2

From Historical Roots to Future Perspectives towards Inclusive Education

Debates, Policy and Practice

Berit H. Johnsen

Introduction

When the principle of inclusion was internationally introduced in UNESCO's Salamanca Declaration (1994), the idea of having one school for all children, with or without special educational needs and disabilities, had been debated for many years. Amongst the leading notions in this discourse were concepts such as the school for all, education for all and integration. A thorough understanding of the principle of inclusion would therefore gain from revisiting these basic concepts. However, neither inclusion nor the three abovementioned concepts are defined once and for all. As all other concepts, they are not static, but dynamic and changeable within various professional and scientific discourses as well as within different cultures and at different times in history. In this article inclusion is seen as the global policy prescribing development towards a local regular school that welcomes all children with their unique individual characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs; all children with and without special needs and disabilities; a school combating discriminatory attitudes, and providing a meaningful and individually adapted education to every pupil within the community of the class (Johnsen, 2013a).

This text focuses on debates, policies and practices involving educational inclusion in Norway. It is addressed to international research colleagues and professionals. The subsequent discussion is situated in Norwegian culture and

Citation of this chapter: Johnsen, B.H. (2020) Doing Research. Theoretical and Methodological Considerations and Choices. In B. H. Johnsen (Ed.), *Theory and Methodology in International Comparative Classroom Studies* (pp.18-36/ pp.16-34 in print edition). Cappelen Damm Akademisk. https://doi.org./10.23865/noasp.130

history of educational ideas albeit with a view to other cultures. The article's structure may be outlined with three sentences: It takes as the point of departure the first known statement about a school for all or the roots of the modern basic school free of charge, following this track until it disappears at the same time as this basic school is extended with several additional subjects and takes over the educational arena from private schools, becoming over time characterised by the notion of the unified school. Next, the article outlines the subsequent turn from segregation towards the new school for all and inclusion within legislation and national curricula in light of a general Norwegian context. This is followed by a discussion of a slow and hesitant transfer from "inclusion by law" towards "inclusion in practice", pointing to challenges and opportunities.

A school for all: Historical roots

European education is generally considered to have its known origins in ancient Greece. Since then, different kinds of education have seen the light of day, mostly in families who could afford to invest in their children's education at home or in institutions. When did the idea of a school for all children appear? It seems to have emerged with the Enlightenment or modern times.

In a European context regular school legislation in the twin realms Denmark[1] and Norway has an extraordinarily long history since the royal decrees made by King Christian VI in 1739. The decrees were identical except for the different names of the two countries. The stated intentions were to establish schools free of charge all over the country so that all and everybody, both boys and girls, also the poorest of children, would obtain sufficient education. What was sufficient education? According to the decree and related royal instructions, the content in this early elementary school was reading acquisition and texts with explanations of selected Christian doctrines so that the children were prepared for further training for confirmation. The decree marks the legislative establishment of an uninterrupted line of development up to the current Norwegian joint elementary-, lower and upper secondary school of ten + three years duration, even though this development has at times been slow (Johnsen, 2000a).

The foundation of "the school for all and everybody" was a huge innovation project at that time as it would have been today, too. Where did King Christian

1. Several Danish historians choose to mention a later and much more detailed decree issued in 1814 as forming the establishment of the Danish non-payment elementary school.

VI and his court get the ideas for the project? What were the incentives for it? In retrospect, a combination of two main trends was specifically influential.

1) Cameralistic financial policy claimed that education was important for economic growth. Thus, being able to read became an important skill at the beginning transmission from subsistence economy to an increasing division of labour (Markussen, 1991).

2) Christian Lutheran Pietism was the state religion, and the King and his selected court were dedicated Pietists. A main pillar of Pietism was that religion was a matter between the single person and God. The road to salvation went through enlightenment or the light of knowledge. Moreover, a basic means to reaching this direct connection was the ability to read religious main-texts. A reading acquisition programme was therefore necessary in order to facilitate each individual's responsibility before God (Johnsen, 2000a).

What did they mean by a school for all' and everybody when the decree was issued in 1739? Did they mean absolutely all children, or were some children not accounted for, even not thought about in this very early decree, which was in fact an "educational act"? These questions are discussed in the following.

What became of the school for all in the development of the unified school?

As argued in the introduction, each country follows its own paths on the inclusion and meeting children's different and special education needs. In the case of Norway, the establishment of the first school for all and everybody in the form of a school free of charge for both girls and boys marked the direction for the further development of official school policy. Thus, related to the key concept of the 'school for all', another notion turned into a basic principle for debate and development throughout the centuries up until today, namely the 'unified school'[2]. This concept represents a principle pertinent for giving a further historical perspective on changes in the Norwegian educational system. The principle may be dated back to the early nineteenth century during which Frederik M. Bugge (1806–1853) became the first scholar to make a holistic plan

2. The term 'unified school' is a translation of the Norwegian word "enhetsskolen" applied in English by Rust (1989) in his book about the democratic tradition and evolution of schooling in Norway.

for a Norwegian educational system from the elementary to university level. He brought the ideas home from continental Europe and the Prussian educator and philosopher Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835). Bugge's plan for the unified school was a systematic organisation of all levels of education within a national framework. His plans had little to do with what is today called educational equality, as at that time the great majority of pupils only attended elementary schools financed by their municipalities, whereas children of a small number of wealthy families attended private elementary schools before they went on to pursue education (Grue-Sørensen, 1969; 1972; Høigård & Ruge, 1971; Høverstad, 1930; Johnsen, 2000a; 2001b; Lüth, 1997; Myhre, 1970).

