone was not thought to be sufficient. All subject teachers should work together in order to create a similar situation that elementary school teachers were able to achieve, as discussed in extract (145):

(145) että aineenopettajalla on paljon tärkeempää sitten se muitten aineenopettajien kanssa. niinku yhteistyön tekeminen että tavallaan. yläasteen opettajat on yhdessä sitä mitä luokanopettaja on [-] sille oppilaalle alakouluun puolella (M3-B, 9, 19)

Summary: The last part of the theme, which dealt with the differences between the work of elementary school teachers and subject teachers regarding inclusion, revealed that the future subject teachers did not believe in their chances to succeed in inclusion (Group A: 2/Group B: 3) as much as they believed in elementary school teachers' chances (Group A: 3/Group B: 3). However, elementary school teachers were seen to have more challenge in teaching all subjects (Group A: 1/Group B: 0) and subject teachers might sometimes notice difficulties related to their own subject (Group A: 0/Group B: 2).

Summary of the theme 'advantages and challenges'

The third theme of the present study tried to find an answer to the research question dealing with advantages and challenges that the future subject teachers find in general, and in their job description. The theme was divided into five separate categories. The findings of the third theme are now summarized and comparison between the ideas of groups A and B are made.

When discussing advantages and challenges, many of both sorts were discovered. Firstly, inclusion could be seen to have many advantages. It could save a great deal of money because there would be no need to build separate special education classes. Instead of listing a lot of material points, the participants focused on the social advantages inclusion could bring about. Inclusion, when achieved and financed with proper resources, could prevent discrimination and increase tolerance towards other human beings. It could be seen as an important educational element for preparing young people for the future. Immigrant students were seen to be integrated into the society with inclusive education. Finally, the participants concluded that inclusion could teach students important social skills and promote socializing in general.

Secondly, inclusion was considered to offer advantages to the actual work of teachers. The promotion of co-operation among professionals was seen as an essential advantage. Another point was made about inclusion working as a way of affecting teachers' own professional growth, because they had the possibility to find new, innovative ways of teaching heterogeneous groups. Multiculturalism was the third point mentioned, because teachers could use their students' own experiences of different cultures and languages as authentic teaching material.

Thirdly, many challenges in general were found in the data. Students were seen to be already challenging because they all are on different levels in their studying skills. Including students with specific special needs would multiply the problems already existing in schools. Furthermore, inclusion was seen to cause bullying of students with special needs, at least in the beginning. Also taking into account cultural differences was considered challenging for schools. Adjustments to the physical environment would cause a challenge of its own: deciding how to make a learning environment suitable for all students was found extremely demanding. Average students were seen to suffer in an

inclusive classroom because teachers might not have time for them and their needs. Other practical challenges, such as finding inclusion realizable and changing the traditional education system, were also expressed.

Many more challenges in the actual work of teachers were discussed. Teaching was seen to be challenging already because of the variety of students learning in different pace. The participants found inclusion difficult also because they were lacking knowledge of special education. Keeping order in a classroom with all kinds of learners was seen challenging because time was taken away from the actual teaching. Differentiation of teaching, and moreover, knowing how and when to differentiate was considered a challenge, as well as teaching with different perspectives in mind. All this additional thinking and studying the needs of their students was seen to cause a whole lot of extra work to teachers. Because groups are so heterogeneous, creating equal evaluation methods was seen almost impossible. Co-operation, although mentioned as an advantage as well, was seen to demand a lot of time and effort. Finally, frustration and staying positive in the midst of all these challenges were seen as real challenges.

Finally, the participants shared a common view when discussing the chances elementary school teachers have in succeeding in inclusion compared to the situation of subject teachers: elementary school teachers were seen to have far better chances because they had the possibility to create a close and trusting relationship with their group. Subject teachers were seen to lack the advantage of continuity because they taught several different groups and thus had fewer chances in creating a close relationship with their students.

There were no great differences in the views of the advantages between the two groups. Only members of group B mentioned cost-effectiveness and a member of group A integration of immigrants, but other than that the groups seemed to share the same view of inclusion offering a great deal of social advantages. When discussing teachers' work, group B promoted the idea of co-operation as an advantage to teaching, while only one member of group A focused on the advantages of multiculturalism.

When it came to challenges, group A focused on the facts that teaching is already challenging and average students would suffer if students with special needs were included, and thought that inclusion could even cause bullying. Members of group B

shared practical concerns such as financial issues and difficulties of designing a suitable learning environment for all students. When discussing teaching, some differences were found although the answers were surprisingly similar: only members of group A were worried about the possible disturbances that would distract teaching. Members of group B pointed out the amount of work creating a good co-operation network would demand, and for that reason called co-operation and co-teaching challenging. Otherwise, the groups shared common views of the lack of theoretical background and knowledge of special pedagogy, difficulties in teaching and differentiation, as well as the challenge of staying positive.

Finally, both groups felt that inclusion was easier for elementary school teachers than for subject teachers. Only difference was that members of group B thought that subject teachers too could succeed in teaching an inclusive classroom, and sometimes subject teachers might notice difficulties that elementary teachers may not even realize.

6.4 Teacher education

The fourth research question of the present study dealt with teacher education. The main focus was on whether the subject teacher students believed their education on teaching students with special needs in an inclusive classroom was sufficient. All participants were about to become teachers and were completing their pedagogical studies for teachers (group A) or had already completed them (group B). The main categories of the fourth theme were: **teacher education and inclusion, sufficiency of education on teaching students with special needs, ideas for improvement, expectations (group A only) and responses to the statement** (see figure 7).

Figure 7. Theme 4: Teacher education

IV. TEACHER EDUCATION

TEACHER EDUCATION AND INCLUSION	SUFFICIENCY OF EDUCATION ON TEACHING STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS	IDEAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	EXPECTATIONS (GROUP A ONLY)	RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some education ▪ Focus on philosophy ▪ Focus on disabilities ▪ Focus on differentiation ▪ Provocative lectures and idealistic views ▪ No room for critical discussion ▪ No connection to real life ▪ A gap between theory and practice ▪ Examples by teacher training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient experiences from teacher training ▪ Inclusion remains unclear ▪ No necessary means provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for concrete examples ▪ Need for more special education ▪ Responsibility of the teacher training school ▪ More training in regular schools ▪ More practical training ▪ Co-operation with special education ▪ Useful theory base 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Little practical training ▪ Special pedagogy ▪ Expectations of training lessons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disrespectful ▪ Disagreement about teaching methods ▪ No connection to reality ▪ Disagreement because of teachers' lack of knowledge ▪ Qualities of teachers ▪ Role of special education teachers ▪ Achievable

6.4.1 Teacher education and inclusion

The first part dealt with teacher education and moreover, what pedagogical studies for teachers had taught the participants about inclusion and special education. A total of nine different points of view of this issue were found: **some education, focus on philosophy, focus on disabilities, focus on differentiation, provocative lectures and idealistic views, no room for critical discussion, no connection to real life, a gap between theory and practice, and examples by teacher training.**

It had seemed that the University of Jyväskylä supported the idea of inclusion, as illustrated in extract (146):

(146) No mä oon ymmärtäny että Jyväskylän yliopiston linjaus on se että inkluusiota kannatetaan. (N2-B, 17, 10)

However, many participants felt that inclusion had not played an important role in their studies since they had only **little recollection about it**, as discussed in extracts (147) and (148):

(147) *Öö no mä en kyllä niinkun muista että oliko meillä tollon har- harjotteluvuonna ollenkaan. Saatettiin ehkä jossain ryhmätapaamisissa vähän puhua. puhua. Tai jos on puhuttu niin se ei oo ainakaan jääny mulla mieleen mitenkään hirmu paljon. (N4-B, 10, 25)*

(148) *Tota. Noh. Asiasta lienee mainittu koska osasin määritellä tämän haastattelun aluksi /suurin piirtein mitä inklusio on/ Mutta. En kyllä voi väittää että se olis ollu mitenkään keskeisessä asemassa. (M8-A, 9, 28)*

According to the participant in extract (148), something about inclusion must have been mentioned because he was able to define the phenomena in the beginning of the interview. Nonetheless, he did not think it had been talked about too much. When inclusion had been mentioned, the perspective had been rather theoretical, as expressed by a participant in extract (149):

(149) *Sitä opetettiin näissä. pienryhmissä. luentomaisesti luettiin tavallaan luettiin artikkeleja ja keskusteltiin siitä teoriasta ja siitä niinkun filosofiasta sen takana (M3-B, 10, 8)*

Inclusion had been mentioned in small group meetings where the students had first read articles about it, and then discussed the theory and **philosophy** behind the idea of inclusion. The perspective had been too focused on **disabilities**, too, as described by a participant in extract (150):

(150) *Ei se kyllä niinku oo ainakaan viime vuoden aikana tullu niinku että vaikka oli jotain joku jollakin kurssilla kyllä käytiin yleisesti. Mut sekin oli ehkä semmosta se oli hirveen jotenkin semmosta että niinkun voiko puhua vammakeskeistä [-] mikä oli mun mielestä tosi niinku. Väärä lähestymistapa että käytiin vaan yleisiä niinkun piirteitä et no mistä tunnistat ja tämmöstä on ominaista tälle ja tälle mut jotenkin sit se pedagoginen näkemys siihen kaikkeen [-] niin se jäi must kokonaan pois (N2-B, 18, 22)*

Focusing on disabilities had felt like the wrong approach to a multilayered phenomenon such as inclusion. The participants had felt as if the pedagogical approach to inclusion had been ignored because the focus was on theoretical and ethical issues concerning disabilities. Moreover, many lectures on inclusion had dealt with **differentiation** rather than inclusion, as illustrated in extracts (151) and (152):

(151) *muuten ehkä se niinku enemmänki puhuttu eriyttämisestä. ku ite inklusiosta (N1-B, 12, 15)*

(152) *On siitä joitain luentoja ollu. [-]Öö. lähinnä eriyttämisestä puhuttiin paljon. [-] Sekaryhmissä luokissa. et millaista eriyttämistä pitäis olla. Ja kyl se se oli mun mielestä aika siitä puhuttiin paljon. [-] Ylipäätään. Just siitä eriyttämisen näkökulmasta [-] Se sana on jääny mieleen sieltä tosi voimakkaasti ((naurahtaa)) (M7-A, 11, 14)*

A very **provocative lecturer** in the basic studies of the pedagogical studies for teachers had stated various idealistic views of inclusion and claimed that special pedagogy was not, in fact, needed any longer, and that every normal elementary school or subject teacher could work in an inclusive classroom without assistance. Although the interviewees believed that the purpose was to provoke students to think about the issue, they did not find it a good beginning for a discussion about inclusion. Many had left the lecture with rather a bad feeling about inclusion, as discussed in the following extracts (153) and (154):

(153) perusopintojen aikana mä muistan et sillon oli joku luentosarja joka niinku varsinaisesti käsitteli inkluusiota. ja sit taas mun mielestä lähtökohta siihen okei varmasti myös niinkun provosoiva tarkoituksella, mutta että se lähtökohta siihen on se että erityispedagogiikkaa ei tarvita [-] ja et jotenkin erityisopettajaa ja sen ammattitaitoa ei tarvita vaan kuka tahansa pystyy [-] tähän niin se mulla jäi niinku mieleen sieltä. (N1-B, 12, 23)

(154) Meillä oli ((nimi poistettu)) luento sillon niissä OPEP:eissa niin se puhu siitä että. tää ei oo ehkä ihan suora lainaus mut se tais sanoa silleen että että just et kyllä kaikki erityisoppilaat pitäisi yhdistää niihin normiluokkiin. ja sellainen opettaja joka ei pysty niitä niitä erityisoppilaita käsittelemään on vain laiska ja [-] niinku tehoton. mikä se on se myös sen tyyli et se provosoi ja tekee tota tarkoituksella mut toisaalt jos toi on niinku perusopinnoist ainut asia mikä mullon jääny inkluusiosta mieleen. plus et kaikki ei ehkä ymmärrä ot- käsitellä sitä niinku sellasena provona [-] nii niin et se ei ehkä sit oo niinku. ehkä ihan hirvee hyvä kuva siitä (N6-A, 5, 7)

It was also mentioned that during the first year of the pedagogical studies for teachers the students received large amounts of new information. They had come across several arcane terms which had not been familiar to them so it was no wonder they had only little recollection of inclusion being mentioned. This point is expressed in extract (155):

(155) Tähän pakko sanoo et että että. kun ne ekat kurssit mitkä käyään sillon fuksivuonna kun on niitä luentokurseja ja niist pitää kirjoittaa se opintopäivä- kurssipäiväkirja. niin miul ei oo oikeesti ihan hirveesti mitää hajuu mitä siel on puhuttu. [-] ne jää sellaseks sumuks et miun mielestä [-] ne on niin kaukana mistään konkreettisesta et voi olla et siel on puhuttu jotai inkluusiosta mutku siel käytetään myös tosi paljon muitakin tosi isoja sanoja [-] jotka on fuksille ihan hepreaa niin sitte tavallaan tommoset jää. et kun niitä ei konkretisoida mitenkään [-] ku se on vaan sellasta niinku tosi sellasta niinku tiukkaa teoriaa eikä sillei oo mitää sellasta konkretiapohjaa (N6-A, 12, 13)

The situation was considered to be even more difficult because the pedagogical studies begun with a theoretical approach to education in general and the students found it difficult to connect that theory into practice. Later in the pedagogical studies the discussion about inclusion had seemed to be theoretical as well. In addition, there was a feeling of there being two sides to the discussion: researchers who blamed teachers for being lazy if they did not want to teach an inclusive classroom; and teachers who were

worried about the practical issues of inclusion. This point was discussed in extract (156):

(156) Ja se se sen niinku se ongelma on tuntunu tullu aika paljon esille. inklusio noissa keskusteluissa mitä ainaki aineenopet- niinku opettajan aineopinnoissa käytiin oli se. niinkun tää koko keskustelu on opettajat vastaan tutkijat. [-] Et siinä on yllättävän paljon vastakkainasettelua ja vähän semmosta niinku pahaa vertakin siinä niitten välillä ainakin joitain kommentteja mitä oon lukenu [-] Opettaja-lehestä artikkeleja ja muuta niin siinä on aika soimaava ote opettajia kohtaan (M3-B, 12, 24)

The point made above was emphasized by the fact that many participants who had completed their pedagogical studies felt that they had **not had a possibility to freely discuss** inclusion in lectures, as expressed in extract (157):

(157) Mut ite mä oon sitä mieltä siitä ei ehkä saanu käydä vapaata keskustelua [-] mikä on musta niinku ollu. Sääli ja ristiriitasta koska se että jos on näin vahva kanta niin pitää myös pystyä myös sitte sitä. Pystyy myös ottaa kritiikkiä vastaan ja sit sitä että [-] siitä ois enemmän avointa ja vapaata keskustelua et se on ehkä vähän lyöty sitten luu kurkkuun et asiahan on näin ja [-] piste. (N2-B, 17, 21)

The participant believed that if there was a strong opinion that inclusion is what we should strive for, the lecturers should have been able to handle the criticism and defend themselves. Inclusion, according to the participants, had been made rather distant and had seemed to have **little connection to reality**. This had seemed to contradict the idea of them having inclusive classrooms ahead of them in the future, as illustrated in extract (158):

(158) Tehdään hirveen etäiseksi se niin mun mielest se on hirveen ristiriitasta sen kans sit kuitenkin mihin meitä kannustetaan [-] Et mitä pitäis, millaisia valmiuksia pitäis olla sit työelämässä (N2-B, 20, 35)

Inclusion was also seen to be taught in two rather different ways, and there seemed to be **a gap between theory and practice**. The university lectures dealt with theoretical and ethical issues that had little to do with the actual work, as discussed in extracts (159):

(159) mutta niinkun tavallaan se. se semmonen teoreettinen tai niinkun se idea mitä on yliopistolla annettu niin se eroo minusta aika paljon siit- siitä todellisuudesta mitä on nähny [-] ja kuullu muilta opettajilta [-] eli opettajien ja sitten niinkun tutkijoiden mielipide tästä asiasta ((naurahdus)) poikkeaa aika aika paljon [-] että sen varmaan sitten näkee ite työmaailmassa että mitenkä. se lähtee etenemään (M3-B, 4, 27)

The teacher training school (Norssi) gave the only **real examples** of how inclusion could be put into practice. The instructors taught differentiation by showing the trainees how to plan lessons or design extra teaching for students who had learning difficulties, as described in extracts (160) and (161):

(160) sitten siinä varsinaisessa harjottelussa niinkun hypättiin siihen tilanteeseen et okei, sulla on tässä ryhmässä sulla on kolme lukivaikeuksista jotka ei oikein puhu suomeeseen äidinkielenä ja [-]sä teet yhteistyötä tän. erityisopettajan kanssa nyt tämän kanssa ja sitten suunnittelette tunnit näille (M3-B, 10, 11)

(161) harjotteluohjaajat niin ne niinku tavallaan pysty sitte. vähän neuvo sen oman kokemuksensa pohjalta just semmosia kikkoja että [-]et miten hyödyntää sitä samaa materiaalia jotenkin silleen että. että joku tekee sitä vaan eri tasolla ku toinen (N1-B, 12, 10)

Summary: The findings from the first part dealing with teacher education and inclusion showed that inclusion had not seemed to be a central part of the participants' pedagogical studies. There had been only few lectures or small group meetings where inclusion had been discussed (Group A: 2/Group B: 2). When there had been lectures about inclusion, the focus had been on the philosophy of inclusion (Group A: 0/Group B: 1), disabilities (Group A: 0/Group B: 1) or differentiation (Group A: 1/Group B: 1). Many participants remembered having listened to very provocative lectures about inclusion, and recalled having heard idealistic views about inclusion (Group A: 1/Group B: 2). There seemed to be no room for critical conversation (Group A: 0/Group B: 1) or a real connection to the reality (Group A: 0/Group B: 1) when inclusion was discussed. There was also seen to be a gap between theory and practice (Group A: 1/Group B: 1) and the only real examples of inclusive practices were received from the teacher training school (Group A: 0/Group B: 2).

6.4.2 Sufficiency of education on teaching students with special needs

The second part of the theme focused on discussing whether the participants believed they had received enough information about teaching students with special needs in an inclusive classroom. There were three separate subcategories that were found in the data: **insufficient experiences from teacher training, inclusion remains unclear and no necessary means provided.**

The pedagogical studies for teachers had **not offered enough practical experiences** of teaching students with special needs. Some teacher trainees had only taught classes where all students could be described as normal, as discussed in extract (162):

(162) Koska ei ei tuolla ha- opeharjottelussakaan oikeestaan tullu semmosia tilanteita mä just mietin että ei siellä ne kaikki ryhmät mitä mä opetin niin. Ne oli aika aika se oppilasaines oli aika semmosta tasasta [-] Et ei mulla sattunu yhtään semmosta vaik- ns vaikempaa tai erityisoppilasta (N4-B, 3, 6)

Even in a situation where there had been a student with special needs in the classroom who had been assisted by a special education teacher, the teacher trainee did not feel like he would have received practical training about inclusion. The instructor had told the teacher trainee only that the special education teacher comes in to help occasionally, instead of talking actually about inclusion and explaining how it was done. An example of such situation is described in extract (163):

(163) Ja sit siinäkin tilanteessa että oli tää harjottelu ja siel oli niitä muutama semmonen oppilas joilla oli vähän. Kävivät erityisopettaja pakeilla tiety- tiettyjen aineiden kanssa. [-] Niin ei siitä että he välillä oli siellä ja sitten suurimman osan ajast kuitenkin suurimman luo- suri- öö sen luokan kanssa, niin ei siit puhuttu millään inklusion nimellä vaan se oli sillettii vaan et joo, he on välillä siellä ja välillä he tulee tänne ja blaa blaa (M8-A, 9, 33)

The insufficiency of knowledge of inclusion was seen as having various different ideas about what inclusion could mean, but the exact definition had **remained unclear**, as illustrated in extract (164):

(164) ja niinkö tavallaan et jos miettii et mullakin on tosi monta just käsitystä siitä tavallaan [-] niinku se et mitä se on niinku laidasta laitaan niin niin. et kuka sen sitten määrittelee ja miten sen määrittelee että millanen luokka [-] on. tai niinku että tavallaan että onhan nykyäänkin luokat jo tosi monimuotisia. (N1-B, 12, 31)

A feeling of not being prepared to work in an inclusive classroom was expressed. The teacher trainees were lacking practical tools and knowledge about teaching students with special needs, as discussed in extract (165):

(165) Ei. Se ((naurahtaa)) on ihan selvä. Vai. No emmä tiedä viittinkö mä sanoo niin vaikka nimeltämainitsemattomat henkilöt ovat sitä mieltä että. Että tän meidän koulutuksen pitäis kattaa ja pitäisi antaa meille valmiudet toimia oppilaan kuin oppilaan kanssa [-] niin kyllä mä sanon jos mä joutusin luokkaan opettaan missä on vaikka vakavasti autistinen oppilas, niin joutusin oikeesti ottamaan vähän etukäteen selvää tietoa et miten mä häntä on parasta lähestyä (N2-B, 18, 11)

Even though some education professionals would claim that the pedagogical studies for teachers give all their teacher students the necessary means and abilities to work with all kinds of students, the teacher students themselves did not think alike. They believed they **would have to study much more** in order to know how to teach students with special needs.