However, one of Bugge's successors, Ole Vig, a poor crofter family's son holding a teaching certificate, introduced aims and content which would greatly expand the existing free or non-payment primary school. He introduced a new name; "Folkeskolen" for this school, meaning the people's school, clarifying the term "folk":

> By "The people" we should be aware that we are in fact not thinking about a single "stand" or a class of people. The peasantry alone does not constitute the people, just as little as town citizens and officials do. No, when we speak about the Norwegian people, we mean every single "mother's soul" between Lindesnæs and Nordkap, between Kjølen and the North Sea, whether they are found in towns or rural areas, as long as they do not explicitly reject our "fatherland and mother tongue". The highest civil servant in the capital belongs to the people as well as the poorest fisherman on a lonely rock, and when we therefore speak about public enlightenment, we are primarily thinking about enlightenment that is useful and necessary for the whole people, and suits all[3] (Ole Vig in *Folkevennen*, 1852a:5–6).

This poor but eager spokesman for full democracy – in times when only men of wealth or property had the right to vote – went on, clarifying which ones of the existing types of schools should be considered "folkeskoler", namely all primary and secondary schools, both tuition-based and non-payment schools, and the newly established teacher training colleges, in short, all schools where education was conveyed through the people's mother tongue and did not have scholarly "Bildung" (such as the so-called 'Latin schools') as its main goal (Vig, 1852b). He discussed the content of "folkeskolen" in a large number of articles. Vig's vision was to extend the curriculum by including several secular subjects. The free, non-payment school should develop the same standard of quality as the private

3. Translated to English by the author of this article.

schools offered. Inspired by British liberalism and German romantic philosophy, the Danish theologian and educational philosopher Nikolai Grundtvig's (1783 – 1872) ideas about "the school of interest" and "the live storytelling", and, most of all, his own experience of Norwegian culture, Vig argued that amongst all school subjects, three should be main subjects, namely mother tongue, history and religion (Johnsen, 2000a). In this way Vig's "folkeskole" vision represented a groundbreaking extension of the notion of a 'unified school'.

Large parts of Vig's visions became political reality with the passage of several new "Folkeskole"-Acts towards the end of the nineteenth century. They secured a free secular and religious primary education of seven years' duration all over the country. This improvement became a reality as male peasants, who had enjoyed the right to vote since the introduction of the modern Norwegian Constitution in 1814, became increasingly conscious of their political strength and established their own political party, the Left Party.

An important question from current perspectives of educational inclusion is what had become of the principle of 'the school for all' during the almost one and half centuries since the 1739- Decree. Legislative revisions during this time span indicate that educational authorities gradually became aware of the fact that there were some children who appeared unable to learn to read. It may seem that children with various difficulties and disabilities had become more visible as the school grew in content and expectations. The new "folkeskole" acts explicitly demonstrated that some groups of children were now seen as problems for the school whose curriculum had been greatly expanded. At the same time as the large majority of Norwegian children were given much better schooling, some children were excluded. They were 1) children with serious contagious diseases (such as tuberculosis), 2) children with serious learning difficulties and 3) children exhibiting such bad behaviour that they spoiled their own learning and were bad role models for other children (Johnsen, 2000a; Lov, 1889a; 1889b). Thus, in accordance with the new legislation, the school was not for all anymore, but for those children only who could meet the school's requirements.

A few years before the "Folkeskole" acts were passed, the first Norwegian special school act was passed. In this way that the growing awareness for "curing and training" persons with disabilities had spread from the cradle of special education in Paris to most European countries and reached Norway, that was the last of the three Scandinavian countries to establish this type of school. At that time the first remedial class for "neglected and negligent children" had also been established in a regular town school; an organisational model that was adopted

by an increasing number of schools in the years to come. Three special school acts were adopted within a timespan of just under a century and an increasing number of children with different special needs received education, albeit in segregated schools or classes. (Indst. O. No. 12.,1881; Johnsen, 2000a; 2000b; 2001b; Lov, 1915; 1951; Thorsteinsen, 1974).