Summary: The subject teacher students did not feel that they had received enough education, and above all, practical examples on how to teach an inclusive class (Group A: 2/Group B: 1). The signs of insufficient knowledge could be seen as, for example, having an unclear concept of inclusion in general (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). The

pedagogical studies for teachers were not seen to offer the necessary means or advice on how to teach students with special needs (Group A: 0/Group B: 1)

6.4.3 Ideas for improvement

In the third part of the theme concerning teacher education the participants were asked to share their ideas on how teacher education could better meet the goal of preparing teachers for inclusion. First the idea was to gather ideas for improvement only from group B, but as it turned out, group A had similar suggestions to offer, which is why their answers are included in this section. These ideas were divided into seven subcategories: **need for concrete examples, need for more special education, responsibility of the teacher training school, more training in regular schools, more practical training, co-operation with special education, and useful theory base**

In order to improve teaching about inclusion there should be **more concrete examples** that would illustrate the vague concept of inclusion, as described in extracts (166) and (167):

(166) Koska kirjoistahan voit nimenomaan lukea niitä että mistä nyt tunnistat jonkun mut se että kuinka sit lähestyä ja auttaa parhaalla mahdollisella tavalla niin. Eihän niihin varmaan mitään oikeita vastauksia välttämättä edes ole mut edes jotain konkreettista niin [-] jäin kaipaamaan (N2-B, 18, 31)

(167) Se pitäis sitoo paremmin siihen todelliseen maailmaan. Se on ehkä se sen ongelma. (M3-B, 10, 22)

It was claimed to be easy to read about how to recognize symptoms of a certain learning difficulty or how to help students struggling with their studies than to actually practice it in reality. Even though no right answers would be available the teacher trainees were longing for practical examples from people who had taught inclusive classes. Teacher training was thought to lack this connection to the real world. Although the theoretical approach and the amount of theory were criticized, many participants shared a view that **special pedagogy** should be included in the pedagogical studies for teachers. This point is discussed in extracts (168) and (169):

(168) Lisäisin. Mä näkisin että se ois sellasta mikä kuuluu, kuuluu kaikille ei tietenkään tietenkin missä määrin mutta ees joku semmonen perehdytys mitä, mitä niinkun erityispedagogiikassakin opetetaan [-] ja opiskellaan. Että itekin koen en oo niitä suorittanu niin tavallaan jotka on käyny sen niin saa sitä aika valtavan hyödyn siinä siinä niinku luokkahuoneessa toimimiseen niin näkisin että se ois tosi hyödyllinen asia (M3-B, 11, 7)

(169) Mun mielest sinne pitäis sinne pitäs lisätä ihan selkeesti jotain erityispedagogiikkaa [-] Ei tietenkään nyt välttämättä samalla tavalla ku ne jotka opiskelee nimenomaan erityispedagogiikkaa. mut niin et ei vaan sanota että on erilaisia ja on myös näitä

erityistarpeisia oppijoita[-] Et semmosta mä nimenomaan kaipaisin käytännön ohjeistusta (N5-A, 11, 10)

Having special pedagogy as a part of the pedagogical studies would not have to mean studying it as much as those who have it as a minor subject, but some sort of introduction to special education was considered useful. The participants wanted a concrete approach to the studies in special pedagogy as well. The **teacher training school** (Norssi) could take more responsibility of teaching teacher students about inclusion, as expressed in extract (170):

(170) mä toivosin että Norssin puolella ehkä otettais enemmän vastuuta siitä toiminnasta [-] koska ylipäänsäkin opettajankoulutuksen aikana mää näin että se Norssin puolen koulutus oli paljon hyödyllisempää sellasta niinkun. no semmosta jolla oli oikeesti niinkun vaikutusta siihen miten siinä harjoittelussa toimi [-] verrattuna sitten näihin niinku. luento osi- osioihin. Että sitä mä siirtäsin sitä painopistettä ehkä enemmän sinne. sinne puolelle. (M3-B, 10, 26)

The training in the teacher training school was seen to be the most useful part of the whole pedagogical studies, which is why this suggestion was made. Also **more training outside the teacher training school** were suggested, as in extract (171):

(171) niin niin kyllä laittasin ja laittasin vielä enemmän niinku semmosta jotain. pois tuolta harjoittelukoulusta jonneki kentälle ja jotain niinku oikeeta kokemuksia [-]niinku sen sijaan että sä käyt luennolla ja sit sä kirjotat jonku raportin [-]ja siinä pohdit kuinka hyvä juttu tää on vai ei, [-] ilman että sulla on periaatteessa konkreettisia kokemuksia aiheesta (N1-B, 13, 23)

The teacher training school was considered to be different (as in “too good”) from other schools, which is why teacher students should visit real schools and observe real life situations outside their own training school. Going to lectures and listening about inclusion, and afterwards writing reports about it without having any personal experience of inclusive classrooms were seen as a waste of time.

On top of that, **more practical examples** about how to deal with students with special needs in general, information about different disabilities and diagnoses and discussion about the current situation in schools were listed as ideas for improvement, as discussed in extract (172):

(172) Hmm ois kiva jos siellä keskityttäis just koska niinku miusta tuntuu et niinku oppimisvaikeudet. ja niinku et niitä diagnosoiiaan koko ajan vaan enemmän ja sit just kaikkee tällasta niinku ADHD:ta ja tai ADD:ta mitä näit nyt on niin diagnosoidaan nyt enemmän lapsille [-] Niin sitte ja lukihäiriöitä ja sellasii niin sitte ois kiva jos niihin keskityttäis vähän silleen että mite se käytännössä toimii miten just sellasta että mitä se arki on jossain yläasteella tai niinku peruskoulussa et mikä on vaik esimerkiks Suomessa joku yleisin malli et miten niitä et onks se inkluusio se malli vai onks se joku muu että. (N6-A, 14, 21)

A very practical suggestion for improvement was also expressed: it would be good to have **training lessons together with special education teachers** or students of special pedagogy, so that the idea of inclusive practices and co-teaching would become more concrete, as illustrated in extracts (173) and (174):

(173) Oisko huono sisällyttää vaikka yks harjoitussykli erityisopettajan kanssa [-] Tai jotain vastaavaa. Niin sii- sellasia että sitäkin tuua niinku. minusta se harjottelu kuitenkin on se olennaisin osa. OKL:n opintoja (M3-B, 11, 30)

(174) että mustakin ois hyvä jos vaikka jossakin opetusharjottelussakin mikä tehdään niin voitais tehdä jotenkin oikeesti yhdessä erkan kanssa (N2-B, 20, 28)

It would be also educational to send each future subject teacher to observe small groups or special education classes for a few hours to actually witness what it is to work with students with special needs, as described by a participant in extract (175):

(175) ehkä tuo harjotteluvuoden aikana siis se oli tosi tosi antosa ja opettavaa mutta se mitä mä oisin. tai mitä vois ehkä olla siinä niin ois se että kaikkien ois pakko käyä vaikka jossain pienryhmässä tai että kaikki näkis minkälaista on olla semmosten tosi vaikeitten erityisoppilaitten kanssa. Et semmonen niinku saatto monelta jäädä ihan kokonaan. puuttumaan sieltä [-] Et ei, ei niinku välttämättä oo kokemusta sitte siitä mitä se luultavasti tulee olemaan sitte työelämässä (N4-B, 11, 30)

This was seen almost necessary especially in case training lessons had not offered the experience of dealing with students with special needs. Additional education could be necessary in order to gain a **theory base** on special pedagogy, but a point about having to educate oneself later in working life was also mentioned, as in extract (176):

(176) ehkä sitä ois voinu olla vähän enemmän. mut mä luulen että kuitenkin pakko niihin asioihin on palata siellä työelämässä kun kohtaa niitä tilanteita [-] Että et totta kai ois hyvä jos ois sellanen teoria taito. tietopohja jo valmiiks mut että niitä asioita joutus kuitenkin niinku käymään läpi vielä ja opiskelemaan itsenäisesti että en tiä sitten onko se nyt hirveesti haitannukaan että meillä ei oo niin paljon sitä ollu (N4-B, 11, 6)

Summary: The participants had quite a few ideas on how to improve their pedagogical studies so that they could claim having received enough information about inclusion in theory and practice. The participants would have wanted to have more concrete examples to support the concept of inclusion (Group A: 1/Group B: 3). More lectures and practical education about special pedagogy would be necessary (Group A: 1/Group B: 3) and the teacher training school could take more responsibility of teaching about inclusion (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). All teacher students should get more teaching experience in regular schools (Group A: 0/Group B: 1) and receive more practical guidance and information about inclusion and everything related to it (Group A: 2/Group B: 0). A practical suggestion of working together with special education

teachers or students of special pedagogy during teacher training was offered (Group A: 0/Group B: 3). Finally, a theory base about special pedagogy was seen to be of use. However, one has to study independently later in working life anyway, so adding special pedagogy to the pedagogical studies for teachers might not be necessary after all (Group A: 0/Group B: 1).

6.4.4 Expectations (group A only)

The fourth part dealt with the expectations the members of group A (those participants still completing their pedagogical studies) had of their pedagogical subject studies, which include the intensive teacher training in the teacher training school. Three separate subcategories were found in the data: **little practical training, special pedagogy, expectations of training lessons.**

The participants seemed to have the idea that their later studies would consist of theoretical reflection but **little practical examples**, as discussed in extracts (177) and (178):

(177) Mä odotan että siitä puhutaan siellä koska se tuntuu olevan tänä päivänä tosi yleinen aihe, [-] Mutta en. en odota että siellä mitään taikatemppeja tulis, [-] Käytännössä. Että. enkä välttämättä odota mitään konkreettistakaan, vaan että ylipäättään tästä aiheesta pidetään yllä ja sitten pohdiskele itse tykönäsi että mitä tekisit tällaisessa tilanteessa (M7-A, 12, 1)

(178) Hmm. No aikasempien kokemusten mukaan. niinku OKL:n jutuista niin mie oletan tosi paljon vielä lisää sellasta teoriahuttua ja tosi vähän mist- mitään konkreettista. [-] Öö koska se tuntuu vaan olevan sen talon tapa että. puhutaan paljon niinku. sellasesta just tavallaan sellasesta ideologisesta ja sellasesta niinku näin pitäisi olla mut [-] sit siellä puhutaan tosi vähän sellasesta niinku konkreettisesta just et miten toimitaan niinku vaikka erityisoppilaitten kanssa tai mitä tehään niinku. tilanteissa (N6-A, 14, 11)

The participants did not expect to see magic tricks (*taikatemppeja* as expressed in the extract (177)) nor anything too concrete because of their earlier experiences of the pedagogical studies for teachers. They expected a lot of talk and discussion about ideological matters but their expectations on the practical side were quite low. Despite this, they hoped to receive some information **about special pedagogy** although the expectations of the amount of it were not high, as expressed in extract (179):

(179) No luulen et sitä sivutaan jossain määrin mutta sitä, se ei kuulu siihen sinänsä koska se on erillinen oppiaine. [-] Mut et niitä teemoja on varmaankin sillain pintapuolisesti ängetty sinne joukkoon koska se on aika luonnollista (M7-A, 12, 12)

It seemed that the only real expectations were with regard to the **teacher training school** if there would happen to be students with special needs during their teacher training, as illustrated in extract (180):

(180) Toivoisin saavani vaikka mitä mutta en odota kyllä mitään muuta kuin ehkä sit käytännön harjoittelusta [-] Jos siellä on on oppilaita, joista mun tarvii tietää jotain tavallaan erityistä [-] Niin et sitä kautta varmaan tulee tutummaksi. Mä en usko että siel ihan hirveesti. tuo tota OKL:n puolelta niin (N5-A, 11, 1)

Summary: One could say that the expectations concerning the pedagogical studies for teachers were not really high. The participants expected to receive practical examples only from the teacher training school. They also hoped to get some training in special pedagogy. The number of participants answering each point was not seen necessary to point out since the findings could not be compared with the other group.

6.4.5 Responses to the statement

As a final part of the interviews, the participants were given a statement to which they were asked to react and give their reasons for the reaction. The statement is presented here in order to facilitate reading through the findings:

“Jokainen opettaja pärjää inklusiivisessa luokkatilanteessa aivan tavallisilla, monipuolisilla opetustekniikoilla, jotka jokainen oppii aivan tavallisessa opettajankoulutuksessa”

“Every teacher is capable of coping in an inclusive classroom with ordinary, versatile teaching techniques that each will learn in the ordinary teacher education”

Seven subcategories could be found in the data: **disrespectful, disagreement about teaching methods, no connection to reality, disagreement because of teachers’ lack of knowledge, qualities of teachers, role of special education teachers and achievable.**

There was no complete agreement with the statement. Firstly, it was found **disrespectful** and thought to mock the whole occupational group of teachers, as illustrated in extract (181):

(181) Se se on. ää niinkun opettajan ammattikuntaa hieman niinkun. mollaava koska tuon viestihän siinä taustalla on että mitä te valitatte. kaikkihan siihen pystyy. -henkinen. että en minä ole samaa mieltä sen asian kanssa kyllä se aina vaatii. niinkun. tai no. (M3-B, 12, 4)

The participant believed there was a message behind the lines which said that “what are you complaining about, everyone can do it” (*mitä te valitatte, kaikkihan siihen pystyy*), and that is why he could not agree with the statement and claimed it to have a disrespectful tone.

Secondly, the part about **versatile teaching methods** was questioned: it was not clear what could be considered versatile teaching methods, as discussed in extracts (182) and (183):

(182) Joo no ensinnäkin mä kyseenalaistan mikä on tavallinen. Siis toi toimintatapa opetustekniikka mikä on tavallinen. Mut just se että. Ei tota oo määritelty mun mielest toi on huono määritelmä ensinnäkin [-] en oo kyllä nyt ihan tän väitteen puolella ((naurahdus)) suoraan sanottuna. (N2-B, 19, 24)

(183) Hmm ((naurahtaa)) No miun mielestä mejän opettajankoulutuksessa ei opeteta monipuolisia. opetustekniikoita [-] Niinku. meillä puhutaan monipuolisista opetustekniikoista mutta se käytännön. että kuinka niitä puhu- tehdään niin se. ainakaan toistaseks ei oo vielä (N6-A, 15, 1)

The definition of versatile teaching methods was also insufficiently explained. They were thought to have been talked about in lectures during the pedagogical studies, but they were not taught to be used in practice.

The statement was also criticized for lacking a **connection to reality**. It was claimed that whoever wrote the statement did not work as a teacher on a daily basis, as expressed by a participant in extract (184):

(184) tuon väitteen on luonut ihminen joka ei. toimi joka päivä opettajana. (M3-B, 12, 4)

The statement was said to be rather a provocative one, too, but not really tied to the situation teachers have to face in schools with their students, as described in extract (185):

(185) Se on provosoiva väite ((naurahtaa)) Öö. se on ylevä väite. Se ei välttämättä oo ihan sidottu siihen todellisuuteen mikä. opettajalla nykyään on ihan normaalienkin oppilaitten kanssa. (M3-B, 12, 1)

Furthermore, the pedagogical studies for teachers, or the ordinary teacher education, were not seen to offer all the means to learn the skills that teachers would need later in working life, as discussed in extracts (186) and (187):

(186) No ei se ihan pidä paikkaansa. Ei mä en usko et siellä opettajankoulutuksessa oppii. oppii niitä taitoja ja mitä sitten. mitä sitten oikeessa työelämässä lopulta tarttee. Että se opitaan sitten ehkä enemmänkin sen kokemuksen ja käytännön kautta. [-]saa ehkä

semmosta niinku valmiudet mut että ei kyllä mä uskon et se oppiminen sitten tapahtuu vasta siellä (N4-B, 12, 1)

(187) kyllä tässä koulutuksessa niinku ihan tavallaan jos ajatellaan ihan mitä tahansa ryhmää tai mitä tahansa opettamista. niin toi on niin semmonen pintaraapasu. että sää. niinku opettajan työ on työssä oppimista tai niinku opettamalla oppimista. [-] Jet mun mielestä se koulutus on aika kaukana arjesta. (N1-B, 14, 3)

The pedagogical studies were considered to be just a taste of what the work of teachers involves and that the actual learning would happen later in working life. Teaching was said to be learned through practice, no other way was considered possible. One would have to receive **more information** about the various learning difficulties and disabilities so that inclusion would even make sense, as discussed in extract (188):

(188) Mielestäni tuo ei ole totta. Tuo väittämä. [-] Autismit Aspergerit tämmöset niin niistä vaan oikeesti pitäis saada tietoa, niistä ei mun mielestä tietysti en oo aineopintoja tosiaan käyny vielä[-] Niistä ei hirveesti puhuta. Ja. valitettavasti kaikista oireyhtymistä syndroomista kaikista ja myöskin sit ihan niinku normaalista tämmösistä ylivilk- no no taas normaalista ja epänormaalista mut semmosesta perus ylivilkkaudesta niin kyllä niistä pitäis saada jotain konkreettisia.[-] opetus. tai siis niinku neuvoja et miten opettaja pystyy toimimaan niin et ne saa saman verran siitä opetuksesta irti kuin ne muut. Koska ei inkluusiossa oo mitään järkeä siinä vaiheessa jos siellä ne oppilaat joilla on jotain ihan mitä tahansa erityistarpeita ni jos ne ei pysty seuraamaan sitä samalla tavalla ja ne ei saa siitä ne ei opi siellä. (N5-A, 11, 25)

There were also seen to be **teachers who do not have it in them** to cope with an inclusive class. Teachers were said to be individuals as well and others were believed to have better prerequisites to become inclusive teachers than others. The ordinary teacher education alone could not guarantee that all teacher students would be able to teach an inclusive class after they graduated. This point is discussed in extracts (189) and (190):

(189) Ei pidä paikkaansa. Koska jos on olemassa erilaisia oppijoita niin on olemassa myös erilaisia opettajia. [-] Kaikille ei löydy niitä samoja valmiuksia. (M8-A, 10, 39)

(190) Mutta ei siihen siis se riippuu niin paljon ihmisestäkin et ei kaikista vaan oo siihen [-] Että se niinkun koulutus ei välttämättä takaa sitä että. Koska se on niin paljon just sitä ihmisten kohtaamista erilaisten ihmisten opettamista niin. mä en vaan usko että pelkästään opettajankoulutukseen vaan voi niinkun ihmist- kaikkia siihen valmistaa (M7-A, 12, 31)

The role of the special education teachers was discussed as well. Because there still was a separate (major) subject called special pedagogy, the situation could not be like the statement claimed it was. Having additional education on special pedagogy in the ordinary pedagogical studies for teachers might be unnecessary since the university was already educating people as special educators, as illustrated in extract (191):

(191) No tietysti itseni kohdalla totta kai. mut miks olis erityispedagogiikkaa erikseen. jos toi olisi se tilanne käytännössä. Eli väittämänä. taas sellanen niinkun. uskon että se on tavoitteena noissa aineopinnoissa että sen jälkeen toi olisi se tilanne [-] mutta sitten on

vaikee kuvitella just että kun tääl voi opiskella sitä erityispedagogiikka niin pitkälle niin onks se sit turhaa (M7-A, 12, 23)

Additionally, special education teachers were thought to be needed for their expertise and knowledge of teaching students with special needs, as stated in extract (192):

(192) Kaikki ei ole sitä sitä mieltä että erkaopettajat ja erkaopettajia tarvitaan mä oon sitä mieltä et erityisopettajia tarvitaan koska. He on erikoistunu siihen omaan alaansa ja sitte että. Mun mielestä nimenomaan jos sais niinku. Niinku erityisopettajien ja aineenopettajien kautta luokanopettajien välisen yhteistyön toimimaan niin sillan se niinkun. Se on niinkun se on mulle se ideaali päässä eikä se [-]että yhen opettajan tulee selvitä yksin siitä kaikesta koska. (N2-B, 19, 35)

The ideal situation would be that no teacher had to cope on their own but that inclusion would be achieved in **co-operation** with teachers and special education teachers.

Finally, there was thought to be a possibility for one subject teacher alone to teach an inclusive classroom. However, managing everything without assistance would take away time and resources from the other tasks that are included in teachers' work. The statement could be true in theory, but definitely more challenging than how it was made to sound, as illustrated in extract (193):

(193) Varmasti jokainen pärjäis mutta se vie aika paljon voimavaroja siltä opettajalta [-] /pois/ ehkä siitä yleisestä niinkun toiminnasta koulussa niinku opettajan tehtäviin kuuluu kuitenkin kaikkee muuta /no/ [-] oppilaat niinkun joilla on omia ongelmia jotka ei liity oppimiseen ja sitten on. ryhmäohjaajan, luokanohjaajan. vastuut [-] Kaikki sellanen niinku tulee mukana siihen niin sitten siihen päälle vielä jos itelläs tulee vastuu suunnitella niinkun. kaikkien ne. niin se on. hankalampaa kun mitä tossa väitteessä todetaan (M3-B, 12, 8)

Another point dealt with sufficient knowledge: a teacher could manage in an inclusive classroom if he/she would have also studied special pedagogy and had more training, which the pedagogical studies for teachers do not offer unless one chooses to study special pedagogy as a minor subject. This point is discussed in extract (194):

(194) Öö mie tavallaan sinänsä uskon että opettaja vois pärjätä niinku et sille ei ois tavallaan mitää esteitä ettei pärjäis siinä inklusiivisessa luokkatilanteessa mutta miustmie ehkä uskon siihen että sitten sen opettajan täytyis. olla opiskellu erityispedagogiikkaa ja saanu niinku enemmän koulutusta siihen [-] tai niinku että OKL:n pitäis ehkä sit jos jos halutaan tätä inklusiivista niin sit kyllä ehkä OKL:n pitäis tarjota siihen jotain työkaluja et [-]. Tai siis tarjoo ne jos ottaa erityispedan sivuaineeks. (N6-A, 15, 6)

Summary: The participants' reaction to the statement they were given in the end of their interviews was disagreement. They believed, for instance, that it was disrespectful towards teachers (Group A: 0/Group B: 1). The pedagogical studies for teachers were not seen to offer versatile teaching methods or the phrase 'versatile teaching methods' (*monipuoliset opetustekniikat*) was found too vague (Group A: 1/Group B: 2). The

statement did not seem to have a connection to the real situation in schools (Group A: 0/Group B: 3). The future subject teachers believed that they did not have enough information about different learning difficulties and special pedagogy in general (Group A: 1/Group B: 0) in order to meet the ideal situation of the statement. There was said to be teachers who could not manage in an inclusive classrooms and the pedagogical studies for teachers alone could not guarantee that they would learn to manage (Group A: 2/Group B: 0). The role of the special education teachers was pointed out (Group A: 2/Group B: 1) because they were still believed to be needed for their expertise even if inclusive classroom were to become reality. Finally, some participants believed that the statement could be true but it definitely was not as easy as it was made to sound (Group A: 1/Group B: 1).

Summary of the theme ‘teacher education’

The theme called ‘teacher education’ had five separate sections that were discussed. It sought to find answers on whether the subject teacher students received enough information about teaching students with special needs. The findings of the fourth theme are now summarized and the differences and similarities of the views of the two groups are compared. Section 6.4.4, which dealt with expectations of future studies, was left out of the comparison because only group A could answer the questions concerning it.

Firstly, inclusion had not seemed to be a central part of the participants’ pedagogical studies. They recalled that they had had only few lectures or small group meetings where inclusion had been mentioned. In lectures on inclusion, the focus had been on the theoretical side of the issue: on the philosophy of inclusion or on disabilities, which was not considered a good approach to a multidimensional concept of inclusion. The participants had been taught about differentiation rather than inclusion. Many participants told about provocative lectures on inclusion which had stirred a lot of opposition towards the whole idea of inclusion. There seemed often to be no room for critical conversation, which was found disappointing. The participants thought that a connection to the reality was often missing when inclusion was discussed. A gap between theory and practice was visible and the only real examples of the actual work were gained from the teacher training school.

Secondly, the subject teacher students did not feel that they had received enough training, or practical examples on how to teach an inclusive class. The insufficient knowledge was thought to cause an unclear concept of inclusion in general. The pedagogical studies were not seen to offer the necessary means or advice on how to teach students with special needs.