It was not until the turn of the twentieth century that the principle of the unified school came to mean that the school was free of fees for pupils from all societal levels from elementary school and throughout further education. This milestone was reached due to another political force, which was the establishment and growth of the Norwegian labour movement. The consequence was that nearly all schools with tuition-fees were closed down (Dokka 1974; 1983; Høigård & Ruge 1971; Johnsen, 2000b). From this time on it has been a main characteristic of the Norwegian school that the professor's son and the factory worker's daughter sit side by side in the classroom. The phenomenon that children of families from all societal levels and cultural groups are together in the same school may be one main reason for the relatively egalitarian society in Norway.

During the twentieth century the content of the principle of the unified school was further expanded and related to the idea about a school for all'. In the nineteen-seventies the term unified school covered all pupils regardless of their economic or social status, geographical location, cultural background, gender or **ability** (Østvold, 1975). With the rapid changes taking place in recent decades as Norwegian society becomes more international, the principle is again extended to also include multiethnicity and multilingualism (Johnsen, 2001b).

The 1960s and the turn towards a revitalised school for all

What became of the notion of the school for all'? It reappeared in conjunction with two other central concepts in the 1960s, namely the notions of normalisation and integration, concepts that focused on educational as well as social conditions in general. At that time the widespread practice of placing persons with disabilities in institutions began to be seriously questioned. Particularly in densely populated countries, institutions were large and often isolated from the rest of society. Thus, when the two pioneers, Niels Bank-Mikkelsen from Denmark and Bengt Nirje from Sweden, presented a new organisational principle using the notion of normalisation in their visit to North-America, it soon

became an international principle (Bank-Mikkelsen, 1980; Johnsen, 2001a; Nirje, 1980; Wolfensberger, 1980). Nirje (1980:32–33) described the principle in the following way:

> Normalization means sharing a normal rhythm of the day, with privacy, activities, and mutual responsibilities; a normal rhythm of the week, with a home to live in, a school or work to go to, and leisure time with a modicum of social interaction; a normal rhythm of the year, with the changing modes and ways of life and of family and community customs as experienced in the different seasons of the year.

A huge wave of dissidence now rolled over international discourse, focusing on the vulnerability of institutions to neglect, abuse and cover up, and of isolated life conditions for children and adults with disabilities. The wave hit medical and special education institutions as well as orphanages on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. In Norway, journalists revealed harsh and unethical conditions for children with developmental impairment. Parents started to organise in nongovernmental organisations (NGOs). NFU – Norwegian Association for People with Developmental Disabilities, which was founded in 1967, had and has on their main agenda equal rights, the local school for all and inclusion.

When it comes to education, Norway led the Nordic turn towards normalisation through the so-called Blom Report (KUF, 1970). In this White Paper the principle of integration was introduced explicitly and given a description. The criteria of integration were the following:

a) Belongingness in a social community
b) Participation in the benefits of the community
c) Joint responsibility for tasks and obligations

Thus the notion of integration had found its way into Norwegian policy papers as well as been given an explicit conceptual description. Consequently, the third and last Norwegian "special school" act was abolished, and matters concerning special education needs were integrated into the Educational Act in 1975. The new main principle was that all children without exception should be covered by the same educational act. The principle was described in more detail in the Act of 1969/75 and in the current act (Education Act, 1969/75; 1999/05).

The integration of special needs education into regular educational legislation on the preschool, elementary and secondary level was a result of many years of public information and debate, advocated by special needs educators, politicians, parents and user organisations. The Norwegian NFU and the Nordic Cooperation Council (NSR) arranged a series of symposia where focus was

directed to political principles as well as practical consequences of decentralising education and other welfare services to local schools and municipalities[4]. They named their main principle **the school for all** in the local community for all. As mentioned, this time the principle of the school for all contained the same main aim as the principle of the unified school had come to represent, namely that the regular local school should include all pupils regardless of their ability or special needs. This revisited and revitalised concept of the school for all was adopted in Norwegian policy papers and legislation (Education Act 1969/75; 1999/05; M 1987; L 1997).

Aspects of the abovementioned educational principles have been, and still are, in focus of educational discourse in Norway as well as internationally under several headings or formulations such as comprehensive schools, mixed-ability teaching and mainstreaming as well as normalisation, integration and education for all. However, a large gap between claimed and actual integration and development of schools for all without exceptions led to a devaluation of the concepts' content. In Norway, the rhetorical question "If the school is for all, who are the others?" became a slogan for criticism of interpretation of the law as well as school practice. Internationally, the criticism resulted in the introduction of a new concept, namely the notion of inclusion, also called educational inclusion or the inclusive school[5]. Thus, this last shift in terminology may be seen as criticism of the half-heartedness characterising local regular schools when they were opened only to certain groups of pupils with special needs, or when special classes or special schools were organised as special units within regular schools.

What, then, are the main ideas behind the principle of the inclusive school? They may be described in the following statements:

- Every child belongs to their local community and a regular class or group
- The school day is organised with a great amount of educational differentiation, co-operative learning tasks and flexibility with regard to choice of content
- Teachers and special needs educators co-operate and have educational knowledge of general, special as well as individual learning strategies and tutoring needs, and of how to appreciate the plurality of individual differences in organising class activities.