However, the participants had quite a few ideas how to improve their pedagogical studies so that they could receive the needed information about inclusion in theory and practice. More concrete examples to illustrate the concept of inclusion were needed. More lectures and training about special pedagogy were thought to be needed, and the participants would like to learn special pedagogy in practice, too. The teacher training school could take more responsibility of teaching inclusion because the studies done in Norssi were seen as the most practical and useful studies in the pedagogical studies for teachers. Subject teacher students should also visit regular schools more often in order to see the reality of the school world. Practical guidance and information about inclusion and everything related to that term were also needed. A practical suggestion of working together with special education teachers or students of special pedagogy during teacher training could be a great way of offering teacher students useful practice for their future work. Finally, it was mentioned that a theory base about special pedagogy might be of use. However, one would have to study independently later in working life anyway, so adding special pedagogy to the pedagogical studies for teachers might not be that important after all.

As the last part of the interviews the participants were given a statement to which they were asked to react. None of the participants agreed with the statement completely. The statement was found disrespectful because it suggested that if a teacher is unwilling to teach an inclusive classroom, he/she is lazy or a poor teacher. The phrase 'versatile teaching methods' was questioned because it could mean anything without a proper definition. The pedagogical studies for teachers were not seen to offer the means to use versatile teaching methods in practice. The statement was found rather unrealistic, because the situation in schools was challenging already. Enough information about different learning difficulties and special pedagogy in general were not available in order to meet the idealistic situation claimed by the statement. Also teachers who could not manage in an inclusive classroom because of their personal qualities were mentioned. The pedagogical studies alone were not seen to be able to change the

personal qualities of individual teacher trainees. The role of the special education teachers was also pointed out because they would be needed for their expertise in an inclusive classroom. Finally, it was believed that the statement could be true but definitely not as easy as it was made to sound.

In this last section all the possible differences could be explained by the amount of teaching experience. The pedagogical subject studies contain a lot of practical training which means that the participants in group B had gained a lot more experience in teaching than the participants in group A. This could be seen in the division where members of both groups found the pedagogical studies for teachers rather theoretical but only members of group B thought that teacher training in the teacher training school had offered them useful experiences of differentiation.

Both groups agreed on the insufficiency of education on teaching students with special needs. Their ideas of improvement, however, differed to some extent. Members of group B suggested practical ideas about working together with students of special pedagogy or special education teachers during teacher training, while group A required just more practical approach to teaching students with special needs.

When observing the data concerning reactions to the statement given in the end of the interviews, the differences were once again minor. Group B seemed to be more strongly against the statement and they used their own experiences to support their resistance. Members of group B also found the statement more insulting and out of place.

In the next section (6.5) the similarities and differences in views found in the data between the two groups A and B are taken together and summarized.

6.5 Differences and similarities in views between groups A and B

In the last section of the chapter dealing with the findings of the present study a summary of the comparison between the views of the two groups is made. Group A consisted of those four participants still completing their pedagogical studies for teachers and group B of those four who had already completed them. Since the number

of the participants was limited to a total of eight teacher trainees, only a short overview of the findings is offered.

First, only modest differences were found when observing the data dealing with the **definitions of inclusion**. The members of group A had to guess more often when defining inclusion whereas the members of group B had more confident answers with clarifying examples. Only members of the group B compared inclusion with the track system. Both groups agreed that inclusion meant having one group for all students so that no one would have to be separated from the main group. However, only group A seemed to believe that this meant taking special education classes out of use for good. When discussing inclusion in schools today the answers were similar in both groups. The only exception was that the members of group B thought inclusion could make students with special needs a part of the school community. Both groups shared similar views of how support is given to students with special needs, too. The official tripartite support system regarding special education, which is introduced in the subject studies of the pedagogical studies for teachers, was mentioned only by members of group B. Finally, the discussion about support for teachers caused a minor division between the two groups. All members of group A admitted that they had never heard of such type of a support and were forced to guess whereas only one member in group B did so. Group B focused on the resources and wondered if there was a possibility to get such support. A member in group B was the only one who mentioned teachers receiving help from technology.

Second, when observing the data concerning the **attitudes towards inclusion** surprising amount of similarities were found. Even though it could have seemed that group B thought about inclusion more positively than group A, the case was not entirely straightforward as that. Three members of group A had conflicting views of inclusion, which meant that they had both positive and some doubtful views concerning inclusion. Thus one could claim that both groups had mainly positive attitudes towards inclusion. Both groups were worried about the sufficiency of resources, but only one member of group B speculated inclusion being an excuse for saving money. Both groups had the same worries about the situation of average students, but more members of group B worried about the situation of teachers and their increasing workload. The effects of inclusion, such as ensuring the quality of education, were only mentioned by members of group B. Segregated special education divided the opinions of the groups to some

extent. Group B favored segregated special classes more than members of group A, who had mostly conflicting views about them. Both groups had also members who were against segregation because it was believed to stigmatize the students studying in special education classes and reduce their chances of a stable development. There were no significant differences when observing the participants' own experiences of special education in the past and today, and they were not found to fully explain the attitudes towards inclusion or segregation. The only remarkable division between views was found in the negative experiences in the past: more members of group A had had them. This could be a coincidence so the finding did not seem that relevant. All in all, both groups could be said to have a positive attitude towards inclusion, but group B had more members in favor of segregated special classes.

Third, the part about **advantages and challenges** once again offered only minor possibilities for comparison, but nonetheless some differences were found. There were no great differences in the views of the advantages between the two groups. The members of group B mentioned cost-effectiveness and a member of group A integration of immigrants, but other than that the groups seemed to share the same positive view of inclusion offering a great deal of social advantages. When discussing the work of teachers, group B promoted the idea of co-operation as an advantage, while one member of group A focused on the advantages of multiculturalism. When it came to challenges, group A focused on their beliefs that teaching was already challenging and average students would suffer if students with special needs were included, and thought that inclusion could even cause bullying. Members of group B shared practical concerns such as financial issues and difficulties of designing a suitable learning environment for all students. When discussing the work of teachers, some differences were found although the answers were surprisingly similar: only members of group A were worried about the possible disturbances that would distract teaching. Members of group B pointed out the amount of work creating a good co-operation network would demand. Otherwise, the groups shared common views of the lack of theoretical background knowledge on special pedagogy, difficulties in teaching and differentiation, as well as the challenge of keeping a positive stand towards inclusion. Finally, both groups thought that inclusion was easier for elementary school teachers than for subject teachers.

Finally, the last theme dealt with **teacher education**. In this section all the possible differences could be explained by the amount of teaching experience. The pedagogical subject studies contain a lot of practical training which means that the participants in group B had gained a lot more experience in teaching than the participants in group A. This was evident in the division where members of both groups found the pedagogical studies for teachers rather theoretical but only members of group A thought that teacher training in the teacher training school had offered them useful experiences of differentiation. Both groups believed that their education on teaching students with special needs had not been sufficient, although members of group A were hoping to find out more about special pedagogy later in their pedagogical studies. The ideas of improvement, however, differed to some extent. Members of group B suggested more practical ideas about working together with students of special pedagogy or special education teachers during teacher training, while group A was hoping for a practical approach to teaching students with special needs. When observing the data concerning reactions to the statement given in the end of the interviews, the differences were once again minor. Group B seemed to be more strongly against the statement and they used their own experiences to support their resistance. Members of group B also found the statement more insulting and out of place.

A more thorough overview of the findings in general, and differences and similarities are offered in chapter 7, where the findings are discussed and compared with earlier studies on the matter.

7 DISCUSSION

The present study aimed at finding out how the subject teacher students at the University of Jyväskylä understood and defined inclusion, and what their attitudes towards inclusive education were. The study also attempted to compare the answers of two groups of students, those who were still completing their pedagogical studies for teachers (Group A) and those who had already completed them (Group B). The aim of the present study was to gain a comprehensive understanding of the issue, which is why a total of five research questions were formed. The first research question dealt with the definition of inclusion. The second research question had to do with a more personal view of inclusion as it sought to find out what kinds of attitudes the participants had

towards inclusion. The third research question was interested in the possible advantages and challenges the participants found when discussing inclusion in general, and in the light of their future job as subject teachers. The fourth research question dealt with teacher education, and moreover if the future subject teachers found their education on teaching students with special needs sufficient. The last research question had to do with the possible differences and similarities in views of the two groups. The data of the present study consisted of eight semi-structured theme interviews. The interviewees were subject teacher students who had English as their major subject. As already mentioned, the participants were divided in two groups: four of the participants belonged to group A and were still completing their pedagogical studies for teachers, and the other four to group B who had already completed them.

When comparing the findings of the present study similarities to the previous studies, which mostly dealt with practicing teachers, were found (Moberg 1984; Häkkinen and Vanhatalo 1997; Ollqvist 2001; Kokko 2005; for details see section 3.3). Although teacher students were studied in some of the studies reviewed, none of the studies dealt with subject teacher students alone, not to mention language teacher students (for example, Mäkinen and Vuohenniemi 2001). This chapter discusses the findings reported in chapter 6, in terms of the theoretical background and previous studies on the issue. Some suggestions for the reasons behind the findings are also discussed in this chapter, and finally, some ideas for improvement are offered.

Defining inclusion

The findings concerning the first research question were interesting. The definitions of inclusion on the one hand varied a lot but on the other hand were surprisingly similar. This could be the result of the definitions given by teacher education or of the discussion about inclusion that the students have had with each other; or simply a matter of general knowledge. No distinction between integration and inclusion was made and, furthermore, the participants were often hesitant about the terminology when making a division between average students and students with special needs. Inclusion seemed to be difficult to define without having had personal experiences of inclusive classes. A shared view of the aim of inclusion was having one group for all students and allowing students with special needs to study together with their peers. However, the definitions often dealt with integration rather than inclusion: the literature states that inclusion

means allowing all students to attend a regular school and *altering education to all students whether disabled or not* (Kavale and Forness 2000: 279). In the interviews the focus was mostly on talking about modifying education to those students with some sort of a special need. This could be considered a worrying notion since Ainscow et al. (2006: 15-25) stated that categorization which focuses only on the disabled or pupils with special needs might result in ignoring the ways in which the participation of all students could be improved. For the members of group B inclusion also meant not having special classes in use at all, which could be considered rather a radical view.

Furthermore, another interesting issue follows: when discussing students with special needs, only those students who had some sort of a diagnose or deficiencies were mentioned by the majority of the participants. Multicultural issues and immigrants were mentioned by only two participants, and the same two participants took into consideration students who were exceptionally talented. The literature emphasizes that inclusive education means supporting all students regardless of their differences, and appreciates every student's unique needs and qualities (Naukkarinen 2000: 1-6). For this reason it would be important to make sure that inclusion was not seen just as focusing on disabled students, or students with learning difficulties. A view slightly different from the others was given by a participant who had had experience in working with children with special needs: inclusion was seen to be based on familiarity, which meant that a teacher could help the student with special needs best through forming a warm and trusting relationship with him/her. This view could be considered to be the closest one to the definition given by the researchers of inclusion.

It seemed that inclusion/integration was related to special pedagogy rather than to education in its entirety since the definitions focused on the situation of the students with specific disabilities or learning difficulties. This differs a lot from the definition given by researchers, where inclusive education is seen to question the two separate branches of education: the regular one and the special one (Naukkarinen 2000: 1-6). This could indicate that inclusion was not completely understood by the teacher students and defining it correctly would require studying the matter further. The reason for the misunderstanding is merely based on a conjecture but, as many of the participants themselves stated, the matter had not been not discussed or taught sufficiently or explicitly enough during the pedagogical studies for teachers.

With the introduction of special education students with special needs were seen to become a more visible part of the school community, which was considered a positive matter. This point was not mentioned by any of the members in group A, but then again, they have had less experience in working in schools where they could have had witnessed this change. However, the work of teachers was seen to have become increasingly demanding because of inclusion, which again, was seen as a negative matter. These two sides were visible throughout the interviews and provided a very interesting contradiction to think about; even though inclusion might benefit students, the increasing pressures in a teacher's work could prevent teachers from advocating it.

The support given to students was described rather well even though the majority of the participants had not witnessed inclusion being used in schools. Special support was seen to be given by special education teachers or school assistants, rather than the subject teacher himself/herself. An ordinary teacher was seen to differentiate teaching, modify tasks and teaching methods or design a modified curriculum to a student with special needs. Small group teaching and adjustments to the physical learning environment, such as screens, were seen as the means of support in schools. Many practical and detailed forms of support were thus given. Only two participants in group B mentioned the official tripartite support system (for further details see Amendments to the NCC 2010: 10-23, presented in section 2.3.2). which would include all the means of support listed above. In spite of this, teacher education could be given some credit because the means of differentiation and the tripartite support system are explained thoroughly during the subject studies (see, for example, Curriculum of Teacher Education 2010-2013, presented in section 3.2).

However, the uncertainty about the support for teachers among the participants was rather an alarming notion. Especially the participants in group A, who were still completing their pedagogical studies, seemed to be unaware of this kind of support. The literature mentions resource centers and in service-training where teachers can receive support and information about inclusion when needed (Special Education Strategy 2007: 28). Due to the unawareness of such support the participants of the present study were rather skeptical about receiving any support whatsoever. Hopes were expressed that in service-training would be offered by schools but many participants referred to the lack of resources that many municipalities and towns face these days and for this reason did not believe in a sufficient support system for teachers.

Attitudes towards inclusion

The second research question dealt with attitudes towards inclusion. The findings were somewhat similar to the answers of the teachers that were studied in the previous studies: as an idea inclusion was seen as very good but hardly possible to put into practice (see, for example, Ollqvist 2001, Arnala 2009; for further details see section 3.3). In the present study inclusion was said to have quite many social advantages although the opinions about it were rather conflicting. Especially the concerns seemed to be similar to the previous studies. For example, the lack of resources and knowledge were mentioned in all interviews in the present study, as well as in many previous studies (Moberg 1984; Freire and Cesar 2003; Salomaa 2008; Arnala 2009 etc.; for further details see section 3.3). In the present study even those participants who had not yet had much experience in teaching were worried about similar issues as teachers in the previous studies, such as the situation of average students or the effects of inclusion. Many of the concerns were said to arise from the reportage in the newspapers and journals, which raises a question of whether this type of reportage affects negatively to the attitudes.

All the participants in the present study had attended school when segregated special education was still a common practice in schools (in 1990s, see the history of inclusion for further details from section 2.2 onwards), and as a result they had not had the experience of learning in an inclusive classroom. The whole idea of inclusion may have seemed distant because of the lack of personal experiences of this type of learning and teaching. It would also explain their little knowledge of inclusion and integration in practice. The reason why some participants favored segregation in spite of its possibly stigmatizing effect was that they had concerns over their own abilities to teach an inclusive class. These concerns have been also raised by teachers in the previous studies (Mäkinen and Vuohenniemi 2001; Arnala 2009; for further details see section 3.3). In the present study it was also believed that it might be best for some students to study in smaller groups, since concentration and focusing on the tasks could be challenging for students with difficulties in learning. However, special education classes today were not considered similar to those in the past by none of the participants, although one participant mentioned that there might be more students receiving special support now than before. These days the sources of the difficulties were seen to be closely investigated before making any hurried decisions on transferring a student to special

education class. Some changes in the current schooling system seem to have been taken place even though the participants themselves did not find them too remarkable. According to the NCC (2004: 25-31) the primary aim is to include all students in regular classes to study together with their peers. Moreover, the updated version of the core curriculum certainly states so (Amendments to the NCC: 2010: 6-7). Therefore, one could say that a step towards inclusion has been taken even though the movement has not yet been too visible. The Special Education Strategy (2007: 43, see section 2.3.3 for further details) also points out that the reason for the growing number of students receiving special support lies in the increase in diagnosing and labeling learning difficulties. This naturally does not mean that there would be more students in need of special support in classes than before; nowadays the needs of support are just more carefully recognized.

Advantages and challenges

The third research question had to do with the advantages and challenges that inclusion could bring about, and was by far the most extensive section of the present study. The reasons for regarding inclusion as an advantage in general were that it could be cost-effective, but above all, it was seen to have many social advantages. Inclusion was thought to promote socialization and increase tolerance, prevent discrimination and educate young people to understand difference. These issues were seen extremely important and were emphasized by all participants even though they were hesitant in defining inclusion in the first place. The literature on inclusion states that inclusion is above all a way of thinking about education in the fight against discrimination (Väyrynen 2001: 13; Biklen 2001: 56), which would mean that the participants had an idea of what inclusion was all about. However, not many practical advantages were found when talking about the work of teachers and inclusion. Co-operation with professionals of special education was seen as a good thing and a positive movement towards inclusion. Teachers themselves could learn a great deal when teaching an inclusive class and develop as professionals. This point was mentioned by teachers in a study of Seppälä-Pänkäläinen (2009, for further details see section 2.4.2), too. The teachers saw inclusion as a chance to critically evaluate and change their teaching methods. In the present study multiculturalism was also seen as an advantage: those students with experiences of living in another country and speaking a foreign language could offer the other students an authentic example of a language user, especially if

their mother tongue was English. Researchers agree with the point about multiculturalism, and emphasize that teachers should take advantage of the variety of cultural and linguistic background and include each student in the classroom activities without worrying about possible language barriers (Stoop Verplaetse and Migliacci 2008: 11).

In the present study the challenges seemed to overrun the possible advantages. It was rather interesting to notice that similar claims were made which Saloviita (2012) had compiled in his article. In the article the claims were considered to be the most common comments about inclusion and the findings of the present study seemed to confirm this. It was claimed that Finnish schools were not ready for inclusion because not enough resources were granted for it (Saloviita 2012: 24). The situation in schools was also seen to be already challenging even without including students with special needs. By the lack of resources the interviewees in the present study meant the insufficient number of special education teachers and assistants in schools, large group sizes which prevented teachers from dividing their attention equally with all students, and impractical physical spaces for inclusive learning and teaching. There were also worries about bullying of students with special needs, the situation of the average students in the classroom and the quality of teaching if a teacher could not follow the curriculum in a pace required for reaching the instructed learning goals. Now, similar concerns were mentioned by a number of teachers in the previous studies (Moberg 2001; Salomaa 2008; see section 3.3 for further details). Saloviita (2009b; 2012) has gathered together opposing views regarding bullying and the situation of average students: firstly, bullying has not seen to decrease if a student with special needs was transferred to a special class because, statistically speaking, students in special classes are bullied more than students in regular classes. Secondly, average students have not been seen to suffer in inclusive classes but research has shown that inclusive education has positive effects on all students. Finally, an article in *Opettaja* (Nissilä 2004) stated that elementary school teachers were seen to wear themselves out because they were trying to reach the high standards of education rather than trying to adapt the education suitable for all students. Focusing too much on the quality of teaching could actually be a burden on teachers. Now, interesting in the findings considering challenges of inclusion in general was that most of the claims were expressed by members of group A. This would indicate, that concerns such as bullying and the suffering of the average mass in the classroom were

not seen as challenges by group B, who had already had more experiences of teaching heterogeneous classes.

In contrast to the study by Mäkinen and Vuohenniemi (2001) the teacher students in the present study were mostly concerned by practical issues. In the previous study by Mäkinen and Vuohenniemi novice teachers were concerned about their lack of knowledge and not that much about practical issues, which were considered to be worries of the more experienced teachers. Still for some reason it seemed easier for the participants of the present study to come up with various practical challenges of inclusion, even though none of the teacher students had been teaching for a longer period of time. The reason for this was discussed earlier and the same comments could be added here: the lack of knowledge and experience of inclusion has possibly raised concerns. The previous studies have shown that uncertainty about inclusion increased negative attitudes towards inclusion (Pinola 2008, see section 3.3 for further details). Another study considering teachers' negative attitudes towards inclusion concluded that a pessimistic attitude towards inclusion prevented teachers seeing anything positive in it and affected how they viewed the amount of support and help given to them (Kokko 2009). For this reason it would be important to invest in promoting inclusion in a positive light so that unnecessary worries among inexperienced teachers could be avoided to begin with.

In the present study, the work of novice teachers was seen fairly demanding. There were seen to be many things that had to be learned in the beginning of a teaching career from dividing one's attention equally with each student in the classroom to preparing lessons that would take account of each individual learning style. On top of that it was seen almost impossible to have time to individually guide and teach students with severe learning difficulties and at the same time keep order in the classroom. Moreover, dealing with specific language difficulties when trying to teach a foreign language was seen rather a demanding issue. All in all, inclusion was seen to bring about a lot of extra work. Co-operation among professionals, although mentioned as an advantage earlier was listed as a challenge as well because creating a working network of professionals was seen to take a lot of time and effort. It was even commented by two of the participants that it is rather hard to come up with anything positive when all one could think about was the escalating workload inclusion would produce. This could be considered a novice teacher's problem: when there are so many things than one has to

adapt to when making a shift to working life, inclusion is seen as an extra burden. However, as already mentioned, experienced teachers share similar concerns about the escalating workload (Trade Union of Education 2009, see section 2.4.2). Reasons for this can once again be only guessed, but it could be suggested that inclusion is still rather a new phenomenon in an education system in which changes always take time. This is partly due to teachers and their attitudes, which were claimed to obstruct the progress (Saloviita 2012: 19). For this reason attention should be paid to changing the attitudes through education in a way that future teachers could see inclusion possible.

An interesting notion was made about the tasks a teacher could make students do together in the classroom if there were many students with a modified curriculum included. For example, in language lessons many exercises are done together, such as listening exercises, listening comprehension tests, and reading exercises among all pair and group work activities. It was seen extremely demanding to ensure equal opportunities for participation and a fair grading system for, for example, deaf students who could not possibly attend ordinary listening comprehension tests and other tasks involving normally functioning hearing. These worries were reasonable since this would once again suggest that the interviewees had none or little experience in learning and teaching in an inclusive classroom. Previous research states that inclusion would not, in fact, mean having always that one deaf student in the classroom, since their number of all students is less than 2 per cent (Saloviita 2012: 18-20) In addition, it has been estimated that if each student with special needs was integrated into regular classrooms, there would be one student with special needs per class in average. Two thirds of those students would have only mild learning difficulties, and integrating a student with more severe difficulties would mean acquiring additional support. Furthermore, researchers claim that segregated special classes do not provide any better learning conditions for students with special needs but, on the contrary, regular classes offer more opportunities for academic and social progress (Smith and Ryndak 1997, for further details see section 2.4.1). Not knowing these facts and having these sorts of worries are by no means the fault of the interviewees. It only indicates that the teacher education has not possibly taken into account that even though teacher students are still young, the special education system has changed to some extent from the times when they have attended elementary or secondary school. This is what should be emphasized in the teacher training, and teacher students should be granted much more possibilities to get to see and practice actual teaching in an inclusive classroom. It is possibly the only way to

affect the attitudes teacher students have towards inclusive education. Even the previous studies show that in addition to research findings, practical models are needed so that teachers could really believe in the possibilities of inclusion (Deidre 2009: 17; Arnala 2009, for further details see section 3.3).

The lack of education on special pedagogy was mentioned in several parts of the interviews by nearly all participants, especially when discussing the challenges of inclusion. It was stated that without knowledge of special pedagogy novice teachers would be facing a lot more difficulties in their work than those who had studied special pedagogy during their studies. For this reason a suggestion of adding more education of special pedagogy in the pedagogical studies for teachers was made. The same suggestion has been stated in the Special Education Strategy by the Ministry of Education (2007: 54-64, for further details see section 2.3.2) and in the statements of the Trade Union of Education (2009, see section 2.4.2). Also teachers in the study of Arnala (2009, see section 3.4 for further details) stated that they could have used more special pedagogy in their teacher training so that their knowledge of inclusion would be better. Some researchers, however, believe that studying special pedagogy only increases teacher students' confidence in their own abilities rather than reveals any secrets of special pedagogy (Saloviita 2009c: 359-362). The researcher even stated that it would be too straightforward to claim that additional education on special pedagogy would solve the problem, which in the end deals with a feeling of inadequacy. It has also been shown that no secret or special methods were used in a special school that was observed in a study by Leons et al. (2009, further details in section 3.3). The teaching in the school was versatile, multimodal and multisensory and the tasks were modified according to each individual's needs. It is worth mentioning that teaching in a special school such as the one in the study by Leons et al. involved a lot of one-on-one instruction and tutors, which had a great impact on the learning outcomes of the students. Versatile teaching methods alone were not the key to success but the whole education was structured to meet the various needs of the students.

In general it is thought that integration/inclusion is possible or less challenging with those students who have problems with their speech or reading, or with students who have some sort of a sensory disability (such as deaf children) (Moberg 1984; Häkkinen and Vanhatalo 1997; Ollqvist 2001; Mäkinen and Vuohenniemi 2001, for further details see section 3.3). However, the interviewees in the present study were especially worried

about the students who have these types of difficulties. It was questioned whether it was even necessary to try and learn a foreign language if a student had, for example, a severe dyslexia. Severe language difficulties and learning a foreign language would require quite a lot from the teacher and the student because language learning focuses on four dimensions which all have to do with language per se: reading, writing, listening and speaking. In addition, learning a foreign language was seen as a process which often requires knowledge and understanding of the mother tongue. The worrying aspect was that how a teacher whose mother tongue was Finnish could try to teach a foreign language (in this case English) to a student whose mother tongue was some other language than Finnish. The problem was seen to escalate if the teacher did not know the student's own mother tongue. For this specific problem teacher education had not given answers in the interviewees' opinion, although immigrant students in the Southern Finland were known to be an increasing part of the school population. Teaching about multiculturalism is, in fact, a part of the pedagogical studies for teachers but none of the participants mentioned it when talking about inclusion and studies concerning it in the pedagogical studies for teachers (see section 3.2 for further details). This would once again suggest that the idea of inclusion has not been successfully conveyed by the teacher education, at least in a way that immigrants would be automatically linked to students with special needs.

Compared with a situation of subject teachers, the elementary school teachers were seen to have better chances in succeeding in inclusion. The lack of continuity was seen as a major problem facing subject teachers. It was believed to be almost impossible to keep track of each individual with specific needs when it was hard enough to keep track of the students' names. The previous studies showed that subject teachers have had the most critical attitudes of all teachers that have been studied (Salomaa 2008, further details in section 3.3). The reasons were similar to those concerns the participants in the present study had: subject teachers did not have sufficient knowledge of the general situation of their students with special needs because of a constant turnover of groups. Also the lack of information about possible teaching aids was seen challenging. Only by sufficient education and support, starting from teacher education, can these concerns be removed.

Teacher education

The fourth research question dealt with teacher education. In general the pedagogical studies for teachers were seen to have a diverse range of different theoretical perspectives to teaching. However, quite a lot of criticism about the lack of practical view into matters was given. This is something teacher education should pay attention to. As was said in one interview, one can easily read about learning difficulties in theory but one cannot know which teaching method works best unless one has a chance to try it out or to see it done in practice. The lectures about inclusion were considered perhaps too provocative and idealistic because the themes were difficult to connect into reality. There was seen to be no room for critical conversation in the lectures, which was found disappointing. The gap between theory and practice, which was the most common reason for criticizing the pedagogical studies for teachers, might be reduced by letting teacher students question and test the idea of inclusion themselves during these lectures.

The teacher training school (Norssi) and the training lessons were seen as the most educating experiences the teacher students had had. However, the focus had usually been on normal teaching, normal curriculum and average students. The differentiation was said to have been mentioned in passing just before practice lessons had begun. As a result, the future subject teachers found their education on teaching students with special needs insufficient. The concept of inclusion was unclear and the pedagogical studies had not offered the means to become an inclusive teacher, in the participant's opinion. It was rather alarming that the participants who had not completed their pedagogical studies did not have any expectations of getting practical training in teaching students with special needs. The students had reservations about their future studies before the actual training had even begun, which is probably due to the stories heard from students who had completed their pedagogical studies.

In order to improve teacher education many suggestions were offered. More concrete, practical examples and training, and more education on special pedagogy were mentioned. In addition, more training outside Norssi was seen to be needed. It was mentioned that Norssi might not give a realistic view of the actual difficulties students have today, because a student applying to study there has to have a certain average grade, usually rather a good one. Norssi might thus give too optimistic view of the situation, at least to the interviewees' opinion. Also the fact that all teacher students did

not have a chance to try out co-teaching together with a special education teacher was highly criticized. Co-teaching has been said to be essential for the inclusive teaching to be possible, and in the previous studies this has been emphasized as well (Arnala 2009, see section 3.3 for further details). Therefore, criticism could be given about talking about co-operation in schools in the pedagogical studies for teachers. Co-operation skills must be something teacher education is aiming at because some of the study groups in the pedagogical studies for teachers were mixed so that students studying different subjects learned to work in co-operation in a simulated teachers' recreation room (in Finnish this is called *sekaryhmätyöskentely*). This alone did not seem to be enough. The participants of the present study stated that co-operation in an inclusive school would mean working alongside with a special education teacher, which, however, was not practiced nearly at all during their studies. Some elementary school teacher students have been said to have the opportunity to practice inclusive education by working together with students of special education (Saloviita 2009c: 361; Special Education Strategy 2007: 49). Subject teacher students should be given the same opportunity in order to get practical experience of inclusive education.

Teaching about differentiation of teaching in the pedagogical studies for teachers was mentioned in nearly all interviews. In spite of this thinking about different ways of teaching was seen to require enormous amounts of time when there were students with special needs in the classroom. These statements are rather contradictory and would once again indicate that the idea of inclusion and using differentiation as a part of it had not been fully understood. It was even mentioned that in an inclusive model the teacher is forced to use various teaching techniques, which would naturally then benefit all students, and that one would have to plan lessons to individuals instead of the mass of students. However, these types of statements were mentioned by those interviewees who had not completed their pedagogical studies. The researchers have stated that using versatile teaching techniques will enable teaching students with various skills (Peterson and Hittie 2010: 363; also see the statement in section 5.4.2). Yet, for some reason the participants of the present study refused to agree with the statement given to them in end of the interviews regardless of their knowledge of differentiation. The aim of the statement was to sum up the idea of inclusion once more after the participants had had time to think it through during the interview. Although many positive views of inclusion had been stated the reactions to the statement were disagreeing. The statement was considered provocative because it gave no further explanation to the claim it made. In

addition, the statement was seen as disrespectful towards the whole occupational group of teachers and it was believed that the writer of the statement did not work as a teacher himself/herself. The versatile teaching methods mentioned in the statement were not seen as properly defined and the pedagogical studies were not seen to teach such methods – even though the participants claimed having been taught about differentiation (which means using versatile teaching methods, see the full definition in section 2.3.2). The statement was not considered to have a connection to reality because ordinary teachers do not have sufficient knowledge of special pedagogy. This, as discussed earlier, might not in fact be the answer to succeeding in inclusion (for example, Saloviita 2009c). There was seen to be already such a variety of students that required special attention that students with more severe special needs would be too large of a burden on an ordinary teacher. The claims about the qualities of teachers and the role of special education teachers, however, cannot be claimed to be completely unjustified. Even researchers admit that resources should be transferred from special education classes to regular classes in case inclusion was taken into use (Saloviita 2012: 35). This would then mean that a teacher would not have to cope by himself/herself in a class with several students with special needs. Additionally, it would not mean that special education teachers were no longer needed but quite the opposite. The statement does not clearly mention this point of view which is why it understandably might have evoked such strong feelings against it.

Differences and similarities in views between the two groups

The last research question dealt with the differences and similarities in views between the two groups. One could say that the pedagogical studies for teachers seemed to have given more information on inclusion to group B. This would suggest that the subject studies focused more on inclusion than the basic studies in the pedagogical studies for teachers, and therefore group A understandably had only vague ideas of the concept of inclusion. This did not, however, remove the fact that also members of group B were hesitant in their definition of inclusion and that they did not find their knowledge of inclusion sufficient either. Both groups were considerably worried about the effects of inclusion in general, and in their work as teachers. Group A had slightly more worries than group B which can be explained by the amount of education and training. In spite of these worries, the participants in both groups believed that inclusion could have significant social advantages and were thus in favor of inclusion in theory. In practice,

inclusion was seen as unrealistic and causing several challenges and for that reason some members of group B were in favor of holding on to segregated special education classes. Group B had much more concrete examples to support their arguments for and against inclusion, whereas group A often had to base their arguments on guesswork and hearsay. This, again, could be explained by the amount of education and teaching experience. Finally, group B seemed to be more critical towards their education on inclusion since they had more practical concerns and suggestions on how to improve the situation in the pedagogical studies for teachers.

If inclusion is something our school system is aiming at, teacher education should be the place where the necessary means and practices are learned. If one graduates from the university as a language teacher without knowing what inclusion involves, teacher education has not succeeded in a way the teacher education curriculum states. The uncertainty could be seen in every interview. One could think that after completing the pedagogical studies for teachers which aim at giving future teachers the prerequisites to work in an inclusive classroom, a future teacher would have a confident and positive view of the matter. This, however, was not the case in the present study. The participants had many suggestions for how teacher education could be improved so that they could better claim to have all the means to work as inclusive teachers. Those participants who had already completed their pedagogical studies hoped that they would have had a chance to observe special education classes and even train in co-operation with special education teachers or students of special education. The suggestion was very good since inclusion is thought to happen in co-operation with education professionals. If a future subject teacher was given the chance to work together with a special education teacher in an inclusive classroom during the pedagogical studies it would work as a good, practical example of inclusion.

To conclude the discussion, the present study aimed at finding out the views of inclusion and attitudes language teacher students studying at the University of Jyväskylä have towards inclusion. Inclusion in the teacher students' opinion was a vague concept which was hard to define and understand in its entirety. The definitions provided gave the impression that inclusion had been talked about during their studies but perhaps not fully comprehended. The attitudes towards inclusion were controversial and many more challenges of inclusion were found than advantages, which indicated the uncertainty and lack of sufficient knowledge of inclusion. In the light of the theoretical background and

the previous studies, as well as the present study, it might not be incorrect to claim that the discourse of inclusion in Finland is still researchers versus teachers. This could be seen in the attitudes the teacher students in the present study had and in the comments they made about the impossibility of inclusion in reality. The next task could be to remove the gap between theory and practice and find ways to make inclusion reality.

8 CONCLUSION

The final chapter of the present study focuses on assessing the findings in terms of reliability and validity. The data collection method and data analysis are both taken into close observation and critically evaluated. The strengths and limitations of the present study are discussed, and finally suggestions for further study are briefly outlined.

The data collection methods in qualitative research are said to resemble everyday interaction, and therefore their objectivity could be questioned (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 125). There is a possibility for a variety of misinterpretations since interviews are always culturally bounded, context and situation bounded and the participants often have a tendency to produce socially favorable answers (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 206-207). In addition, it could be claimed that all information is subjective considering the fact that the frames of the study are built according to a researcher's own understanding of the phenomena which is being studied (Tuomi ja Sarajärvi 2009 :20-21; 134-135). This is why is it important to explain the methods of data collection and analysis carefully in order to gain reliability.

The limitations of the data collection methods were taken into consideration before the interviews took place. The specific data collection method in the form of a theme interview and selection of the interviewees were a conscious choice and seem to offer the kind of data that was needed for the present study. Furthermore, a theme interview is seen as a suitable data collection method if the researcher is using content analysis as the method of analysis, because the themes have been created beforehand before the actual data collection (Tuomi ja Sarajärvi 2009: 93). The theme interview schedule was carefully planned and structured. The piloting interview offered a chance to critically evaluate the choices of words and revise the structure of the interview so that the problem of possible misunderstandings could be avoided in the actual interviews. In

addition, with the feedback from several people it was possible to refine the interview so that the questions did not lead the participants towards expected outcomes. The aim of the interviews was to let the participants speak freely about the topics instead of leading them towards some desirable answers. Casual conversation before and during the interviews was seen as a crucial part in creating the trust between the participant and the interviewee (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 90). Trust is much needed in this type of interviews.

Reliability in data analysis can be improved by defining and describing the research process in detail (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 141-142). To avoid subjectivity the interviews were recorded and transcribed with care soon after the interviews had taken place. Furthermore, the recordings were listened through several times in order to capture all the necessary information the interviews had to offer. It is important that the researcher goes through the material several times in order to see it as an entity rather than as individual thoughts (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008:143). The researcher had also made notes during the interviews that facilitated recalling even the non-verbal nuances of the interviews.

Analyzing interviews in a qualitative study is seen to lack objectivity, which is why it is important to explain the stages of the analysis in detail as well (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 20-22). The researcher is often seen to use his/her own intuition to interpret the meanings in the data and may even do this subconsciously. As already mentioned, the researchers' own experiences and knowledge could lead the interviews into a certain direction. For this same reason particular issues could be searched in the data. However, in the present study a theory-driven method of content analysis was chosen in the first place, which means that the analysis of the data was tied to a certain theoretical background and certain preconceptions. Additionally, the theme interviews were built to follow a certain structure. As a result the interviewees were led into a certain direction to some extent. All this was a result of a conscious and careful consideration because discussing the topic without a certain structure could have been too challenging for the participants. The participants were not, however, aware of the theoretical background of the present study nor the findings of the previous studies regarding teachers' attitudes towards inclusion, which could have easily led them towards similar conclusions. Furthermore, having a certain structure for the analysis in the form of a theme interview before the interviews took place ensured that the interviews could offer the kind of data

that was needed to answer the research questions of the present study. This also limited the possibility of receiving unnecessary data that could not fit into the frames of the present study, which naturally saved time and resources.

The present study attempted at providing an extensive and detailed description of the stages in the data collection and analysis. Authentic extracts from the original data were included in the findings because they were seen to increase the validity of the present study (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009: 232-233). The selection of the extracts was made with careful consideration and the most representative extracts illustrating each particular category were chosen. Furthermore, various findings had more than one extract to illustrate the topic in question. Appendix 3 illustrates the process of the analysis, and Appendix 4 the rough translations of the extracts. Translations were made to represent the answers in the original transcript as well as possible. Furthermore, the extracts in Appendix 3 were different (whenever possible) from the extracts in chapter 5 in order to provide even further examples. The detailed description of the particular choices was made to give the reader a possibility to assess the reliability and validity of the present study.

There were only eight participants in the study. Even though they could be divided in two different groups, the size of the group as a whole ruled out the possibility to generalize the findings and thus could have decreased its validity. Nonetheless, the findings of the present study gave some insights of the situation and provided interesting issues to consider. The group size had to be limited because of the limitations in time and resources. Also, as there was no intention on generalizing the findings of the present study in the first place, eight participants were seen to be enough to provide an understanding of the phenomena that was studied. The data provided by theme interviews enabled the researcher to explore the topic thoroughly even with a limited number of participants. This would not have been the case if the researcher would have used questionnaires as the method of data collection. The reason why the data of the present study provided such surprising and interesting findings was that the theme interviews offered the participants a chance to really reflect their thoughts on the topic from several perspectives.

Naturally, there are other limitations to the present study than merely methodological ones. The extent of the topic caused certain difficulties. Inclusion, being a multidimensional issue, was not the easiest topic to study and it took time to narrow

down the focus so that it would fit in the purposes of this type of study. In order to meet the challenge of providing a comprehensive understanding of the matter, a total of five research questions were formed. Choosing the theory-based content analysis also meant that the theoretical background and findings from the previous studies had to be investigated and summarized before the data collection for the present study could begin. For these particular reasons the process of the work took more time than originally scheduled.

The present study succeeded in providing answers to the research questions set for it and gave an idea of how future English teachers define and understand inclusion. The findings of the present study could contribute to making teacher students understand the concept of inclusion better, and reflect on their own attitudes towards inclusive education. The study also provided a few practical suggestions, which could improve teacher education, and could thus be used as a means for justified feedback. Although the present study answered the questions that were set, it also raised many more. It would be interesting to repeat the present study from a different point of view and begin by asking what the reasons for certain attitudes towards inclusion are. It might be interesting to see whether newspapers and other media have an effect on the attitudes, or if the teacher education affects them. The roots for such attitudes could be located somewhere else as well, for example, in the past experiences of special education. In addition to finding out the possible origins of the attitudes it would be of interest to see how the existing attitudes could be changed so that developing inclusive schools in Finland would succeed better. Naturally, in order to generalize the findings a large-scale study with many participants studying different subjects would be needed to find out if the attitudes really are similar to what the present study states. On top of that it would be of great interest to compare the views of students studying in different universities in Finland and find out whether there are significant differences in the views and attitudes of students studying in different parts of Finland. Finally, it would be interesting to interview the participants of the present study after they graduated and begin working as teachers and see if their attitudes would change after gaining more work experience and perspective of the work of teachers.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M., Booth, T. and Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Arnala, M. (2009). ”Välttämätön mukava paha”. *The collaboration between English teachers and special education teachers in secondary schools*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.
- Autismi- ja Aspergerliitto ry: Aspergerin oireyhtymä.
http://www.autismiliitto.fi/autismin_kirjo/aspergerin_oireyhtyma.%20. (9 February, 2013)
- Biklen, D. (2001). Inklusion sosiaalisia konstruktioita: käytännössä oppimassa. In P. Murto, A. Naukkarinen and T. Saloviita (eds.), *Inklusion haaste koululle*. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 55–81.
- Blackhawkings, K., Florian, L. and Rouse, M. (2007). *Achievement and inclusion in schools*. London: Routledge.
- Celia, Kuntoutussäätiö and Speres: Lukihäiriön määritelmä.
www.lukihairio.fi/fi/lukihairio. (9 February, 2013)
- Deidre, M. (2009). *Language disabilities in cultural and linguistic diversity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dufva, H. (2011). Ei kysyvä tieltä eksy: kuinka tutkia kielten oppimista ja opettamista haastattelun avulla. In P. Kalaja, R. Alanen and H. Dufva (eds.), *Kieltä tutkimassa*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 131–145.
- Erityisopetuksen strategia 2007*. Ministry of Education [online].
<http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2007/liitteet/tr47.pdf?lang=fi>. (12 November, 2012)
- Falvey, M., Givner, C. and Kimm, C. (1997). What do I do Monday morning? In S. Stainback and W. Stainback (eds.), *Inclusion: a guide for educators*. Baltimore: Brookes, 117–138.
- Freire, S. and Cesar, M. (2003). Inclusive ideals/inclusive practices: how far is a dream from reality? Five comparative case studies. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* [online] 18(3), 341–354.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0885625032000120224>.
- Hirsjärvi, S. and Hurme, H. (2008). *Tutkimushaastattelu*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. and Sajavaara, P. (2009). *Tutki ja kirjoita*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Häkkinen, K. and Vanhatalo, S. (1997). *Opettajat integraation edessä: peruskoulun opettajien suhtautuminen poikkeavien oppilaiden sijoittamiseen yleisiin opetusryhmiin*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Special Education. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ju-1997780667>.

- Kavale, K. and Forness, S. 2000. History, rhetoric and reality: analysis of the inclusion debate. *Remedial and Special Education* [online] 21(5), 279–296.
<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&hid=126&sid=b7d0d309-c6d0-422d-9068-4ae9ef557b2e%40sessionmgr111>.
- Kokko, T. (2005). *Jyväskyläläisten opettajien suhtautuminen kaikille yhteiseen kouluun*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Special Education.
- Leons, E., Herbert, C. and Gobbo, K. 2009. Students with learning disabilities and AD/HD in the foreign language classroom: supporting students and instructors. *Foreign Language Annals* [online] 42(1), 42–54.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01007.x/pdf>.
- Metsämuuronen, J. (2006). *Tutkimuksen tekemisen perusteet ihmistieteissä* (2nd edition). Helsinki: International Methelp.
- Moberg, S. (1984). *Poikkeavia lapsiako normaaliopetukseen. Peruskoulun ja lukion opettajien suhtautuminen poikkeavien oppilaiden sijoittamiseen yleisiin opetusryhmiin*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education 17. University of Jyväskylä.
- Moberg, S. (2001). Opettajien näkemykset inklusiivisesta opetuksesta. In P. Murto, A. Naukkarinen and T. Saloviita (eds.), *Inklusion haaste koululle*. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 82–95.
- Moberg, S., Hautamäki, H., Kivirauma, J., Lahtinen, U., Savolainen, H. and Vehmas, S. (2009). *Erityispedagogiikan perusteet*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Mäkinen, O. and Vuohimäki, S. (2001). *Onnistuuko integraatio. Erityisopetuksen integraatio opettajien ja opettajaksi opiskelevien silmin*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Special Education.
<http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:juu-2001860210>.
- Naukkarinen, A. (2000). Inklusioidiskurssit. Paper presented at the TUHTI conference, Tampere, 27–28 April, 2000.
- Naukkarinen, A. and Ladonlahti, T. (2001). Sitoutuminen, joustavat resurssit ja yhteistyö – välineitä kaikille yhteiseen kouluun. In P. Murto, A. Naukkarinen and T. Saloviita (eds.), *Inklusion haaste koululle*. Jyväskylä: PS-Kustannus, 96–124.
- Niemenmaa, H. and Niemenmaa, J. (2006) *Opettaja- ja erityisopettajaopiskelijoiden sekä luokanopettajien ja erityisopettajien asenteet poikkeaviin ihmisryhmiin*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä. Department of Education.
https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7996/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-200661.pdf?sequence=1.
- Nijakowska, J. (2010). *Dyslexia in the foreign language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Nissilä, M-L. (2004). Erityisopetus uuvuttaa luokanopettajia. *Opettaja* 42, 20–21.
- Nordlund, J. (2005). Inklusio on täällä. *Opettaja* 7, p. 7.

OAJ: Erityisopetuksen yhdistäminen epäonnistunut – kuntia syytetään säästökikkailusta. *Turun Sanomat* [online] 24 April, 2012.
<http://www.ts.fi/uutiset/kotimaa/337827/OAJ+Erityisopetuksen+yhdistaminen+epaonnistunut++kuntia+syytetaan+saastokikkailusta>. (12 November, 2012)

OAJ:n lausunto luonnokseen hallituksen esitykseen eduskunnalle laiksi perusopetuksen muuttamisesta 2009. Trade Union of Education in Finland [online].
http://www.oaj.fi/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/OAJ_INTERNET/01FI/05TIEDOTTEET/02LAUSUNNOT/LAUSUNTOPERUSOP.PDF. (24 September, 2012)

Ollqvist, P. (2001) *Integraatio ja opettajat. Peruskoulun opettajien käsityksiä erityisoppilaiden sijoittumisesta yleisopetukseen*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education.
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/10623/paivioll.pdf?sequence=1>.