4. http://www.nfunorge.org/no
5. See also the UNESCO Salamanca Statement of 1994.

Educational practice in accordance with these statements requires a radical turn from traditional discipline-centred to child-centred education and from one-sided discipline or norm-related assessment of the pupil's learning results to assessment of individual progress. All in all, inclusive education is much more dynamic and complex than traditional discipline-centred practice (Johnsen, 2001c; 2014b). However, it is doubtful that a regular school with inclusive orientation will "… improve … the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system", as proclaimed in UNESCO's Salamanca Statement, section 2 (1994). The profound educational turnaround from traditional, discipline-centred to inclusive practices requires major changes in mentality, knowledge and skills regarding class, school and municipality or state level as well as in higher education of regular teachers and special needs educators, even when inclusion-friendly legislation is in place. It involves making radical changes in the school system, more specifically in each school and classroom. This type of change is pervasive and takes time.

The current Norwegian national educational system

In what way does the Norwegian national educational system support the principle of the school for all and inclusion? How do laws and national curricula intend to fulfil the criteria of inclusion today and in the immediate future? Three pillars of current Norwegian education acts and national curricula outline the principle framework for the school for all or the inclusive school in the local society for all:

1. The School shall have room for everybody and teachers must therefore have an eye for each individual learner. The mode of teaching must not only be adapted to subject and content, but also to age and maturity, the individual learner and the mixed abilities of the entire class (L, 1997:35)

This passage secures the right of all children to attend their own local regular school. As mentioned earlier, this right was first pronounced in the Educational Act (1969/75. See also Educational Act, 1999/2005, section13–1).

2. Teaching shall be adapted to the abilities and aptitudes of individual pupils, apprentices and trainees (Educational Act, 1999/2005, section 1–2)

The current act of 1999 covers for the first time elementary, lower and upper secondary educational levels – both vocational education and programmes for general studies. Thus, it applies to all children and youth; pupils, apprentices and trainees, as mentioned in the above quotation.

3. Pupils who either do not or are unable to benefit satisfactory from ordinary instruction have the right to special education (Educational Act, 1999/2005, section 5–1). The right to special education is described in more details in following sections of the act.

As already indicated, the current Educational Act (1999/2005) relates to primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education and also including adult education at the level of knowledge compatible to primary- and lower secondary education. It also contains the same rights to special needs education on all levels, including preschool age. In addition to the core principles quoted above, the Act describes special regulations such as securing the right to use the Braille sign system. Several minority languages have their own national curricula, such as sign language and Sami languages.

These statements in current Educational Act and National Curriculum demonstrate that Norwegian educational legislation has taken many fundamental steps towards the realisation of equal rights to meaningful and individually adapted education within the collective of the local regular school. The crucial question is how each municipality and school practices these principles.

This being said, it is important to have an overview of the Norwegian educational system's structure in order to be able to compare it with other countries' systems. As an elongated, yet small country with approximately five million inhabitants, the same legislation and educational structure is applied on a national level. However, the responsibility for the school lies with the little more than four hundred municipalities (primary- and lower secondary school) and twenty counties ("fylker": upper secondary school). Governmental institutions monitor whether the schools are administered within the national legislative frameworks. The Norwegian school system of today is divided into the following levels:

- Kindergarten: ages one to six years
- Primary and lower secondary school: ages six to sixteen
- Upper secondary school: ages sixteen to nineteen (twenty-one)
- College and University education
- Adult education (at all educational levels)

Decentralisation is an old tradition in Norway with its sparsely populated demography combined with the political principle of equal rights for everyone. This relates to educational policy and administration as well. All children one year and over have the right to attend kindergarten (Kindergarten Act, 2005/2009). While municipalities and parents share the financial responsibility for the kindergartens, schools are, as mentioned, free of charge.

Compared with other countries, there are very few private schools in Norway; however, they may be approved and given state grants if they fulfil educational laws and national curricula. Private institutions are more common at the kindergarten level, in higher education and adult education.

With this backdrop of the inclusive school-legislation, the question is how special needs education is organised on the different educational levels. At the kindergarten level the great majority of children with special needs attend regular kindergarten groups, receiving special needs education support either in dyads or small groups, but most often in the ordinary kindergarten group. The preferred organisation in the elementary- and lower secondary school, in accordance with current Education Act, is that each pupil attends school in his or her age group and that pupils with documented special needs are awarded additional resources within the class, outside the group and/or combined with small group education. Schools, as a rule, have additional resources to provide "courses" in reading, writing and arithmetic for pupils who need extra time and support. When more specialised support is needed, the pupils' special needs are assessed in within their school and at the municipality's Educational-Psychological Service (EPC). This is only done with the consent of and in collaboration with parents. The EPC is responsible for documenting any special needs and supporting the school with individual recommendations concerning educational intentions, content and instruction approaches (Educational Act, 1999/2005). It is preferable that each school has its own special needs educator, and many schools employ teachers having one semester to two years of further higher education in special needs support or the equivalent. Thus, special needs education support is in principle available to the single school and pupil provided that the EPC has assessed and documented the needs for additional resources due to special educational needs. Who are employed at the municipalities' EPCs? Three related professional disciplines allocate this kind of responsibility: 1) special needs education with expertise within different areas, such as speech therapy, psychosocial difficulties and intellectual challenges, to mention a few; 2) school psychology; and 3) education; all on Masters level.

What should be done if the EPC does not have the required expertise on hand? Then, they are obliged to search for support from the National Support System for Special Education (http://www.statped.no), where more intense updating and specialisation within various relevant fields are carried out. Cooperation with other institutions such as within medicine, psychiatry (http://www.bupbarn.no) and child welfare occurs frequently.

How the right to education for all is met at all educational levels? While primary- and lower secondary education is an obligatory right and duty for all children, all young adults are guaranteed admission to upper secondary school after finishing the lower secondary level (Education Act, 1999/2005). The upper secondary level is divided into thirteen foundation courses offering vocational and/or academic education. Classes with theoretical subjects may contain from 20 to 30 pupils, whereas vocational subjects are taught in classes of 10 to 15 pupils. The great majority of pupils with documented special educational needs on upper secondary level attend one of the regular foundation courses with individually adapted support. An amendment to the Education Act provides the right to so-called partial competence or competence at a lower level to pupils with special needs (Tangen, 2012; Education Act, 1999/2005: section 3–3). In addition there are smaller educational units for some of the pupils with severe and multiple disabilities. Pupils with recognised disabilities have the possibility of spending up to five years at this level instead of the usual three. According to information from the Ministry of Education, Research and the Church, 3,6 % of the pupils between 16 and 19 years of age receive education based on assessed needs for specially adapted courses (KUF, 1996b). Quite a number of pupils with and without special educational needs use four or five years to complete this educational level. The drop-out rate in the years 1999 – 2001 was estimated to be around 30 % (Støren, Helleland & Grøgaard, 2007). This means that approximately 70 % of the pupil population at this age level succeeded in completing upper secondary education. Innovation projects in order to increase the success rate represent a step in the right direction in current national action plan against poverty (Buland, Havn, Finbak & Dahl, 2007).

Nearly all institutions of higher education in Norway are run by the national government. These include six universities, six specialised colleges, and a larger number of state colleges. The ordinary entrance qualification is the final national upper secondary examination. Within higher education each institution is responsible for the provision of advice and assistance to students with special needs. The government has introduced a number of practical measures to pro-

mote equal opportunities regarding access to higher education (KUF, 1996a; 1996b).

In the future larger numbers of pupils with special needs are expected to qualify for higher education due to higher educational quality and increased individual adaptation of education at the primary and secondary levels. As a follow up to this, up to 10 % of study places at state colleges are expected to be reserved for applicants with special needs. This means that once general academic admission requirements are satisfied, applicants with special needs may be exempted from ordinary competition (KUF, 1996b).

Responsibility for administering adult education programmes is divided between authorities at municipal, county and state level as well as private institutions. Adult education consist of schools such as the Folk High schools, adult education associations, language courses for non-Norwegians, labour market courses and education programmes at the primary and lower secondary level, distance education and special needs education. Adult education within the level of comprehension for primary and lower secondary education is free of charge (Education Act, 1999/2005; Johnsen, 2001b).

Undoubtedly, it is quite different to be a child or adolescent with disabilities and special needs in the Norwegian education system today than it was forty years ago, before the turn towards inclusion. However, there is still a gap between the principles of inclusion stated in educational acts and national curricula and the realities in school, as several studies reveal (see Johnsen, 2014c).

Future Perspectives towards Inclusive Education

Official policy is not static, but dynamic and constantly changing. In the Norwegian case the major turn in political reforms towards inclusion took place from the early 1970s on. During the more than forty years after the turn, revisions in educational acts, national curricula and related regulations have mostly, but not always, been directed towards inclusion. Trends and countertrends may be expected in an open and politically democratic society, since many different and even conflicting educational ideas are competing for dominance. Thus, through the years the eagerness for attaining inclusion as well as discussing special needs educational issues has faded from public debate. Other aspects of education and schooling have obtained positions in the foreground. Since the start of the abovementioned PISA assessment programme in 2000 and other similar assessments, Norway's position on these international rankings has been a win-

ner in the media coverage. Consequently, increased emphasis has been placed on teacher education with regard to reading, mathematics and natural science teaching, and less on didactical aspects concerning differentiation, individually adapted curricula and inclusive practices. Thus, media play a prominent role in the interactive triangle between themselves, politicians and voters.