Opettajankoulutuslaitoksen opetussuunnitelma 2010-2013. Department of Teacher Education [online]. <https://www.jyu.fi/edu/opiskelu/opinto-opas/opettajankoulutuslaitos-ops-2010-13>. (9 October, 2012)

Opettajan työ Suomessa 2010. Trade Union of Education in Finland [online].
http://www.oaj.fi/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/OAJ_INTERNET/01FI/05TIEDOTTEET/03JULKAISUT/OAJ_OPETTKOULUTUS_10_WEB.PDF. (12 November, 2012)

Perusopetuslaki 628/1998. Finland's Ministry of Justice [online].
<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1998/19980628>. (24 September, 2012)

Perusopetuslaki 642/2010. Finland's Ministry of Justice [online].
<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2010/20100642>. (24 September, 2012)

Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2004. Finnish National Board of Education [online]. http://www.oph.fi/download/139848_pops_web.pdf. (24 September, 2012)

Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteiden muutokset ja täydennykset 2010. Finnish National Board of Education [online].
http://www.oph.fi/download/132882_Perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteiden_muutokset_ja_taydennykset2010.pdf. (24 September, 2012)

Peterson, M. and Hittie, M. 2010. *Inclusive teaching*. Boston: Pearson.

Pinola, M. 2008. Integraatio ja inklusio peruskoulussa. Luokanopettajien asennoituminen kaikille yhteiseen kouluun. *Kasvatus* [online] 39(1), 39–49.
<http://elektra.helsinki.fi/se/k/0022-927-x/39/1/integraa.pdf>.

Policy guidelines on inclusion in education 2009. UNESCO [online].
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001778/177849e.pdf>. (24 September, 2012)

Salamanca statement and framework for action for special needs education 1994. UNESCO [online]. http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF. (24 September, 2012)

Salomaa, K. (2008). *Viittomakielinen oppilas yleisopetuksessa: opettajien ajatuksia integraation toteutumiseen*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/19124>.

Saloviita, T. (2009a). *Kaikille avoimeen kouluun*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Saloviita, T. (2009b). Inclusive education in Finland: a thwarted development. *Zeitschrift für Inclusion* [online] 1, n.pag. <http://www.inklusion-online.net/index.php/inklusion/article/view/18/29>. (18 January, 2013)

Saloviita, T. (2009c). Antaako opettajankoulutus liian vähän tietoa erityiskasvatuksesta? *Kasvatus* 40 (4), 359–363.

Saloviita, T. 2012. Inklusio eli ”osallistava kasvatusta”: lähteitä sekä 13 perustetta inklusiota vastaan [online]. <http://users.jyu.fi/~saloviit/tutkimus/inclusion.html>. (24 September, 2012)

Seppälä-Pänkäläinen, T. (2009). *Oppilaiden moninaisuuden kohtaaminen suomalaisessa lähikoulussa*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research 346. University of Jyväskylä.

Smith, A. and Ryndak, D. (1997). Practical strategies for communicating with all students. In S. Stainback and W. Stainback (eds.), *Inclusion: a guide for educators*. Baltimore: Brookes, 87–103.

Stainback, S. and Stainback, W. (1997). Introduction. In S. Stainback and W. Stainback (eds.) *Inclusion: a guide for educators*. Baltimore: Brookes, SIVUNUMEROT

Stoops Verplaetse, L. and Migliacci, N. (eds.). 2008. *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Suomen Perustuslaki 11.6.1999/731. Finland’s Ministry of Justice [online] <http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1999/19990731>. (18 January, 2013)

Tilastokeskus 2012: Erityisopetus [online]. <http://www.stat.fi/til/erop/tie.html>. (8 November, 2012)

Tuomi, J. and Sarajärvi, A. (2009). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities 1993. United Nations [online]. <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/dissre00.htm>. (12 November, 2012)

Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948. United Nations [online]. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml>. (12 November, 2012)

Väyrynen, S. (2001). Miten opitaan elämään yhdessä – Inklusion monet kasvot. In P. Murto, A. Naukkarinen and T. Saloviita (eds.), *Inklusion haaste koululle*. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 12–29.

Woolfolk, A. (2007). *Educational psychology* (10th edition). Boston: Pearson.

World Declaration on Education for All 1990. UNESCO [online].

http://www.ncpcr.gov.in/Reports/UNESCO_World_Declaration_on_Education_for_All%201990.pdf. (12 November, 2012)

Appendix 1: Background information form

TAUSTAKYSYMYSLOMAKE:

(Täytetään haastattelun aluksi)

Sukupuoli: mies nainen

Ikä: _____

Pääaine:

Sivuaine/-aineet:

Suorittanut aineenopettajan pedagogiset aineopinnot: kyllä ei

Suoritusvuosi: _____

Suorittanut erityispedagogiikan opintoja: kyllä ei

Jos kyllä, kuinka paljon: _____

Opetuskokemus (sijaisuudet, kokopäiväistä opetusta, ym.):

Annettuja tietoja käytetään vain tutkimustarkoituksiin luottamuksellisesti ja anonyymisti.

Annan luvan käyttää tietojani tutkimustarkoituksiin: []

Aika ja paikka: _____

Nimikirjoitus ja nimen selvennys: _____

Appendix 2: Theme interview schedule

TEEMAHAASTATTELURUNKO

- Taustatiedot – lomake
- Alkulämmittely:
 - o Kerro omin sanoin millaisia opettamiskokemuksia sinulla on?
 - o Minkälaisia ryhmiä olet opettanut/ohjannut? Kuinka kuvailisit niitä?
 - o Miksi lähdit opiskelemaan opettajaksi?

1. INKLUUSION MÄÄRITTELY

- Määrittely: inkuusio / integraatio
- Erityinen tuki: oppilaat
- Erityinen tuki: opettajat

2. ASEENTEET INKLUUSIOTA KOHTAAN

- Asenne yleisesti
- Asenne erillistä erityisopetusta kohtaan
- Omakohtaisia kokemuksia sinulla on erityisopetukseen/-oppilaisiin liittyen
- Erityisopetus nyt ja ennen

3. INKLUUSION EDUT JA HAASTEET

- Etuja inklusiiossa on yleisesti
- Etuja opettamisen kannalta
 - o kielten opetuksessa
- Haasteita inklusiiossa yleisesti
- Haasteita opettamisen kannalta
 - o kielten opetuksessa
- Luokanopettajan ja aineenopettajan tilanne: erot toisistaan

4. OPETTAJANKOULUTUKSEN ANTAMAT VALMIUDET

PEDAGOGISET OPINNOT SUORITTANEET:

- Inklusio: opetus yliopistossa
- Muutosehdotuksia opintoihin
- Väittämään reagointi: Jokainen opettaja pärjää inklusiivisessa luokkatilanteessa aivan tavallisilla, monipuolisilla opetustekniikoilla, jotka jokainen oppii tavallisessa opettajankoulutuksessa.

PERUSOPINNOT SUORITTANEET:

- Inklusio: opetus yliopistossa
- Odotukset myöhemmistä opinnoista
- Väittämään reagointi: Jokainen opettaja pärjää inklusiivisessa luokkatilanteessa aivan tavallisilla, monipuolisilla opetustekniikoilla, jotka jokainen oppii tavallisessa opettajankoulutuksessa.

Appendix 3: Illustrations of the data analysis (tables 1-4)

Table 1. Illustration of the analysis of the theme ‘defining inclusion’

Illustration of the analysis–THEME 1			
Extracts	Simple statements	Subcategories	Main categories
(195) En osaa sinänsä erotella inklusion ja integraation välillä (M8-A, 2, 26)	Cannot make a difference between terms	No accurate definition	DEFINING INCLUSION
(196) vähän niinku tämmösten tasoryhmien vastakohta. (M3-B, 2, 33)	Opposite of track system	Opposite of track system	
(197) No siis, inklusio mää käsitan sen sill- sillä lailla että. se tarkoittaa sitä että et ryhmä on niinku on vaan yks ryhmä. Tai että. öö esimerkiksi koulussa erityisoppilaita pyritään pitämään siinä siinä omassa luokassa mahdollisimman paljon. (N4-B, 2, 27)	There is just one group for all students	One group for all students	
(198) Niin et ei oo erikseen. erityisluokkia. (N5-A, 2, 22)	No special classes	No segregation	
(199) mun mielestä kuitenkin niinku inklusio lähtee siitä perusajatukselta siltä että sä opit tuntemaan. [-] ja sen tuntemisen ja sen vuorovaikutuksen kautta. ja sitä kautta sä sitten teet sitä just noita arkisia asioita ja osaat mukauttaa. (N1-B, 11, 6)	Inclusion is based on interaction	Familiarity	
(200) mä en tiiä miten se miten paljon se näkyy inklusio nykyään kouluissa mutta [-] mä en tiiä miten paljon se sitten se niinku toteutuu nykyään ainakin siitä paljon puhutaan mutta että. et miten se sitten käytännössä on ni en oikeestaan tiiä. (N4-B, 2, 34)	Not sure how visible inclusion is today	Uncertainty	INCLUSION IN SCHOOLS TODAY
(201) Öö. No se ylipäänsä näkyy ihan siinä oppilas niinku aineksessa. Et vaikee selittää mitenkä se siellä ilmenee mutta siis se että oppilaat joilla on jotain erityistarpeita niin niitä ei. sillä lailla piiloteta pois näkyvistä (M3-B, 3, 22)	Students with special needs are not hidden from sight	Students with special needs as a part of the school community	
(202) Öö. no sitte varmaan myös siinä että jos on ihmisiä joilla on oppimisvaikeuksia tai jotka oppii eri tahdissa niin sitten. se näkyy siinä mielessä että kaikille pitäis kuitenkin olla jokseenkin. samanarvoista tai tasoista tekemistä. (M7-A, 4, 10)	Different and equally challenging tasks	The work of teachers	
(203) Ja. no sitä mä en tie nyt mut nyt tuli mieleen et voikse näkyy esimerkiksi jonkinlaisina häiriöinä käytöshäiriöinä tai. niinku. sen opetustilanteen. et häiritvoisko se häiritä sitä opetustilannetta jollain tavalla (M7-A, 4, 18)	Disturbances in the learning environment	Negative effects	SUPPORT GIVEN TO STUDENTS
(204) Nyt en kyllä ihan suoraan sanottuna osaa sanoa että mi- mitä niinku. Tai. Niin. (N4-B, 3, 19)	No idea	Not visible	
(205) no ensin ehkä perus tukiovetus. sitte osittaista erityisopetusta on osan aikaa viikossa, luokassa muun ryhmän kanssa ja osan aikaa käy tuettuna [-] erityisopettajan luona. avustaja luokassa, (N1-B, 3, 5)	Supported teaching and help from SE experts	Support given by special education experts	
(206) Ainakin semmonen yksilöity opetus, (M8-A, 3, 7)	Individualized teaching	Individualized studies	
(207) Pienryhmiä ehkä (M7-A, 4, 37)	Smaller groups	Small groups	
(208) sitte niinku tavallaan niissä ehkä toisenlaisen tapauksen voijaan niinku sermillä eristää siinä samassa luokkatilassa ja. tehdä semmosta omaa tilaa missä saa työskennellä (N1-B, 3, 8)	Separated learning spaces in the own classroom	Adjustments to the learning environment	
(209) /Yleinen tehostettu ja/ erityinen, nehän on ne kolme ja sitten yleinen on nyt. [-] No yleinen tuki on sitä vielä niinkun että mitenkä. sitä oppilasta voidaan. siinä luokkaympäristössä olevilla resursseilla vielä auttaa niinku näin mä oon ymmärtäny, [-] Olikohan se niin että tehostetun tuen jo. piirissä saatetaan jo tehdä jonkinlainen tota. HOJKSi elikkä. Apua no mutta viimestään sitte ku erityiseen tukeen mennään niin sitte se pitää tarkastaa niinku aina. oliko se nyt vuosittain vai puolivuositain sen tuen tarve että oppilas että se ei oo hirveen helppoa niinko oppilaan siirtyä sinne (N2-B, 6, 20)	Support given in three levels	Tripartite support system	
(210) Mä en tiedä minkälaista tukea. tällä hetkellä on, (N5-A, 4, 7)	No idea what kind of support there could be	No idea	

(211) mulla nousee iso niinkun et resurssit, [-] Et mitenkä ne antaa myöten. (N2-B, 7, 7)	Worry about having enough resources	No resources	SUPPORT GIVEN TO TEACHERS
(212) Varmaan sitä olettais in et se tulis jollain tavalla sieltä koulun puolelta tai niinkun henkilökunnalta sitten muulta henkilökunnalta esimerkiks rehtorilta. Siinä tapauksessa et tämmöset niinku inklusiometodit otettais käyttöön (M8-A, 3, 27)	Probably offered by the school	Help from the school	
(213) Monissa kouluissahan on mahdollisuus muun muassa koulunkäyntiavustajaan ja erityisopettajaan kautta erityisopettajiin (N2-B, 7, 9)	Possibility for SE experts' help	Help from experts	
(214) Nyt tietenkin teknologia auttaa paljon niinku varmaan monissa tapauksissa (M3-B, 4, 10)	Technology could help	Help from technology	
(215) ja sitten että kyllä se varmaan niinku vaatis sit sellasen rinnakkaisopetuksen ja semmosen kahen, kaks opettajaa luokassa tyyppistä niinku mallia että tavallaan et nytte kun puhutaan siitä että niinku. (N1-B, 3, 22)	A need for co-operation	Needs, hopes and wishes	
(216) et muuten en oo ihan varma et onks olemas esimerkiks mitään materiaalipaketteja tai sellasta et (N6-A, 5, 21)	Material packages for teachers	Guesses	

Table 2. Illustration of the analysis of the theme 'attitudes towards inclusion'

ILLUSTRATION OF THE ANALYSIS–THEME 2			
Extracts	Simple statements	Subcategories	Main categories
(217) Et se vois toimia, mut ei nyt oo mun semmonen se var- siis niiden oppilaiden kannaltahan se ois nimenomaan se ihannetilanne mut opettajan kannalta välttämättä ei. (N5-A, 5, 1)	Good for the students, not for the teachers	Conflicting views	OPINIONS ON INCLUSION
(218) kuuluukin niinkun. lähtee toteuttamaan ihan niinkun tasapuolisuuden hengessä ja sitä mitä minusta koulu edustaa on se että kaikki. kaikki pääsee mukaan. (M3-B, 4, 15)	Schools should represent equality	Positive views	
(219) Et nimenomaan. kunnollisella tuella ja kunnan resursseilla inklusio vois toimia kauheen hyvin [-] Mut tällä hetkellä jos sitä lähetään väärillä keinoilla ajamaan niin se on mielestäni aivan tuohon tuomittu yritys. (N5-A, 12, 11)	Inclusion could work with proper support and resources	Sufficient resources	
(220) että inklusiota ajetaan läpi mut sit mitä mä oon sen verran siitä lukenu niin. siellä tulee aina jossain vähän sivulauseessa se et ku se on niin säästämistä että ku [-] ((naurahdus)) ei tarvii sit palkata niin paljon välttämättä erityisopettajia, ja koululla jää rahaa muuhunkin (N2-B, 8, 22)	Inclusion is used as an excuse for saving money	Saving money	
(221) Mut sitte käytännössä. mä en tiä miten se niinku miten se voi onnistua. Eikä onnistukaan aina. Että on niitä oppilaita jotka tarvii sitä erityisempää tukea ja sitten niitten myötä jos ne on siellä ryhmässä niin monesti siitä kärsii myös ne ns tavalliset oppilaat (N4-B, 4, 11)	Normal students will suffer	Situation of average students	
(222) eikä se sais niink- olla opettajalle liian niinku liian paljon sellanen henki- tai psyykkinen rasite käytännössä (M7-A, 6, 1)	Should not be a burden on teachers	Situation of teachers	
(223) et ku on ehkä niin paljon semmosia muita asioita joita pitäis hoitaa niin mä ehkä alan myös kyseenalaistaa sen että mitä merkitystä sillä mun aineella tai silleen niinku et onko sille sillä mitää väliä et sillä on paljon. isompiakin asioita mitä pitäs [-] hoitaa. ja pystyä niinku tukemaan niissä niin. [-] se on ehkä sellanen että. (N1-B, 6, 3)	Too many difficulties can be too much of a burden to students	Effects of inclusion	
(224) mut niis on vähän se että ainakin mitä mie oon ymmärtäny nii et erityiskouluissa tosi paljo tai erityisluokissa ainankin niin tosi paljon laitetaan vaan kaikki joil on joku häiriö oppimishäiriö tai oppimisvaikeus niin ne kaikki vaan laitetaan sinne samaan niin sit se ku siel on tosi eriaisteisia oppimisvaikeuksia j- ja sit jopa siis jopa sellasia joilla on esimerkiks vaan lukihäiriö ja sit joku jolla on niinku astetta vakavampi kehitysvamma niin sit ne on kaikki siellä samassa niin sit ne saa sit ne saa. semmosen leiman et noi on niit erkkaluokkalaisia (N6-A, 7, 1)	Different learners in SE classes as well	Negative views	OPINIONS ON SEGREGATED SPECIAL EDUCATION
(225) En tiedä pitäskö. sen missä uskossa mä elän niin pitäiskö panostaa enemmän niinku erityisopetukseen irrallaan kun integraatioon sinänsä. vaikkakin se integraatio sitten taas monipuolistaa sitä opetustilannetta ja oppilaiden kokemuksia. Ehkä erilaisista lainausmerkeissä ihmisi- ihmisistä [-] mut et niinku sinänsä joku järkihän siinä pitää olla niinku siinä varmasti onkin. että se ei sais haitata. niinkun. kuulostaa kauheelt sanoo et se ei sais haitata [-] sitten niinku suu- suurta osaa siitä ryhmästä (M7-A, 5, 29)	Integration could benefit all, but it could have negative effects on the normal students' learning	Conflicting views	

(226) Se on tietysti sinänsä että siellä erityisluokassa on tavallaan todennäköisesti joku joka ois niinku koulutettu enemmän erityisopetukseen (N6-A, 6, 36)	Special education classes have professional staff	Positive views	EXPERIENCES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE PAST
(227) Se ei oo ollu kauheen näkyvää koska. Hmm mie en nyt ees muista ku et niinku esimerkiks et mis meidän ala-asteen erityisopettajan luokka olis ollu [-] tai et kuka se olis ollu. Et ei oo niinku mitään muistikuvaa sellasesta. (N6-A, 8, 1)	Not very visible because has no recollection	Not visible	
(228) yleisesti mutta musta tuntuu että ainaki ainaki se että ku vertaa sitä että ku oli ite koulussa niin silloin tuntuu että oli vähemmän sitä erityisopetusta ku sitte taas mitä nyt on nähny ja just esimerkiks siellä kouluavustajana ollessa (N4-B, 5, 35)	Less special education before than now	Less special education	
(229)kun miettii omia koulukokemuksia niin must tuntuu et silloin otettiin herkemmin niinku. aina yks kerrallaan ja. (N2-B, 13, 4)	Part-time special education given one student at a time	Part-time special education	
(230) must oli tosi hyvä. Niinkun tosi hyvä järjestely et meil oli yläkoulussa esimes matematiikan opiskelu järjestetty niinku taitotasoryhmittäin [-] Se jotenki, ei ollu paineita siitä että et pitää yrittää suoriutua ja pysyä tietyssä tahissa tai. suorittaa tietyllä tavalla et jotenkii [-] Otettiin sen ryhmän yksilölliset tarpeet sillä tavalla siis [-] pyrittiin paremmin ottaa huomioon (N2-B, 10, 28)	Track system in mathematics in secondary school	Track system	
(231) no silloin tosiaan kun TETissä oli tästä nyt on niin kauan aikaa et en kauheesti muista. Mut et siel oli sitten. sielläkin ne lapset niin siel ei ilmeisesti ollu. muistaakseni siel ei ollu kehitysvammasia vaan ne oli nimenomaan lapsia joilla oli. voiko sanoo käyttöhäiriöitä mutta ongelmia käyttäytymisen kanssa. Ja tota. Ja ja. mä muistan et siel oli kauheen villi meno mäkin oli ihan. vähän järkyttyny (N5-A, 6, 6)	Wild special education classes	Negative experiences	EXPERIENCES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION NOW
(232) Että. varmaan aika paljon vielä tehdään Suomessaki semmosta että sitten tavallaan. kuulostaa pahalta mutta eristetään ne. [-] ne sitten omiin tiloihinsa ja omiin luokkiin. (N5-A, 4, 1)	Segregation used	Segregation	
(233) no meillä oli tossa kun mä olin perusopintojen harjoittelu tekemässä niin siellä oli yks semmonen englannin tunneilla jota minäkin opetin joka oli sitten välillä erityisopetuksessa ja välillä normaaleilla tunneilla. Tai niinkun meidän muiden ryhmäläisten kanssa. [-] Vaikutti kyllä tosi hyvältä ja motivoituneelta niinkun oppilaalta sinänsä että siinä tapauksessa tommonen ajoittainen inklusio on ihan kohallaan. Ainakin mun mielest toimii (M8-A, 5, 3)	Part-time special education used in some subjects	Part-time special education	
(234) Ja ehkä sit semmonen. niinkun tuntuu että tietenki edelleenki vaihdellen koulunki ko- ryhmäkoosta koulun koosta ihan kaikkest tämmösestä mut jotenki tuntuu että nykyisinki erityisopetus tapahtuu enemmän kuitenkin jopa ryhmissä (N2-B, 13, 2)	Special education given in small groups	Changes	

Table 3. Illustration of the analysis of the theme ‘advantages and challenges’