What do the media publish about parents' views of the school for all and inclusion? Two examples from the same day illustrate possible conflicting views: 1) One national newspaper sheds light on needed services for children with disabilities and their families within and outside school (Aftenposten, 22.02.2014). 2) In a competing newspaper a mother argues that children with disabilities should not be in regular schools because they hit and hurt other children (Dagbladet, 22.02.2014). One might ask: Is it 'game over' for inclusion? Several school studies also indicate a clear gap between the ambitious political aims regarding educational inclusion and actual practice in schools (see Johnsen, 2014c). These studies are supported by official information. Thus, according to *The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training* (in Bringsvor, 2013), 92 % of the pupils who receive documented special education attend regular school and class. However, for a majority of them, the special education lessons are arranged outside of class, either in small groups or alone with a teacher or assistant. There are, however, also other participants in the discourse such as the trade journal of the Norwegian Union of Education, *Education*, that has joined hands with the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation (NRK in Bringsvor, 2013); applying investigative journalism in order to document the status for pupils with special educational needs in school. Together these two media sources are starting what might be a new wave of debate about shortcomings in the process of fulfilling the official aims of inclusion.

A combination of critical disclosure of shortcomings and detailed revelations of good examples may act as driving forces in innovative processes. Participants in search of good examples come from different levels of society. Thus, since 2006 Queen Sonja's School Award has been given to a school "… practicing equality and inclusion in such a way that each individual pupil is experiencing to be appreciated in an environment of participation, safety and community" (http://www.kongehuset.no/). Another prize receiving public attention is the annual Jonas prize[6], which has been awarded since 1986 by the Department

6. The Jonas prize is named after the main character in Jens Bjørneboe's novel, *Jonas* (1955), a young boy with reading difficulties.

of Special Needs Education at the University of Oslo. The award is given to a person, organization or institution, and the ranking of candidates for the prize pays particular attention to their contributions to create a more open and tolerant society where human variation and personal characteristics are considered enriching (http://www.uv.uio.no/isp/om/jonasprisen/). Exploring good examples of inclusive practices is also in focus in the Norwegian research community. One example is the longitudinal single case *Classroom Study of Inclusive Practice*s (Johnsen, 2013b). This Norwegian study is also a contribution to a European comparative classroom study project concerning the process towards inclusion (Johnsen, 2013a; SØE 06/02; WB 04/06).

Conclusion

Discourses, policies and practices in the history towards inclusion are the focus of this article on cultural and historical lines and turns of Norwegian education. We have seen how endeavours towards achieving a school for all and, more recently, towards inclusion, appear, disappear and reappear in ever new manifestations and contexts. Opportunities, challenges and obstacles in this process have been outlined, and the gap between solid legislation in favour of inclusion and hesitant practice is a prominent feature. The question has even been raised whether it is 'game over' for inclusion.

History indicates that it may take a long time to bridge the gap between legislation and practice, especially when changes are radical and complex, as the change from a segregated school system to inclusive schools has proven. Norwegian legislation and national curricula have set forth explicit premises for special needs education and inclusion. However, in spite of a growing number of good examples of inclusive practices, class- and subject-centred teaching still seems to have a hold on professional attitudes and practice in many schools. Generally speaking, the road from new principles laid down in legislation to good practice goes through innovation, evaluation, research and dissemination. At the same time radical turning operations such as these are vulnerable to other contextual interests and forces. In this connection it is timely to ask whether educational inclusion has gotten the needed attention and resources within educational as well as special needs educational research. It is not 'game over' for the search towards the inclusive school.

References

Aftenposten (22.02.2014). *Jakten på omsorgen* (The Quest for Care). The author.

Bank-Mikkelsen, N. (1980). Denmark. In R. Flynn & K. Nitsch (Eds.*). Normalization, Social Integration, and Community Services*. (pp. 51–70). Austin, Texas: PRO-ED.

Beyreuther, E. (1957). *Guds levende vitne. August Hermann Francke 1663–1727* (God's Living Witness. August Hermann Francke 1663–1727). Oslo: Indremisjonsforlaget.

Bjørnebo, J. (1955). *Jonas*. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Bringsvor, B. (2013). *Heilt rett å legge ned spesialskulane* (Quite right to close down special schools). http://www.nrk.no/ Published 30.12.2013, kl. 18:08.

Buland, T., Havn, V., Finbak, L. & Dahl, R. (2007). *Intet menneske er en øy. Rapport fra evalueringen av tiltak i Satsing mot frafall* (Report from Evaluation of Actions to Decrease Drop Out). Trondheim: SINTEF.

Dagbladet. (22.02.2014). *Barn som prøvekaniner* (Children as Guinea Pigs). The author.

Dokka, H-J. (1974). Enhetsskoleproblemet i den norske skoles historie. (The Problem of the Unified Shool in Norwegian Educational History). *Kirke og kultur* no.10/1974.

Dokka, H-J. (1983). Enhetsskolevedtaket av 1920 – dets historiske og politiske bakgrunn. (The Unified School Decision in 1920 – Historical and Political Background). In K. Jordheim (Ed.) *Skolen. Årbok for norsk skolehistorie*. NKS-forl.

Education Act (1969) with amendments.

Education Act (1999). Act Relating to Primary and Secondary Education. Last amended 17 June 2005. http://www.regjeringen.no/en/doc/laws/acts/education-act.html?id=213315

Forordning om Skolerne paa Landet i Norge, og hvad Klokkerne og Skoleholderne derfor maa nyde (Decree Relating to the Schools in the Countryside of Norway and What the Parish Clerks and Teachers Therefore May Enjoy). 1739.[7]

Grue-Sørensen, K.(1969). *Opdragelsens historie 1*. (History of Education and Upbringing). Copenhagen: Gyldendals pædagogiske bibliotek.

Grue-Sørensen, K. (1972). *Opdragelsens historie 2 and 3*. (History of Education and Upbringing). Copenhagen: Gyldendals pædagogiske bibliotek.

http://www.kongehuset.no/ Published 01.10.2013.

http://www.statped.no

http://www.uv.uio.no/isp/om/jonasprisen/ Last revised 13. 11. 2013.

Høigard, E. & Ruge, H. (1971). *Den norske skoles historie*. (History of the Norwegian School). Oslo: Cappelen

Høverstad, T. (1930). *Norsk skulesoga. Frå enevelde til folkestyre 1814–1842* (History of the Norwegian School. From Autocracy to Democracy 1814–1842). Oslo: Steenske forlag.

7. The Decree in 1739 concerning the school for all and everybody only covered the countryside. The reason was that the towns of Denmark and Norway already had elementary schools; both payment and nonpayment schools (which did not mean that all children went to school). A main reason is also said to be that the King did not dare to set laws on the powerful town leaders.

Indst. O. No. 12. 1881. *Indstilling fra Kirkekomiteen angaaende den Kgl. Proposition om Udfærdigelse af en Lov om Skoler for abnorme Børn* (White paper from the Church Committee concerning the Royal Proposition on finalizing an Act on Schools for abnormal Children).

Johnsen, B. H. (in press 2014a). Policy and Practice towards Inclusion. From Historical Roots to Future Perspectives towards Inclusive Education. In G, Hensen (Ed.). *Inclusive Education – Perspectives und Entwicklungen im internationalen Vergleich*. Germany: BELTZ.

Johnsen, B. H. (2014b). A Curricular Approach to Inclusive Education. Some Thoughts concerning Practice, Innovation and Research. *Theory and Methodology in International Comparative Classroom Studies*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Johnsen, B. H. (2014c). Otherness, Vulnerability and Inclusion. Julia Kristeva's Political-Ethical Critique and Program concerning Disabilities. In B. H. Johnsen (Ed.). *Theory and Methodology in International Comparative Classroom Studies*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Johnsen, B. H. (2013a). Comparative Classroom Studies towards Inclusion. Joint Research Plan for Cooperation between the Universities of Belgrade, Ljubljana, Sarajevo, Skopje, Tuzla, Zagreb and Oslo. In B. H. Johnsen (Ed.). *Research Project Preparation within Education and Special Needs Education. Introduction to Theory of Science, Project Planning and Research Plans* (pp. 228 – 244). Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Johnsen, B. H. (2013b). Classroom Study of Inclusive Practices. In B. H. Johnsen (Ed.). *Research Project Preparation within Education and Special Needs Education. Introduction to Theory of Science, Project Planning and Research Plans* (pp. 316 – 331). Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Johnsen, B. H. (2001a). Introduction to the History of Special Needs Education towards Inclusion – A Norwegian and European Context. In B. H. Johnsen & M. D. Skjørten (Eds.). *Education – Special Needs Education: An Introduction* (pp. 133 – 154). Oslo: Unipub.

Johnsen, B. H. (2001b). Educational Policies and Debate concerning the School for All and Special Needs Education. In B. H. Johnsen & M. D. Skjørten (Eds.). *Education – Special Needs Education. An Introduction* (pp. 155–172). Oslo: Unipub.

Johnsen, B. H. (2001c). Curricula for the Plurality of Individual Learning Needs. In B. H. Johnsen & M. D. Skjørten (Eds.). *Education – Special Needs Education. An Introduction* (pp. 255–304). Oslo: Unipub.

Johnsen, B. H. (2000a). *Et historisk perspektiv på ideene om en skole for alle* (A Historical Perspective on Ideas about a School for All). Oslo: Unipub.

Johnsen, B. H. (2000b). Idehistorisk perspektiv på spesialpedagogikk i skolen for alle (Idea-Historical Perspective on Special Needs Education in the School for All). In K. Jordheim (Ed.). *Skolen 1999–2000. Årbok for norsk utdanningshistorie* (The School 1999–2000. Yearbook in Norwegian History of Education): 107–126.

Kindergarten Act 2005 with changes in force 2009.

Kramer, D. G. (1885). *A. H. Francke's Pädagogische Schriften*. Langensalza: Hermann Beyer & Söhne.