ILLUSTRATION OF THE ANALYSIS- THEME 3			
Extracts	Simple statements	Subcategories	Main categories
(235) noo. kyllähän se varmaan säästää aika pitkän pennin. ((huokaus)) et sehän on niinku helppo helppoo on tavallaan niinku sitte jos aja- se ajatusmaailma kääntyy siihen et kuka tahansa missä tahansa voi. [-] jettä ei tämä ole kuin ihminen ihmisen kanssa, [-] tyyppistä tekemistä ni että rahhaa säästyy. (N1-B, 6, 27)	Saving money	Saving money	ADVANTAGES IN GENERAL
(236) Että ehkä se on yhteiskunnan. yhteiskunnankin kannalta niinku tavallaan hyvä asia että kyllä mä nään sen sellasena. sellasena syrjäytymistä ehkäsevänä toimintamal- toimintana (M3-B, 7, 7)	Prevents discrimination	Preventing discrimination	
(237) Öö no käytännössä se varmaankin että. tällaset sosiologiset hyödyt. [-] Ihmiset oppisivat kohtaamaan ehkä toisenlaisiakin ihmisiä kuin lainausmerkeissä normaaleja. (M7-A, 7, 38)	Social advantages, people learn to tolerate difference	Increasing tolerance	
(238) ja siitä vois olla hyöty sitten tulevaisuudessa just että tällaseen niinku ihmisten väliseen kanssakäymiseen ja kommunikaatioon ja. (M7-A, 8, 3)	Learning to communicate and meet different people	Preparing young people for the future	
(239) sitä mukaan integr- integroidaan muunmuas maahanmuuttajia yhteiskuntaan [-] Sieltä lähtien et erilaiset. tai erilaisista oppijoista nyt en niinkään osaa sanoo mutta voisoin kuvitella että niille on siitä hyötyä että niitä ei eristetä mihinkään [-] itseksen ja just. (M7-A, 9, 7)	Integrating immigrant students into the society	Integration of immigrants	
(240) ne saa olla niitten, sen sen oman ryhmänsä kanssa ja siellä sitte syntyy sosiaalisia suhteita ja kaveri. kaveri-kaverisuhteita ja muuta että. Et se on niinku. [-] Tottakai hyvä asia. (N4-B, 7, 2)	Promotes socializing practices	Promoting socialization	ADVANTAGES TO THE WORK OF TEACHERS
(241) Niin sit mulle tulee ihan moniammatillinen yhteistyö [-] jos koululla vaan on niinku resursseja ja varaa niinkun kuitenkin palkata myös niitä erityisopettaja avustajia niin sehän ois tosi ihana niinku ideaalitoimintatapa (N2-B, 31)	Could promote multiprofessional co-work with all involved in teaching students with special needs	Co-operation among professionals	
(242) sit tavallaan semmosta. opettajan omaa oppimista ehkä niinkun lisätä. (N1-B, 6, 33)	Promotes own learning	Professional growth	
(243) Öö. no. aineenopettamiseen kieleen kuuluu kulttuurin opetus niin siitäkin tietysti sitten jos on eri kulttuureista tulevia ihmisiä niin saa konkreettisia esimerkkejä kun ne on nykyisin niitä kirjasta (M7-A, 10, 12)	Authentic examples of people from different cultures	Multiculturalism and authenticity	
(244) Mut se on myöskin ihan mun mielestäki voi miettiä et toisko se inklusio sitten niin hirveesti loppujen lopuks et eroisko se niin hirveesti siitä tän hetkisestä tilanteesta [-] Koska. aina on niit vähän villimpiä tapauksia. aina on niitä rauhallisempia. (N5-A, 8, 9)	Inclusion may not change the current situation that much	Already challenging	CHALLENGES OF INCLUSION IN GENERAL
(245) no siinä missä tavallaan voijaan ajatella et ensin säästetään sitä rahaa, niin ehkä se ei säästyköön koska jos opetustilat, ja. niinku yksinkertasesti työtilat niin niitä ehkä joutuu mukauttaa, sillee että siellä vois niinku kaikki sitten saada semmosen mieluisen ja hyvän työskentely-ympäristön. niin tavallaan et kyllä se tavallaan vie myös siihen suuntaan (-) niitä tavallaan resursseja (N1-B, 7, 21)	Money is not saved because of adjustments to the learning environment	Not saving money	

(246) Ja voihan se tietysti sit taas ainakin etenkin niinku aluks aiheuttaa taas sitten kiusaamista tai muuta jos siel on oppilas joka on just tullu jostain. [-] Jostain erikoisluokalta. Ja ja. Kyllähän se varmasti jotenkin sitä koulu yhteisöä muuttais mut en tiedä onko se nyt sitte [-] En osaa sanoo et oisko se negatiivisella tavalla. (N5-A, 7, 31)	There can be bullying in the beginning	Bullying	
(247) Öö. nää kielikysymykset. Mitä käytetään missäkin. [-]Jaa, tai että pitäskö olla äidinkielistä opetusta ja niin edelleen. Öö. kulttuurierot. juhlapyhinä esimerkiks jos /puhutaan/ [-] maahanmuuttajista. Tai en tiedä kuinka paljon Suomessa nyt esiintyy tällasta niinkun vaatetukseen liittyvää kulttuurieroo siinä mielessä niinku en oo tutustunu siihen. (M7-A, 9, 18)	Cultural differences and language barriers	Cultural differences	
(248) En tiiä pitäskö sitte niinku luokassa tehdä tehdä jotain muuto- mahdollisesti jotakin. (N4-B, 8, 3)	Changes in the classroom	Adjustments to the physical environment	
(249) Tietysti. öö. se on siitä varmaan jonkinlaista rasitetta oppilaillekin riippuen tietysti ihmisestä. (M7-A, 9, 18)	Can be a burden on students	Average students	
(250) et ei Suomessa niinku mikää muu vielä tue tätä et se on nyt jos on niinku opettajan oma näkemys asiasta, [-]niin et sä aika lailla yksin lähet vielä raivaamaan sitä tietä, ja luomaan sitä sun oman näköstä luokkaa (N1-B, 8, 33)	Individual teachers carry out the idea of inclusion	Practical concerns	
(251) Joo, no tietysti kielten opettaja työssä aina nyt on haasteena kun on niin eritasoisia eritaustaisia oppilaita (M7-A, 10, 21)	Language teachers' work is always challenging	Already challenging	CHALLENGES IN THE WORK OF TEACHERS
(252) Jos on vaan yks opettaja paikalla niin saattaa tulla semmonen tilanne että. Ei oo millään mahdollista ottaa kaikkien tarpeita huomioon. Se on tietenkin sitten haastavaa. (M8-A, 7, 16)	It may not be possible to take into account the needs of everyone	Including everyone equally	
(253) niinku no toki varmasti semmonen niinku ehkä semmonen tietynlainen haaste siinä. se voi olla hyvä sekä huono asia et sitte. et var- varmaan riippuu vähän että minkälainen on niinku oma opiskelutausta et onks esimerkiks opiskellu eri- erityispedagogiikka tai niinku että kokeeks sen sellasena asiana että (N6-A, 11, 9)	Depends on whether one has studied special pedagogy or not	Lack of knowledge on special pedagogy	
(254) mutta tietenki siihen sisältyy kaikki käytännön haasteet niinku esimerkiks työrauhan säilyttäminen. (M8-A, 4, 4)	Challenging to keep a peaceful learning environment	Keeping order in the classroom	
(255) sitten just ehkä sen rajan vetäminen siihen että. että niinku missä tavallaan. missä tilanteessa eriytetään mikä on [-] sellasta mihin kaikki osallistuu. [-] niin tavallaan et miten se sitten näkyy inklusiivisessa luokassa [-] ja tai missä määrin, niin se just varmaan tuo haasteita niille jotka sitä vetää. (N1-B, 7, 34)	How to decide when to differentiate and when not	Differentiati on	
(256) Musta tuntuu jotenki vaan et se on. vaan va- vaikeuttaa sitä opettamista [-]Ehkä niinku opettajan kannalta. Että ku pitää ottaa niin monenlainen oppilasaines huomioon. [-] Niin erilaiset oppilaat tai oppijat (N4-B, 7, 7)	One has to take into account so many different learners	Teaching from many perspectives	
(257) Että se eriyttäminen kuitenkin sitte vaatii opettajalta aika paljon lisätyötä. (M3-B, 7, 28)	Differentiation demands a lot of extra work	More work	
(258) jos jokaista kielen osa- aluetta pitäis arvioida, tai niinku ajatellaan näin et ne neljä kielen osa- aluetta muodostaa sen kokonaisuuden, [-] mut sit toi yks ei vaikka pysty niinku kahteen niistä ollenkaan. niin mistä lähetään (N1-B, 9, 24)	Equal evaluation is challenging	Equal evaluation	

(259) Erityisopettajan kanssa pitäis varmasti jutella ja kyllä mä uskon että mä ite haluaisin sitä tai totta kai, helpottaakseni omaa työtä ja oppilaitten muitten oppilaitten olemista myös siinä luokassa (N4-B, 8, 24)	A need to consult a special education teacher often	Co-operation	
(260) ehkä niinku ne epäonnistumiset et sit taas voi syödä myös tosi paljon. (N1-B, 8, 27)	Failures can cause frustration	Frustration	
(261) Hyötyjä ehkä. kauheen vaikee keksii mitää sellast niinku konkreettista hyötyä siitä että työ määrä lisääntyy ja (N6-A, 11, 6)	Demanding to think positively about increasing workload	Staying positive	
(262) Öö, kuvittelisin että luokanopettaja on varmaankin huomattavasti enemmän tekemisissä sen ryhmän kanssa niin se inklusion toteuttaminen on jossain määrin varmaankin helpompaa, [-] Tai tapahtuu nopeammin, tai. on luontevampaa. [-] Ja. öö. Mä mietin tällast niinku tavallisen luokan opettaja varmaan tuntee ne ihmiset paremmin ylipäättäänkin mutta. (M7-A, 10, 31)	Elementary school teachers know their students better	Elementary school teachers have better chances	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE WORK OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND SUBJECT TEACHERS
(263) Miten erilaiset oppijat ottaa sit siinä tilantees huomioon siinä- hän. Jos opettaa useampii aineita. Ja monilla oppilailla saattaa olla sillettii et ne liittyy vaan tiettyihin aiheihin- aineisiin [-] Ne heidän ongelmat niin siinä tilanteessa saattaa olla todella vaikeeta jos pitää alkaa ottaa niinku kokonaisen ryhmän kaikki tarpeet huomioon [-] Kaikissa aineissa (M8-A, 9, 11)	Elementary school teachers face difficulties because they have to teach all subjects	Elementary school teachers' challenges	
(264) kuinka paljon mä opin tuntemaan [-] yhtään oppilasta jos se istuu mun tunnilla neljä tuntia viikossa (N1-B, 11, 11)	Subject teachers teach one group just few hours a week	Subject teachers have less chance	
(265) että aineenopettajalla on paljon tärkeempää sitten se muitten aineenopettajien kanssa. niinku yhteistyön tekeminen että tavallaan. yläasteen opettajat on yhdessä sitä mitä luokanopettaja on [-] sille oppilaalle alakoulun puolella (M3-B, 9, 19)	All subject teachers together are the same as class teacher in elementary school	Subject teachers' possibilities	

Table 4. Illustration of the analysis of the theme 'teacher education'

ILLUSTRATION OF THE ANALYSIS-THEME 4			
Extracts	Simple statements	Subcategories	Main categories
(266) Tota. Noh. Asiasta lienee mainittu koska osasin määritellä tämän haastattelun aluksi /suurin piirtein mitä inklusio on/ Mutta. En kyllä voi väittää että se olisi ollut mitenkään keskeisessä asemassa. (M8-A, 9, 28)	May have been something	Some education	TEACHER EDUCATION AND INCLUSION
(267) Sitä opetettiin näissä. pienryhmissä. luentomaisesti luettiin tavallaan luettiin artikkeleja ja keskusteltiin siitä teoriasta ja siitä niinkun filosofiasta sen takana (M3-B, 10, 8)	Lectures about the philosophy of inclusion	Focus on philosophy	
(268) Ei se kyllä niinku oo ainakaan viime vuoden aikana tullu niinku että vaikka oli jotain joku jollakin kurssilla kyllä käytiin yleisesti. Mut sekin oli ehkä semmosta se oli hirveen jotenkin semmosta että niinkun voiko puhua vammakeskeistä [-] mikä oli mun mielestä tosi niinku. Väärä lähestymistapa että käytiin vaan yleisiä niinkun piirteitä et no mistä tunnustat ja tämmöstä on ominaista tälle ja tälle mut jotenkin sit se pedagoginen näkemys siihen kaikkeen [-] niin se jäi must kokonaan pois (N2-B, 18, 22)	Disability-oriented discussion which was seen as a wrong approach	Focus on disabilities	
(269) muuten ehkä se niinku enemmänki puhuttu eriyttämisestä. ku ite inklusiosta (N1-B, 12, 15)	Talk about differentiation	Focus on differentiation	
(270) Must tuntu et välillä on tullu hyvinki niinku provosoivia niinku. Hyvinki provosoivia tämmösiä niinku teemoja kun ollaan käsitelty niin silloin se on nousu aika jyrkästi ilmi esimerkiksi luennoilla [-] viime vuonna ja kyllähän sen huomaa ihmisistä et kuohuttaa paljon. (N2-B, 17, 20)	Very provocative lectures did not leave a good impression	Provocative lectures and idealistic views	
(271) Mut ite mä oon sitä mieltä siitä ei ehkä saanu käydä vapaata keskustelua [-] mikä on musta niinku ollu. Sääli ja ristiriitasta koska se että jos on näin vahva kanta niin pitää myös pystyä myös sitte sitä. Pystyy myös ottaa kritiikkiä vastaan ja sit sitä että [-] siitä ois enemmän avointa ja vapaata keskustelua et se on ehkä vähän lyöty sitten luu kurkkuun et asiahan on näin ja [-] piste. (N2-B, 17, 21)	No room for free conversation or critics	No room for critical discussion	
(272) Tehdään hirveen etäiseksi se niin mun mielest se on hirveen ristiriitasta sen kans sit kuitenkin mihin meitä kannustetaan [-] Et mitä pitäis, millaisia valmiuksia pitäis olla sit työelämässä (N2-B, 20, 35)	It is made quite distant even though it should be a current trend	No connection to real life	
(273) Sitä on puhuttu siitä on mun mielest puhuttu kauheen teoreettisesti, keskiarvillisesti, [-] Niin että. sillä tavalla miten siitä on täällä puhuttu sitä ei ikinä pystyttäis toteuttamaa (N5-A, 10, 6)	Theory and practice do not meet in the middle	A gap between theory and practice	
(274) harjotteluohjaajat niin ne niinku tavallaan pysty sitte. vähän neuvoo sen oman kokemuksensa pohjalta just semmosia kikkoja että [-]jet miten hyödyntää sitä samaa materiaalia jotenkin silleen että. että joku tekee sitä vaan eri tasolla ku toinen (N1-B, 12, 10)	Instructors in teacher training gave concrete examples	Examples given by teacher training	
(275) Ja sitte myös vähän niinku se että Norssi on tosi semmonen idyllikoulu et sitte se pieni harjoittelu mikä siel tehään niin se on niinku sellasta. sellasta niinku sellast nössöharjoittelua tai sellasta että ko siel on tosi erilais- ainaki siis mun oman kokemuksen mukaan niin tosi erilaista kun missään oikeissa kouluissa. (N6-A, 13, 11)	Teacher training school is "too good" and does not offer real life experiences	Insufficient experiences from teacher training	SUFFICIENCY OF EDUCATION ON TEACHING STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS
(276) on maahanmuuttajataustaa kaikkee tätä niin eikö sekin jo riitä ((naurahdus)) tavallaan [-] inklusiiviseksi luokaksi vai niinku et mitä siellä pitää olla[-] jotta se täyttää jotenkin ne kriteerit (N1-B, 13, 2)	What kind of classes fulfill the criterion of inclusion	Inclusion remains unclear	

(277) Ei. Se ((naurahtaa)) on ihan selvä. Vai. No emmä tiedä viittinkö mä sanoo niin vaikka nimeltämainitsemattomat henkilöt ovat sitä mieltä että. Että tän meidän koulutuksen pitäis kattaa ja pitäisi antaa meille valmiudet toimia oppilaan kuin oppilaan kanssa [-] niin kyllä mä sanon jos mä joutusin luokkaan opettaan missä on vaikka vakavasti autistinen oppilas, niin joutusin oikeesti ottamaan vähän etukäteen selvää tietoa et miten mä häntä on parasta lähestyä (N2-B, 18, 11)	Not sufficient. One does not have the abilities to teach students with special needs without careful preparation	No necessary means provided	
(278) ei varmasti oo riittävää, et ois niinku kaivannu sitä et joku ois tullu ja kertonut et näin mä sitä teen et nyt jotenkii se on tosi abstrakti. (N1-B, 12, 28)	A need for something concrete	Need for concrete examples	IDEAS FOR IMPROVEMENT
(279) No ehkä vähän. mutta tuota. Joo vähemmän piirtämistä ja enemmän erityispedagogiikkaa (N4-B, 11, 20)	More education on special education needed	Need for more special education	
(280) mä toivosin että Norssin puolella ehkä otettais enemmän vastuuta siitä toiminnasta [-] koska ylipäänsäkin opettajankoulutuksen aikana mä näin että se Norssin puolen koulutus oli paljon hyödyllisempää sellasta niinkun. no semmosta jolla oli oikeesti niinkun vaikutusta siihen miten siinä harjoittelussa toimi [-] verrattuna sitten näihin niinku. luento osi- osioihin. Että sitä mä siirtäsin sitä painopistettä ehkä enemmän sinne. sinne puolelle. (M3-B, 10, 26)	Teacher training school should take more responsibility	Responsibility of the teacher training school	
(281) niin niin kyllä laittasin ja laittasin vielä enemmän niinku semmosta jotain. pois tuolta harjoittelukoulusta jonneki kentälle ja jotain niinku oikeeta kokemuksia [-]niinku sen sijaan että sä käyt luennolla ja sit sä kirjoitat jonku raportin [-]ja siinä pohdit kuinka hyvä juttu tää on vai ei, [-] ilman että sulla on periaatteessa konkreettisia kokemuksia aiheesta (N1-B, 13, 23)	More training outside teacher training school (Norssi)	More training in regular schools	
(282) Mä toivon et se menis niin päin että ensin oltaisiin tuolla Musican M103 luentosalissa ja sitte sielläki joku kertois joku nimi. Sensuroitu luennoitsija ((naurahtaa)) siitä että mitä mikä ovat inklusion periaatteet ja minkä takia se on hyvä juttu ja sitte esitetään tutkimustietoa aiheesta ja sit sen jälkeen mentäis Norssille ja sitten. Siellä esiteltäis esimerkiks joku semmonen tilanne missä mihin se konklusio. Konklusio. Inklusio konkreettisesti riitt- liittyy (M8-A, 10, 27)	Education on inclusion both in theory and in practice	More practical training	
(283) että mustakin ois hyvä jos vaikka jossakin opetusharjoittelussakin mikä tehdään niin voitais tehdä jotenkin oikeesti yhdessä erkan kanssa (N2-B, 20, 28)	Teacher training together with special education teachers	Co-operation with special education	
(284) ehkä sitä ois voinu olla vähän enemmän. mut mä luulen että kuitenkin pakko niihin asioihin on palata siellä työelämässä kun kohtaa niitä tilanteita [-] Että et totta kai ois hyvä jos ois sellanen teoria taito. tietopohja jo valmiiks mut että niitä asioita joutus kuitenkin niinku käymään läpi vielä ja opiskelemaan itsenäisesti että en tiä sitten onko se nyt hirveesti haitannukaan että meillä ei oo niin paljon sitä ollu (N4-B, 11, 6)	Some kind of theory base could be good but one has to study independently anyway in working life	Useful theory base	
(285) Mä odotan että siitä puhutaan siellä koska se tuntuu olevan tänä päivänä tosi yleinen aihe, [-] Mutta en. en odota että siellä mitään taikatemppeja tulis, [-] Käytännössä. Että. enkä välttämättä odota mitään konkreettistakaan, vaan että ylipäätään tästä aiheesta pidetään yllä ja sitten pohdiskele itse tykönäsi että mitä tekisit tällaisessa tilanteessa (M7-A, 12, 1)	OKL will offer a lot of theory and little concrete examples	Little practical training	EXPECTATIONS (group A only)

(286) No luulen et sitä sivutaan jossain määrin mutta sitä, se ei kuulu siihen sinänsä koska se on erillinen oppiaine. [-] Mut et niitä teemoja on varmaankin sillain pintapuolisesti ängetty sinne joukkoon koska se on aika luonnollista (M7-A, 12, 12)	Special pedagogy may be mentioned	Special pedagogy	
(287) Toivoisin saavani vaikka mitä mutta en odota kyllä mitään muuta kuin ehkä sit käytännön harjoittelusta [-] Jos siellä on on oppilaita, joista mun tarvii tietää jotain tavallaan erityistä [-] Niin et sitä kautta varmaan tulee tutummaksi. Mä en usko että siel ihan hirveesti. tuo tota OKL:n puolelta niin (N5-A, 11, 1)	No expectations except from the actual training if there happens to be students with special needs	Expectations of training lessons	
(288) Se se on. ää niinkun opettajan ammattikuntaa hieman niinkun. mollaava koska tuon viestihän siinä taustalla on että mitä te valitatte. kaikkihan siihen pystyy. Henkinen. että en minä ole samaa mieltä sen asian kanssa kyllä se aina vaatii. niinkun. tai no. (M3-B, 12, 4)	The statements does not respect teachers' work	Disrespectful	RESPONSE TO THE STATEMENT
(289) ((naurahdus)) miten sä määrittelet monipuoliset opetustekniikat. öö. no olen täysin eri mieltä. (N1-B, 14, 1)	Does not agree	Disagreement about teaching methods	
(290) Se on provosoiva väite ((naurahtaa)) Öö. se on ylevä väite. Se ei välttämättä oo ihan sidottu siihen todellisuuteen mikä. opettajalla nykyään on ihan normaaliinkin oppilaitten kanssa. (M3-B, 12, 1)	A very provocative statement but not really connected to reality	No connection to reality	
(291) Mielestäni tuo ei ole totta. Tuo väittämä. [-] Autismit Aspergerit tämmöset niin niistä vaan oikeesti pitäs saada tietoa, niistä ei mun mielestä tietysti en oo aineopintoja tosiaan käyny vielä[-] Niistä ei hirveesti puhuta. Ja. valitettavasti kaikista oireyhtymistä syndroomista kaikista ja myöskin sit ihan niinku normaalista tämmösistä ylivilk- no no taas normaalista ja epänormaalista mut semmosesta perus ylivilkkaudesta niin kyllä niistä pitäs saada jotain konkreettisia.[-] opetus. tai siis niinku neuvoja et miten opettaja pystyy toimimaan niin et ne saa samanverran siitä opetuksesta irti kuin ne muut. Koska ei inklusiiossa oo mitään järkeä siinä vaiheessa jos siellä ne oppilait joilla on jotain ihan mitä tahansa erityistarpeita ni jos ne ei pysty seuraamaan sitä samalla tavalla ja ne ei saa siitä ne ei opi siellä. (N5-A, 11, 25)	One should get more concrete advice and examples	Disagreement because of teachers' lack of knowledge	
(292) Ei pidä paikkaansa. Koska jos on olemassa erilaisia oppijoita niin on olemassa myös erilaisia opettajia. [-] Kaikille ei löydy niitä samoja valmiuksia. (M8-A, 10, 39)	There are many different kinds of teachers who are not capable of inclusion	Qualities of teachers	
(293) No tietysti itseni kohdalla totta kai. mut miks olis erityispedagogiikkaa erikseen. jos toi olisi se tilanne käytännössä. Eli väittämänä. taas sellanen niinkun. uskon että se on tavoitteena noissa aineopinnoissa että sen jälkeen toi olisi se tilanne [-] mutta sitten on vaikee kuvitella just että kun tääl voi opiskella sitä erityispedagogiikka niin pitkälle niin onks se sit turhaa (M7-A, 12, 23)	Why not but why is there a separate subject called special pedagogy if that is the case	Role of special education teachers	
(294) Öö mie tavallaan sinänsä uskon että opettaja vois pärjätä niinku et sille ei ois tavallaan mitää esteitä ettei pärjäis siinä inklusiivisessa luokkatilanteessa mutta miustmie ehkä uskon siihen että sitten sen opettajan täytyis. olla opiskellu erityispedagogiikkaa ja saanu niinku enemmän koulutusta siihen [-] tai niinku että OKL:n pitäis ehkä sit jos jos halutaan tätä inklusiivista niin sit kyllä ehkä OKL:n pitäis tarjota siihen jotain työkaluja et [-]. Tai siis tarjoo ne jos ottaa erityispedan sivuaineeks. (N6-A, 15, 6)	A teacher could manage if given more education and means for the practical work	Achievable	