KUF. (1996a). *Regjeringens handlingsplan 1994–1997* (The government's plan of action). Oslo: Kirke og undervisningsdepartementet (Royal Norwegian Ministry of Education, Research and the Church).

KUF. (1996b). *The Development of Education 1994–96*. Norway. National report. Oslo: Royal Norwegian Ministry of Education, Research and the Church.

KUF. (1970). *Innstilling om lovregler for spesialundervisning m.v*. (Commissioned Report on Legislation concerning Special Education etc). Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet.

L 1997. *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen*. (The Curriculum for the of 10-Year Compulsory School in Norway). Oslo: The Royal Ministry of Education, Research and the Church Affairs.

Lov om Folkeskolen i Kjøbstæderne. (1889a), (Act on "folkeskolen" in towns).

Lov om Folkeskolen paa Landet. (1889b), (Act on "folkeskolen" in the countryside).

Lov om spesialskoler for utviklingshemmede. (1951), (Law on special schools for retarded).

Lov om døve, blinde og aandssvake barns undervisning og om pleie- og arbeidshjem for ikke-dannelsesdyktige aandsvake. (1915), (Law on deaf, blind and mentally retarded children's education and on care and working homes for uneducatable mentally retarded).

Lüth, C. (1997). On Wilhelm von Humboldt's Theory of Bildung. In *Journal of Curriculum Studies* no. 5/1997.

M 1987. Mønsterplan for grunnskolen (Curriculum Guidelines for Compulsory Education in Norway). Oslo: The Royal Ministry of Education, Research and the Church and Aschehoug.

Markussen, I. (1991). *Til Skaberens Ære, Statens Tjeneste og Vor Egen Nytte* (To the Creator's Glory, the State's Service and Our Own Benefit). København: Institut for Dansk Skolehistorie, Danmarks Lærerhøjskole (Dr. thesis).

Myhre, R. (Ed.). (1968). *Store pedagoger i egne skrifter. II. Humanisme, reformasjon, realisme* (Great Educators in Their Own Writings. II. Humanism, Reformation, Realism). Oslo: Fabritius & sønners forlag.

Myhre, R. (1970). *Pedagogisk idéhistorie*. (History of Educational Ideas). Oslo: Fabritius & sønners forlag.

Neiiendam, M. (1930). *Erik Pontoppidan I. Studier og bidrag til pietismens historie* (Erik Pontoppidan I. Studies and Contributions to the History of Pietism). København: G. E. C. Gad.

Neiiendam, M. (1933). *Erik Pontoppidan II. Studier og bidrag til pietismens historie* (Erik Pontoppidan II. Studies and Contributions to the History of Pietism). København: G. E. C. Gad.

Nirje, B. (1980). The Normalization Principle. In R. Flynn & K. Nitsch (Eds.). *Normalization, Social Integration, and Community Services* (pp. 31–49). Austin, Texas: PRO-ED.

Rust, V. D. (1989). *The Democratic Tradition and the Evolution of Schooling in Norway*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Storjohann, J. C. (1878). *August Herman Francke, de Fattiges og Forældreløses Ven og Forsørger* (August Herman Francke. The Poor and the Orphans' Friend and Provider). Kristiania: H. Aschehoug & Co.

Støren, L. A., Helland, H. & Grøgaard, J. B. (2007). *Hvem sto igjen …?* (Who Were Left Behind …?). Oslo: NIFU, STEP.

SØE 06/02. (2002). *Institutional Competence Building and Cooperation with Two Bosnian Universities: "Special Needs Education towards Inclusion"*. The Cooperation Programme with South-East Europe (CPSEE) 2002–2004.

Tangen, R. (2012). Retten til utdanning for alle (The Right to Education for all). In E. Befring & R. Tangen (Eds). *Spesialpedagogikk* (Special Needs Education), (pp. 108 – 128). Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.

Thorsteinsen, H. (1974). *Særskilt undervisning i Drammen gjennom 85 år. 1860–1945. Bidrag til hjelpeundervisningens historie i Drammen*. (Special Education in Drammen through 85 years. 1860–1945) Oslo: Hovedoppgave i pedagogikk, Pedagogisk forskningsinstitutt, Universitetet i Oslo.

UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. Paris: The author.

Vig, O. (1852a). Editorial. In *Folkevennen*, no, 1: 5–6.

Vig, O. (1852b). Preface. In *Den norske folkeskole*, no. 1.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society. The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

WB 04/06. (2006). *Development towards the Inclusive School: Practices – Research – Capacity Building: Universities of Belgrade, Ljubljana, Sarajevo, Skopje, Tuzla, Zagreb & Oslo*.

Wolfensberger, W. (1980). A Brief Overview of the Principle of Normalization. In R. Flynn & K. Nitsch (Eds.). *Normalization, Social Integration, and Community Services* (pp. 3–6). Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Østvold, H. (1975). Mål og midler i norsk skolepolitikk. (Aims and Means in Norwegian Education Policy). In Kirke *og kultur* no. 1/1975.