Appendix 4: Extracts translated into English

- (1) It has not been clear so far what the real aim of inclusion is. It could mean huge classes with several students [-] with special needs included or that there were just a few students included in each class [-] somehow it has not been clear at any point (N1-B, 11, 31)
- (2) Sort of like an opposite of skill groups in the track system (M3-B, 2, 33)
- (3) One could say that Finnish school system is already integrative since we have no track system which would divide students into different groups. It is not clear where it is aiming at (inclusion) (N1-B, 2, 35)
- (4) In my opinion inclusion means that there is only one group. I mean that students with special needs are integrated into the regular class and are allowed to study there as much as possible (N4, B, 2, 27)
- (5) Well, I do not know the right answer but I could claim that this means including all kinds of learners in the same classroom (M8-A, 2, 22)
- (6) In the mildest case inclusion means that we have students of different levels in the same group, and in the more extreme case it means that we have several students with various diagnoses in need of individual support and guidance. Or that students with disabilities or cognitive failures are included (N1-B, 2, 27)
- (7) Those students with learning difficulties or apparently also mild disabilities are integrated with the norm-, normal, alright normal students. Oh no, you are going to use that ((laughter)). Well, integrated into the same classroom [-] with the normal or average students (N6-A, 3, 17)
- (8) In my opinion inclusion means that students are together in the same physical environment, studying in the same classroom. If someone has some sort of a disability or a learning difficulty [-] or something and full inclusion is in use, then there should be a special education teacher and assistants available. But that no one is being segregated (N5-A, 2, 20)
- (9) Students with learning difficulties are integrated [-] into the same classroom with the average students [-] or that immigrant students are integrated with the Finnish speaking students (M7-A, 3, 27)
- (10) As far as I am aware, inclusion means integrating students of different levels in the same group [-] so the poor students, the average students and the good students, and the ones with learning difficulties are all working in the same group, help each other and that way have an effect on each other. (M3-B, 1, 33)
- (11) I believe that inclusion means not using special education classes anymore (N6-A, 3, 16)
- (12) The students with special needs would not be separated into their own classes with their teachers but that they could study in the same class [-] at the same time with others (M8-A, 2, 29)
- (13) inclusion is based on the idea that you get to know the students individually [-] and only through that knowledge and interpersonal interaction you are able to do all the daily tasks and know how to differentiate (N1-B, 11, 6)
- (14) I do not know how visible inclusion is in schools today [-] at least it is being talked about but I do not know how it presents itself in practice (N4-B, 2, 34)
- (15) In my opinion it means that there is an individual who has the right to study and learn in the same environment [-] Oh gosh ((laughter)) Each individual has rights (N2-B, 5, 23)
- (16) It can be seen in the student population. It is hard to explain, but one could say that students with special needs are not hid from sight (M3-B, 3, 22)
- (17) I think that students with special needs can stay in a regular classroom and they do not have to move around [-] There is just one teacher for a class, or there might be a special education teacher as well. But that no one is being segregated (N4-B, 2, 35)

- (18) There were students whose mother tongue was not Finnish in my class during teacher training [-] so that way it could be visible in the language of instruction (M7-A, 4, 6)
- (19) Teachers should be able to read their students needs and figure out ways of developing their skills (M7-A, 4, 14)
- (20) For me it means that one person should be able to do so many things (N1-B, 2, 36)
- (21) Because there is so much knowledge of different kinds of learners and learning difficulties in theory, demands are placed upon teachers and school staff (N1-B, 2, 40)
- (22) Could it be visible in the form of disturbances, I mean could it disturb teaching somehow (M7-A, 4, 18)
- (23) It really has not been visible [-] It has been strange that there has not been special education teachers or assistants in any of the classes (N5-A, 3, 2+11)
- (24) Well, there is a special education teacher. Then there are students with difficulties in some subject [-] studying separately with a special education teacher sometimes [-] not perhaps every lesson but when necessary [-] And of course there are students with personal assistants or others (N5-A, 3, 24+32)
- (25) Well, there are special education teachers and school assistants for those students who are in need of special support. The students may visit the special education teacher [-] or the special education teacher comes to the regular classroom but that the special education teacher focuses solely on that one student (N6-A, 4, 30)
- (26) it means that there are students with special needs who need differentiation during lessons [-] I think differentiation is the practical means of support (M3-B, 2, 36)
- (27) I would assume that there are individualized curriculums [-] which are designed according to each student's prerequisites or something like that (M7-A, 4, 32)
- (28) Giving the possibility to do easier tasks, basic things such as that [-] Yes, maybe something like the facilitation of tasks (N4-B, 3, 19)
- (29) Possibilities to compensate. If a student has dyslexia one could give more time to complete an exam [-] In some cases exams are not obligatory and there are alternative ways to compensate (M8-A, 3, 9)
- (30) There would be small group teaching as much as possible, so that everyone could be together (N4-B, 2, 30)
- (31) And of course there is a more peaceful learning environment in smaller groups (M8-A, 3, 9)
- (32) There is the possibility to build separate learning spaces inside the same classroom with screens (N1-B, 3, 8)
- (33) I believe there are forms of support that have to do with the learning environment, I could imagine so [-] I remember reading about quiet learning spaces and motivational learning environments that are built to schools these days (M7-A, 4, 37+5, 6)
- (34) Now that the tripartial support system is in use first universal support is given, and next intensified support before any decisions on special support are made. There is the aim to keep the students with special needs among their peers for as long as possible (N2-B, 6, 5)
- (35) If a student gets an individual study plan then there is the possibility to define everything that happens in the classroom [-] and all that (M3-B, 3, 36)

- (36) It is not the first choice. A student always has the chance to move from special support to the lower levels, if the situation seems like it could be possible. Receiving special support does not mean that one is stigmatized for being a special education case for the rest of one's school career (N2-B, 6, 27)
- (37) I know nothing [-] The only things that came to my mind were some in-service training sessions and courses but [-] I think I'd better say I know nothing (M7-A, 5, 14)
- (38) Well, actually I think I know nothing about it [-] as I just said it has not been talked about much anywhere (N6-A, 5, 2)
- (39) I think it is a contradictory issue and unequally divided among schools [-] has much to do with resources (N2-B, 7, 21)
- (40) I remember when there was discussion about inclusion, the problem was that it was a sublime idea but teachers were not given any resources (M3-B, 4, 6)
- (41) I would assume that schools would provide the necessary in-service training; the head master and other school staff would have the responsibility. In case inclusion methods were being used (M8-A, 3, 27)
- (42) There are special education teacher(s) and school assistants in many schools these days (N2-B, 7, 9)
- (43) co-operation among teachers; there might be two teacher in the same class, joint groups (M7-A, 5, 1)
- (44) Technology is bound to help teachers quite a lot (M3-B, 4, 10)
- (45) I hope that there would be in-service training where information of dealing with learning difficulties and students with special needs would be given [-] And that there would be someone in the workplace to whom the teachers could turn to [-] always when needed (N4-B, 3, 32)
- (46) If there are students with special needs in larger groups there should always be assistants present [-] it would be of great help if there were more adults present, in my opinion (M3-B, 4, 7)
- (47) group sizes should be limited. If inclusive classes are the aim of education today, class sizes should be reduced to half of what they are now. One cannot think that everything is going to work out fine in a group of thirty students (N1-B, 3, 25)
- (48) Of course special education teachers would be there in inclusive classes, probably. There would not have to be only one teacher, naturally (M8-A, 4, 18)
- (49) In my opinion it is a fine idea but seems rather unrealistic (N6-A, 5, 33)
- (50) To sum up, it is a great idea [-] but achieving it might be difficult (M3-B, 4, 22)
- (51) It is a really sublime idea but maybe teacher education does not give enough means to make it reality (N6-A, 6, 18)
- (52) It is a very good idea from an educational and societal perspective. There is the aim that everyone learns to get along and support one another; I find it a brilliant idea (N1-B, 3, 33)
- (53) It is a beautiful ideal and I do not want to belittle the idea of equality. Each person should feel oneself equal [-] and no one should be discriminated by taking to another separate physical environment (N2-B, 8, 2)
- (54) Making difference an everyday thing [-] could be desirable and necessary educational element for the youth of today (N1-B, 3, 37)
- (55) I have encountered many students with special needs. There have been students who get counseling, and might not get that much done during lessons but I believe it is good for them to be present [-] I am not

even bothered too much if they do they tasks or not as long as they stay with the group, I find it good (M3-B, 5, 34)

(56) the best part about inclusion is getting rid of the stigma that has been caused by [-] segregation, special classes or special schools. It must be discouraging for students to be in a special class because one cannot make it [-] as well as the others (M3-B, 5, 5)

(57) The practical work would require a lot of resources, perhaps so much that it cannot be done. I believe that if students with special needs are suddenly let to attend regular classes more resources and special education teachers are needed. There should be a special education teacher in each inclusive class as well (N5-A, 5, 28)

(58) I have read that teachers' resources are very limited for the practical work (M3-B, 4, 16)

(59) I could criticize and say that inclusion might not always be for the best interest of the child. Can a teacher with limited resources guarantee that a severely autistic student in a group of twenty other students, of which some might be hyper-active or some might have behavioral issues, is really benefiting from inclusion (N2-B, 8, 10)

(60) Inclusion is being pushed through but I have read that it might be just an excuse for saving money because [-] ((laughter)) there would no longer be a need to hire special education teachers and schools could use that money for other purposes (N2-B, 8, 22)

(61) I do not see how it could work in practice. And it will not, not always. There are always students in need of more intensive support and because of them the average students often suffer (N4-B, 4, 11)

(62) it will take away attention and support from the average students if a teacher can focus only on those two causing disturbances. no one else is receiving [-] attention and help (N6-A, 6, 21)

(63) Learning difficulties are a difficult matter because students with learning difficulties all require different amounts of support and individually designed support for that matter [-] it must be hard for a teacher (N6-A, 7, 18)

(64) I feel that I do not have the prerequisites to teach a student with special needs because I have not studied special pedagogy at all here (N4-B, 4, 15)

(65) on the other hand I feel that it is going to increase my workload quite a bit. I feel that the workload is large as it is and with inclusion it could be three or four times larger than it is now (N1-B, 3, 40)

(66) There are large group sizes and everything else. It is hard to think how you would act if it was your own group [-] Because in a group of twenty students you have the poor students and the good students, how can you share your attention equally (M3-B, 4, 17)

(67) in my opinion teaching is directed by timetables and the national curriculum. It is hard to imagine how it would work with inclusion, does everyone set themselves their own goals [-] and if that is the case how can we ensure that the quality of education remains [-] equal (N1-B, 4, 22)

(68) separating students as their own group gives them a sort of a stigma [-] that they are not a part of the school activities. Segregated special schools are even worse because they are situated in another part of the town (N6-A, 7, 10)

(69) I feel that they are not necessary and it might be a bit stigmatizing for students studying in [-] special classes or schools (M3-B, 4, 39)

(70) They have professional staff who can meet the needs of students with special needs. It is not good that they are separated from the other students as their own society (M8-A, 4, 11)

(71) I think it is good that there is special education but I also believe that integration is the goal [-] we should aim at, but they should not abolish special education classes for good [-] I have a positive attitude

towards segregated special education as long as it does not cause students a feeling like it would be a punishment [-] or a sign of weakness (M7-A, 6, 31)

(72) I do not find special schools so good. In small groups or special classes the students are still integrated into the same school building [-] and can have some sort of a contact with the average students. I find small groups necessary in some cases (N4-B, 4, 30)

(73) In my opinion they cannot just abolish everything. I mean, I find that small groups and special education are needed because not all are capable of working in a large group (N4-B, 4, 23)

(74) I do not see a problem of having segregated special education. I have been attending school when special education classes were a normal thing and my experiences of them are good. There were children who needed more support and special education classes could meet those needs. Otherwise the students were a part of the school community in breaks and other school events (N1-B, 4, 16)

(75) I personally do not find them discriminating if it is for the best interest of the child. I always like to think about the child's best interest first [-] And as an ideal and from the societal perspective inclusion sounds brilliant [-] we are all equal in the same classroom, have social interaction with each other and all. But if it is not for the best interest of the student with special needs (N2-B, 9, 3)

(76) you see that those children lack social skills and group work skills [-] and in my opinion ((sighs)) they should get to learn them in smaller groups [-] where there is time and room to deal with all emotions together with someone [-] who has time for one-on-one interaction. In my opinion there is no time for such interaction in the Finnish school system (N1-B, 6, 9)

(77) I have no recollection of such support whatsoever [-] from the times I attended school (N5-A, 5, 37)

(78) When I was at school they were hidden from sight. There were special education classes [-] and there was also a special education school to which some of the students from my class were sent to. Students in the special education class were integrated with the average students in arts subjects but were otherwise separated into their own class. They were not a part of our school community back then (M3-B, 5, 26)

(79) My experiences of special education are that they were all gathered together ((laughter)) [-] to a small class upstairs and [-] that is that (M7-A, 8, 4)

(80) I am not sure if they have diagnosed disorders at all before. I cannot recall of knowing anyone who would have had learning difficulties in our class. There might have been reading difficulties sure, but not in our class (N6-A, 8, 28)

(81) I think there were less special education in the past if I compare the situation back then to what I have witnessed while working as a school assistant now (N4-B, 5, 35)

(82) I feel that there has been a similar pattern. In my own classes in secondary school there were students who visited the special education teacher or the special education teacher came to fetch them to study in a separate space so that they could better concentrate (N2-B, 10, 22)

(83) In secondary school many students in our class went to study mathematics in the special education class [-] in our school the special education teacher was a nice person [-] and also in his/her class one could do tasks in one's own pace and there was an opportunity to receive individual attention (M6-B, 8, 4)

(84) In secondary school we had track groups in mathematics and I found it a very good practice [-] Somehow it reduced the pressure of succeeding and studying in a certain pace [-] I found that in that way our individual needs were taken into account (N2-B, 10, 28)

(85) I think that in the past special education class was a kind of place for all students who had a tough time or who had some sort of behavioral issues. It was a place where you were put if things did not work out fine (N1-B, 5, 20)

(86) My experiences of special education classes are from elementary and secondary school when they were very scary places [-] I think many people thought that all students in special education classes were bullies and troublemakers [-] difficult people who were to be avoided. The bad reputation did not presumably help the students in those classes either (M7-A, 6, 14)

(87) If you had difficulties in some subject you went to meet the special education teacher. It was a mystical place, average students without difficulties did not really know what happened behind those closed doors in the separate wing of the school building [-] and there were all sorts of rumors going around ((laughter)) (M8-A, 4, 33)

(88) I think it still exists in Finnish schools that. It sounds bad but separating [-] students into their own classes (N5-A, 4, 1)

(89) There has been segregated special education in those elementary schools where I have taught (N2-B, 10, 22)

(90) In this one school I was working at there was a sort of a special class which was integrated into a regular class but the students had differentiated teaching in those specific subjects they had difficulties with. I found that kind of a system very good (M3-B, 5, 2)

(91) Special education teacher was never in the regular classroom [-] whereas nowadays he/she comes to the class to help students who have difficulties (N6-A, 8, 21)

(92) I think it is considered more natural. I do not know if it is because of attitudes in general, teachers can prepare their classes for it (N2-B, 12, 24)

(93) Nowadays the focus is on learning and school attendance [-] somehow the means of support are defined much more carefully and the reasons behind difficulties are searched for instead of thinking that if I cannot cope with that child, we can send him/her to a special education teacher who will deal with it (N1-B, 5, 22)

(94) There might be financial advantages perhaps [-] because there is no need for separate classes and so on, money could be saved (N2-B, 13, 25)

(95) In general if you think about values then it is bound to promote the ideas of equality and non-discriminating society [-] We are all on the same line (N2-B, 13, 25)

(96) In general and in regard to schools I find it good that students learned to see difference [-] and different learners. There could be deaf students [-] who use sign language. It would not come as a shock later to realize that all people are not the same, people with disabilities would not seem abnormal and there would be no need to wonder why some people are different [-] It could be a lesson about tolerance (N5-A, 6, 21)

(97) Making difference visible in the school community, because in the end that is what our society is about. In a world of grown-ups one cannot choose with whom one wants to work with but you must be able to deal with everyone (N6-A, 9, 30)

(98) at the same time immigrants are integrated into the society [-] I cannot say for sure but I would imagine that it benefits different learners if they were not segregated [-] to be by themselves (M7-A, 9, 7)

(99) teaching is so much about educating so I see the advantages in socialization, working together [-] having a chance for spiritual and emotional growth. If you have special needs you do not have to go to a university but the (social) skills you learn in school are extremely important all the less (M3-B, 7, 1)

(100) on the other hand I see it as an encouragement for teachers to try multiprofessional co-operation, if there are several teachers in one class it could promote multiprofessional co-operation [-] and even if it was not between teachers they could be assistants [-] or interpreters, nonetheless it could enable that (N1-B, 6, 27)

(101) There is the advantage of learning a lot about different people and ways to work with them [-] You can develop as a professional when you learn to see the special needs (M3-B, 8, 17)

(102) I think one is more prone to use various learning methods if there are many students who have difficulties with sitting still and reading a book, or doing tasks quietly. You might be encouraged to use more functional learning methods such as conversations and different kinds of methods on the whole. It could push teachers to use the kinds of teaching methods which benefit all students (N6-A, 11, 30)

(103) Well advantages, of course if there is a native English-speaking person in the classroom [-] if we are talking about English. I would imagine that it is not that usual but it just came to my mind. Teaching languages has to do with culture. Students from other cultures could serve as authentic examples (M7-A, 10, 07)

(104) There are students in need of special attention in normal classrooms as well; it is not about having a group of average students sitting quietly and listening to a teacher speaking, and adding two students with special needs and end up having serious disturbances. That is not the case. Children are always children and so on [-] One could think whether inclusion would bring about any drastic changes to the way things are at present in schools [-] since there are always the wild ones and then there are the quiet ones (N5-A, 8, 5)

(105) money might not be saved after all because there might be a need to make adjustments to the learning environment so that all students could have a pleasant and good environment to study. That ought to take [-] resources (N1-B, 7, 21)

(106) It could cause bullying if a student was transferred from [-] a special education class to a regular class, in the beginning at least. It is bound to change the school community [-] but I cannot say whether it would be for worse (N5-A, 7, 31)

(107) First there is bullying and such. Students in secondary schools are not the most tolerant people and inclusion could cause severe bullying incidents and scorn and sorts (N6-A, 10, 4)

(108) Language related issues, which language is used in which situation [-] should there be teaching in each student's own mother tongue, cultural differences if we talk about [-] immigrants. I'm not sure how usual it is in Finland but cultural differences concerning specific clothing could be, I have not looked into that matter M7-A, 9, 18)

(109) I was thinking about a classroom as a learning environment. Someone is in need of a lot of external stimulus such as pictures on the walls [-] in order to concentrate while someone else gets distracted by colors and noises [-] The physical environment (N2-B, 14, 28)

(110) If you have just, say two students who take up much of your time [-] who need to be reprimanded all the time, all the energy is wasted on [-] keeping order instead of focusing on and giving time to the other [-] students (N5-A, 7, 20)

(111) I feel like, what comes to the idea of inclusion I feel like ((laughter)) and I am sorry to say this but many of these ideas are inventions of professors and researchers [-] about a world which they themselves have little experience of, unfortunately (N1-B, 10, 9)

(112) If we begin to change the traditional education system [-] there are bound to be old-school teachers who oppose it [-] There are always people who oppose all change, which makes it even more challenging. [-] To see the values change (M8-A, 7, 20)

(113) I think it would require large changes in matters we cannot even imagine [-] I think it is far easier to hold on to the idea and feeling of belonging and such [-] all those positive things (N1-B, 10, 2)

(114) Nothing else supports this in Finland, it is a teacher's own view of things [-] you have to push it through by yourself and create the kind of class you want (N1-B, 8, 33)

(115) Learning languages is such an individual process, people learn languages in their own pace [-] students are of different levels, someone may have a vast knowledge of vocabulary, someone has lived abroad and learns or has learned to produce speech fluently, there is an increasing number of students of different levels in their learning (N6-A, 11, 21)

(116) Taking into account each student individually, if you think about equality in general [-] is it really possible to take into account each individual equally (N2-B, 14, 14)

(117) in many elementary and secondary schools the lessons last for only 45 minutes. It is a very limited time to make everyone do what they should be doing [-] all students are of different levels and those 45 minutes are spent on keeping everyone in the same pace. Schools work that way, teachers are trying to keep everyone on the same line, and I believe inclusion is aiming at keeping the students with special needs on that same line as well (N6-A, 10, 34)

(118) Well, first of all looking into the kinds of learning difficulties a student may have, especially when I have no experience of sorts [-] I have not studied special pedagogy which means that I have no theory base whatsoever. Studying about learning difficulties, that is it (N4-B, 8, 20)

(119) Many subject teachers graduate from our university without any experiences of special pedagogy. It might be difficult for them to take into account each student with special needs in the classroom, and moreover to make room for the special education teacher working there as well. If one has not studied special pedagogy it might be difficult to understand the difference between disturbing because of behavioral issues [-] and unproductive ways of showing interest or seeking attention (M8-A, 8, 4)

(120) In addition, all disturbances. So much time is spent on keeping order if there is someone who just cannot sit still (N6-A, 11, 4)

(121) of course there are practical challenges such as keeping order (M8-A, 4, 4)

(122) To decide when to differentiate is difficult [-] and to decide what tasks are done as a group together [-] how does it work in an inclusive classroom [-] it must be challenging for the people in charge (N1-B, 7, 34)

(123) Too much differentiation may disturb the learning of some individuals [-] should there be special groups for the exceptionally talented (M7-A, 9, 2)

(124) how does learning English as a person with cerebral palsy differ from physically normal students' learning. You would have to find so many ways and different starting points for teaching and learning (N1-B, 4,3)

(125) if a student has [-] difficulties with one's own mother tongue. Especially if the mother tongue is not Finnish [-] one is not a native speaker and barely even understands Finnish and yet one has to learn a foreign language [-] I find it extremely challenging (N2-B, 16, 6)

(126) I think it will cause a whole lot more paperwork, because you have to prepare many different kinds of tests, for example (N1-B, 8, 30)

(127) It is a burden on a teacher. One has to design courses for individuals instead of the mass of students (M7-A, 9, 24)

(128) I would imagine it takes time to try out different ways of teaching, what suits best for each different learner [-] to find the best possible way for everyone (N4-B, 8, 32)

(129) I am just wondering what are the tasks that can be done together as a group and what effect it has on the dynamics of the class if one person does this and the other one that. What happened to doing things as a group [-] will it disappear [-] because one person cannot do what the others can (N1-B, 4, 5)

(130) I you think about evaluating language skills, there are four different aspects that all count [-] if a student cannot perform two of those aspects at all, what then [-] will you make many versions of one task

which this student can do on this level and that student on that level. But then again we do not have school reports that would tell which level a student has completed (N1-B, 9, 24)

(131) Making co-operation networks work smoothly in a school community will require a lot of time and effort [-] from all participants, both teachers and special education teachers, school assistant whoever could be involved. Some students may have personal assistants. And interpreters [-] and if immigrants are included then there is such a wide range of variables to take into account (N2-B, 14, 18)

(132) Failures can wear a person out pretty badly (N1-B, 8, 27)

(133) It is so hard to see any advantages, you would have to be so optimistic and be able to think positively about it (N4-B, 9, 32)

(134) as a novice teacher there are SO many other things to think about [-] somehow I feel that when you have 250 test papers to evaluate, all what is left of the idealism will vanish (N1-B, 9, 3)

(135) In my opinion elementary school teachers have better chances to practice inclusion [-] they have more chances because they have their own group [-] they are studying in the same room so possible adjustments are easy to implement (M3-B, 9, 8)

(136) A bit of a clichéd answer perhaps, but elementary school teachers get to know their students better than subject teachers [-] because they spend so much more time with their students (N2-B, 16, 22)

(137) One has to create a different kind of relationship with the group and the students because one spends so much more time with them than a subject teacher who teaches one group just a few lessons a week (N5-A, 9, 32)

(138) How does one take into account students with special needs if one teaches many subjects, when some students may have difficulties in only specific subjects [-] It may be very challenging to take into account the needs of the whole group (M8-A, 9, 11)

(139) Subject teachers have a limited time for teaching [-] three to four times a week [-] 45 minutes. It may take time to learn what kinds of students there are in each class (M3-B, 8, 36)

(140) Subject teachers' see their students now and then which makes it more difficult to get to know them (N4-B, 10, 12)

(141) It is not easy for subject teachers to achieve the kind of status compared to [-] elementary school teachers who are authority figures for students [-] and with whom relationship and interaction are built for three to six years (M3-B, 9, 26)

(142) For example, in secondary school parents contact home class teachers instead of subject teachers (N6-A, 12, 17)

(143) You only see one side of students' skills. One could just dislike English [-] but be extremely talented in mathematics, but a subject teacher sees just that one side of things (N6-A, 12, 11)

(144) On the other hand, sometimes English teachers may notice difficulties that are related to language skills, which do not necessarily affect other areas of learning, and present themselves only when a student starts learning their first foreign language (N6-A, 12, 11)

(145) co-operation among all teachers is far more important for subject teachers. secondary school subject teachers together are the same as an elementary school teacher is [-] for a student in elementary school (M3-B, 9, 19)

(146) To my knowledge, the university of Jyväskylä is in favor of inclusion (N2-B, 17, 10)

(147) I cannot recall if we had something during teacher training. It may have been mentioned in small group meetings. Or if it has been talked about it has not stuck in my mind (N4-B, 10, 25)

- (148) something must have been mentioned since I was able to define inclusion in the beginning of this interview but I cannot say that it would have been a key issue in the pedagogical studies (M8-A, 9, 28)
- (149) It was discussed in small group meetings, like in lectures we read articles and discussed the theory and philosophy behind inclusion (M3-B, 10, 8)
- (150) It did not come up last year although there was something mentioned in some courses in general. I found that it focused perhaps too much on disabilities [-] which in my opinion was a wrong approach, we looked into characteristics of disabilities, how could one recognize learning difficulties and such but the pedagogical side of it all [-] was left out (N2-B, 18, 22)
- (151) There was talk about differentiation rather than inclusion (N1-B, 12, 15)
- (152) There has been some lectures [-] mostly we talked about inclusion [-] in small group meetings, how we should differentiate. I found that it was discussed a lot [-] on the whole. From the perspective of differentiation [-] the word has stuck in my mind very effectively (M7-A, 11, 14)
- (153) I remember a series of lectures in the basic studies that dealt with inclusion per se. in my opinion the lectures were provocative on purpose, the starting point was that special education was no longer needed [-] and special education teachers and their expertise were no longer needed, anyone can do [-] this, that I remember (N1-B, 12, 23)
- (154) we had a lecture in the basic studies by ((name censored)) and this is not a direct quote but I believe he/she said that all students with special needs should be integrated into regular classes and a teacher who cannot manage is just lazy [-] and useless. It is his/her style to be provocative but on the other hand if that is the only thing I remember about inclusion then. Besides, everyone may not understand that the purpose is to provoke thoughts [-] In my opinion it does not give a very good impression (N6-A, 5, 7)
- (155) I have to say that the first courses in basic studies during the first year, the lecture courses where one has to keep a diary of what has been learned. I do not have much clue about what has been said in those courses [-] they are a one big blur in my head [-] they lack a connection to anything practical and it may be that something has been mentioned about inclusion but many other big words are introduced at the same time [-] which mean nothing to a freshman and words like that remain, without practical examples [-] it is just intensive theory without any connection to the real world (N6-A, 12, 13)
- (156) A problem about inclusion, which in my opinion stood up in discussions in the pedagogical studies, is that researchers and teachers do not agree with each other [-] there is a lot of juxtaposition and quite a bit of dispute in the comments I have read [-] in the articles in *Opettaja-lehti*, teachers are being reproached quite a lot (M3-B, 12, 24)
- (157) I found that that there was no room for free discussion [-] which was a shame and quite contradictory. If you have a strong opinion on inclusion you should be able to stand criticism and [-] there should be more discussion, now it feels like they told us how things are and that is it (N2-B, 17, 21)
- (158) They make it so distant which contradicts the idea that it is what they encourage us in [-] that we should, or what kind of abilities we should have later in working life (N2-B, 20, 35)
- (159) the theoretical perspective and the ideas provided in lectures at the university differ quite a lot from the reality that I have seen [-] and heard from other teachers [-] there is the teachers' view and the researchers' view on inclusion which do not meet in the middle [-] I think I have to see for myself later how things really progress (M3-B, 4, 27)
- (160) in the actual training we started talking about differentiation with practical examples, like now you have three students who have dyslexia who do not really speak Finnish [-] and now you have to cooperate with a special education teacher and plan lessons for these three students (M3-B, 10, 11)
- (161) the instructors in teacher training could give examples and tips based on their teaching experience on how to use the same teaching material for learners of different levels (N1-B, 12, 10)

(162) There were no such situations in teacher training, all my teaching groups were quite normal [-] I did not encounter any so called difficult students or students with special needs (N4-B, 3, 6)

(163) In teacher training lessons there were students who were in need of help from a special education teacher in most subjects [-] they went to see him/her occasionally but studied in the regular class for most of the time. But they (teachers) did not call it inclusion, they just said that they come and go and blablabla (M8-A, 9, 33)

(164) For example, I have many different concepts of [-] what inclusion could mean. I mean, who defines what kind of class is inclusive [-] since classes are so diverse already (N1-B, 12, 31)

(165) No. That is ((laughter)) for sure. I am not sure if I should say this but certain people believe that our education should give us all the prerequisites to teach any student [-] I have to say that if I were to teach a class where there was an autistic student, I would have to study about autism beforehand in order to know how to deal with that student (N2-B, 18, 11)

(166) One can read about how to define them (learning difficulties) but how to actually deal with and help a student with special needs then. There might be no right answers to it but just something concrete [-] that was missing (N2-B, 18, 31)

(167) It (inclusion) should be connected to real life. That may be the biggest issue (M3-B, 10, 22)

(168) I would add more of it (special pedagogy). I find that it could be of use to everyone. There would not have to be everything about special pedagogy but some sort of introduction of what it is and [-] I find that people who have studied special pedagogy can use their knowledge as an advantage when working in a classroom, I find it very useful (M3-B, 11, 7)

(169) In my opinion there should be more special pedagogy included [-] not as much as there is for students studying special pedagogy. But that they would not just say that we have different learners and students with special needs [-] I need practical examples (N5-A, 11, 10)

(170) I would hope that Norssi took more responsibility [-] because teaching provided by Norssi was far more useful, I mean it had an effect on how one performed in training lessons [-] compared to lectures elsewhere. I would emphasize the Norssi side of the studies more (M3-B, 10, 26)

(171) I would add more training outside the teacher training school, a possibility to go out in the field and get experiences [-] instead of sitting through lectures and writing reports [-] and wonder whether inclusion is good or not [-] without having any actual experiences of it (N1-B, 13, 23)

(172) I feel like more and more children are diagnosed for learning difficulties and ADHD and ADD and what not [-] and also dyslexia and all that, it would be nice if they would be focused on in a way that you could see how they present themselves in reality. and what is the reality in secondary schools in Finland, is inclusion the model or is it something else (N6-A, 14, 21)

(173) Would it be a bad idea to train together with a special education teacher in pedagogical studies [-] or something like that. Because I feel that the teacher training is the most essential part of teacher education on the whole (M3-B, 11, 30)

(174) It would be useful if there was be an opportunity to train or do something else together with (students of/Department of) special pedagogy (N2-B, 20, 28)

(175) teacher training year was very rewarding and educational but I think there could have been. Or it should be obligatory to visit small groups (special education groups) to see what it is really like to work with students with severe special needs. Many future teachers did not get that chance in their training [-] they have no experience of what it could be like in their future work (N4-B, 11, 30)

(176) There could have been more of it (special pedagogy). But I believe that one has to revise many things later in working life when new things are being encountered [-] of course it would be of use to

have some sort of a theory base but one has to revise things later anyway so I am not too sorry that we did not have it that much (N4-B, 11, 6)

(177) I expect that it is being talked about because it seems to be a hot topic these days [-] I do not expect to see or learn any magic tricks [-] Or anything too practical for that matter, just that the topic is discussed and left for students themselves to ponder, how they would act in a certain situation (M7-A, 12, 1)

(178) On the basis of my earlier experiences of teacher education I expect to hear a whole lot more theoretical nonsense and very little anything concrete [-] It seems to be the way things work, ideological and 'this is how things should be' kind of matters are being discussed [-] but very little anything practical is being brought up, like how to deal with students with special needs, what are the ways that work in a specific situation (N6-A, 14, 11)

(179) I believe that it is being talked about to some extent (special pedagogy), but it is not really included in our studies because it a subject of its own [-] I believe some themes are squeezed into discussion because it is natural (M7-A, 12, 12)

(180) I would hope to learn all sorts of things but I do not really have any expectations, except perhaps of teacher training [-] if there happens to be students who are in need of special attention [-] that way it could become more familiar. I do not think that teacher education deals with that kind of issues (N5-A, 11, 1)

(181) I find that it mocks the whole educational group of teachers because the message it sends says what are you complaining about. Everyone can do it. So I do not agree with that, it always requires, oh well (M3-B, 12, 4)

(182) Well, first I would like to question 'ordinary'. I mean that teaching method, technique whatever, what is ordinary. That has not been very well defined, it is a poor definition to begin with [-] I do not really agree with the statement ((laughter)) to be honest (N2-B, 19, 24)

(183) Hmm ((laughter)) I think our teacher education does not teach about versatile teaching methods [-] Like, they are talked about but the way they are used has not come up so far (N6-A, 15, 1)

(184) The statement has been written by someone who does not work as a teacher everyday (M3-B, 12, 4)

(185) It is a provocative statement ((laughter)) It is a sublime claim. It may not be necessarily connected to the reality which teachers have to face each day with the average students (M3-B, 12, 1)

(186) That is not completely true. No, I do not think that teacher education teaches the means that are needed in the actual work. Teaching is learned through practice and experience [-] one might get some sort of prerequisites but no, I believe that the actual learning takes place later (N4-B, 12, 1)

(187) if you think about any group or any kind of learning, teacher education can provide only a taste of what the actual work is like. teaching is learned through the work, learning by doing [-] I think that teacher education is quite far from the reality in schools (N1-B, 14, 3)

(188) In my opinion that is not true. There should be more information about autism, Asperger's and of sorts. I have not completed my pedagogical studies yet so [-] they are not talked about that much. And there should be more concrete examples of syndromes and disabilities, as well as normal issues such as hyper-activity; well alright normal and abnormal [-] I mean advice on how teachers can succeed in providing those students similar learning experiences. Because inclusion does not make any sense if students with any kinds of special needs cannot get anything out of the teaching, or do not learn anything (N5-A, 11, 25)

(189) That is not true. Because if you have different learners then you have different teachers [-] every teacher does not possess the prerequisites for it (M8-A, 10, 39)

(190) But no, it depends on the person, everyone does not have it in them[-] Education alone cannot guarantee that, because it is so much about meeting people and teaching different learners. I do not believe that teacher education alone can prepare everyone for it (M7-A, 12, 31)

(191) Well, of course I could do it. But why would we have a subject called special pedagogy if that is the case. As a statement that is, well. I believe that is what teacher education is aiming at, that the situation would be like that [-] because one can study special pedagogy here, is it kind of waste of time to add it to our education as well (M7-A, 12, 23)

(192) Some people believe that special education teachers are not needed, but I do not agree with it. They have the expertise for their own work which is much needed. In my opinion the ideal is that co-operation between special education teachers and elementary school or subject teachers would work [-] and that teachers would not have to manage alone (N2-B, 19, 35)

(193) I am sure that everyone could manage but it would be very hard for teachers [-] and would take away time from all the other tasks that are included in a teacher's work [-] there are students who have problems which are not related to learning, other responsibilities [-] all that and if one has to take care of everything by himself/herself then. It is far more difficult than how it is made to sound in that statement (M3-B, 12, 8)

(194) In a way I believe that a teacher could manage, that there is nothing that would prevent a teacher from coping in an inclusive classroom but in that case that teacher would have had to get more education [-] teacher education should offer means to do it if inclusion is what is being aimed at [-] oh, but they do offer the means if one chooses to study special education as a minor subject (N6-A, 15, 6)

(195) I cannot make a difference between inclusion and integration (M8-A, 2, 26)

(196) same as (2)

(197) In my opinion inclusion means having just one group, there is one group. And, for example, in schools they try to keep students with special needs in a regular class as much as possible (N4-B, 2, 27)

(198) There are no separate special education classes (N5-A, 2, 22)

(199) same as (13)

(200) same as (14)

(201) same as (16)

(202) If there are people who have learning difficulties, who learn in a different pace. There should be equally challenging tasks for everyone (M7-A, 4, 10)

(203) same as (22)

(204) To be honest, I really do not know (M7-A, 4, 10)

(205) First, there is the normal remedial education, then part-time special education occasionally, in the classroom with support or somewhere outside the classroom [-] with a special education teacher. Assistant in the class (N1-B, 3, 5)

(206) At least there is the individualization of teaching (M8-A, 3, 7)

(207) Maybe small groups (M7-A, 4, 37)

(208) There is a possibility to build separate learning spaces inside the classroom with screens (N1-B, 3, 8)

(209) Universal, intensified and special support, those are the three and the universal is [-] well, universal support means how one can help a student in a regular classroom or that is how I see it [-] there may be an individualized study plan in the intensified, oh gosh. At least when special support is concerned the need for support should be evaluated again every twelve, or was it six months. It is not too easy to end up there (N2-B, 6, 20)

(210) I do not know what kind of support there is (N5-A, 4, 7)

(211) I am just wondering about the resources [-] how they will give in (N2-B, 7, 7)

(212) same as (41)

(213) same as (42)

(214) same as (44)

(215) I suppose it would require co-teaching and having two teachers in the same class, that kind of a system. Now that it has been talked about (N1-B, 3, 22)

(216) I am not sure if there are material packages for teachers or something like that (N6-A, 5, 21)

(217) It could work but it is not. I mean it is good for the students, an ideal situation even, but not necessarily for teachers (N5-A, 5, 1)

(218) It should be put into practice in the name of equality. I think schools represent the idea that everyone can join and take part equally (M3-B, 4, 15)

(219) With proper support and resources it could work brilliantly [-] but now if it is being pushed through with a wrong agenda the whole idea is doomed (N5-A, 12, 11)

(220) same as (60)

(221) same as (61)

(222) It should not be an emot- or mental burden on teachers (M7-A, 6, 1)

(223) I am beginning to wonder if my subject really counts if there are so many bigger things that need to be [-] taken care of and need supporting [-] that might be it (N1-B, 6, 3)

(224) I have understood that there are so many different learners in special education classes, there are learning difficulties and other issues and they are all grouped together as one group. It might be that someone has dyslexia and the other one a mild disability but they are all the same stigmatized as different and special education students (N6-A, 7, 1)

(225) I am not sure how I feel about it, should we emphasize segregate special education more than integration. Even though integration could enrich learning and teaching and students' experiences of, quotation marks, different people [-] there has to be some sense to it, as I am sure there is. It should not harm, it feels terrible to say this [-] but harm most of the group (M7-A, 5, 29)

(226) Of course there would be a person trained to work as a special education expert (N6-A, 6, 36)

(227) It has not been too visible because. I cannot even recall where the special education class in our elementary school was [-] or who the special education teacher was. I have no recollection whatsoever (N6-A, 8, 1)

(228) same as (81)

(229) If I think about when I was attending school it seems that they took students one at a time (N2-B, 13, 4)

(230) same as (84)

(231) When I had this work experience training (TET), it was so long ago that I hardly remember. But there were children who were not disabled but they had behavioral issues and problems with their conduct. And I remember that the class was so wild that I was a bit shocked even (N5-A, 6, 6)

(232) same as (88)

(233) when I had my teacher training in the basic studies there was this one kid in our English lessons who was in part-time special education [-] He/she seemed very motivated which made me think that this kind of part-time inclusion is actually quite a good thing (M8-A, 5, 3)

(234) Of course it still depends on the size of the school, but I think that special education is done in small groups

(235) I would think that money was saved ((sighs)) if we started to think that anyone can [-] this is just a person working with another person [-] money will be saved (N1-B, 6, 27)

(236) Maybe it is good for the society as well. I think it could prevent discrimination (M3-B, 7, 7)

(237) Well, social advantages [-] people would learn to meet other kinds of people than, quotation marks, normal (M7-A, 7, 38)

(238) It could be useful in the future in the light of interaction and communication (M7-A, 8, 3)

(239) same as (98)

(240) They can be with their own group and bond with others, socialize [-] Of course that is a good thing (N4-B, 7, 2)

(241) Well then there's multiprofessional co-operation [-] if schools have funds to hire special education teachers and assistants that is. Then it would be an ideal method (N2-B, 31)

(242) Perhaps it could increase teachers' own learning (N1-B, 6, 33)

(243) Teaching languages has to do with culture. If there are students from different cultures then you get authentic examples (M7-A, 10, 12)

(244) Would inclusion change the current situation that much [-] because there are always the wild ones and there are the quiet ones (N5-A, 8, 9)

(245) same as (105)

(246) same as (106)

(247) same as (108)

(248) I am not sure, but there could be a need to make adjustments to the classroom (N4-B, 8, 3)

(249) Of course it could be a burden on some students, naturally depending on the person (M7-A, 9, 18)

(250) same as (114)

(251) A challenge in the work of language teachers is that all students come from a different background (M7-A, 10, 21)

- (252) If there is only one teacher present it might not be possible to take into account the needs of all students. It is challenging, of course (M8-A, 7, 16)
- (253) There is a challenge, it good be both a good and a bad thing. It depends on what one has studied and whether one has studied special pedagogy and does one feel it is the kind of thing (N6-A, 11, 9)
- (254) Practical challenges such as keeping order (M8-A, 4, 4)
- (255) same as (122)
- (256) I find it makes teaching just more difficult [-] from a teacher's perspective, because you have to take into account all kinds of students [-] so many different students or learners (N4-B, 7, 7)
- (257) Differentiation causes quite a lot of extra work (M3-B, 7, 28)
- (258) If each section of language skills has to be evaluated, or if you think that the four sections are seen as one bigger entity [-] but one student cannot do two of those at all, what do you do (N1-B, 9, 24)
- (259) There is a need to consult a special education teacher, and I think I would want to do that to make my work easier and to facilitate the situation of my students (N4-B, 8, 24)
- (260) same as (132)
- (261) Advantages maybe. It is really hard to come up with any practical advantages about increasing workload (N6-A, 11, 6)
- (262) I suppose elementary school teachers have much more interaction with their group and inclusion is therefore easier [-] or faster or more natural for them [-] and I believe elementary school teachers know their students better in general (M7-A, 10, 31)
- (263) same as (138)
- (264) how well do I get to know [-] any students if they sit through my lessons for four hours a week
- (265) same as (145)
- (266) same as (148)
- (267) same as (149)
- (268) same as (150)
- (269) same as (151)
- (270) I found that very provocative themes were brought up, for example in lectures [-] last year. And you could see that it really churned feelings (N2-B, 17, 20)
- (271) same as (157)
- (272) same as (158)
- (273) It has been talked about theoretically and with mean values [-] the way it has been talked about here could never be put into practice (N5-A, 10, 6)
- (274) same as (161)

(275) Norssi is an ideal school and the short training there feels too easy, because on the basis of my own experiences the situation there is quite different from the situation in any of the real schools (N6-A, 13, 11)

(276) there are immigrants and all, is that not enough ((laughter)) already [-] for an inclusive class or what else should there be [-] so that one could call it an inclusive class (N1-B, 13, 2)

(277) same as (165)

(278) It is not sufficient, that is for sure. I was hoping that someone came and told us how it was done. Now it is really abstract (N1-B, 12, 28)

(279) Maybe a little. But, yes. Less drawing and more special pedagogy (N4-B, 11, 20)

(280) same as (170)

(281) same as (171)

(282) I hope that it would go like this: we would listen to a lecture in Musica103 and there someone, name censured ((laughter)) would tell us the principles and aims of inclusion, why it is such a good thing, and show some study findings. Then we could go to Norssi and see a situation where inclusion was actually used (M8-A, 10, 27)

(283) same as (174)

(284) same as (176)

(285) same as (177)

(286) same as (179)

(287) same as (169)

(288) (same as (181))

(289) ((laughter)) how does one define versatile teaching methods. Well, I disagree completely (N1-B, 14, 1)

(290) same as (185)

(291) same as (188)

(292) same as (189)

(293) same as (191)

(294) same as (194)