

R. Williamson\* 

Simon Fraser University  
British Columbia, 8888, Canada  
\*e-mail: [robert\\_williamson@sfu.ca](mailto:robert_williamson@sfu.ca)

## INCLUSION: A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE

### Abstract.

The Canadian perspective of inclusive education is unique to its history and social context. In some ways, Canada has pioneered theories, frameworks and practices that have greatly influenced the ways nations build inclusive educational experiences. While Canadian practices have evolved, a great deal remains to be done. It is the intention of this article to provide a general context from which Canada's present forms of inclusive education have grown. This is presented as context from which readers may find insights related to their own current practices and future visions of inclusive education. Internationally, Canada reaches out to learn and share practices and principles of learning inclusively with other nations in an effort to improve the practices of all in such partnerships. These partnerships and sharing of information internationally support building better communities of belonging and open intellectual doors of thought not possible if one remains only within one's own context. Inclusive education is indeed a worldwide effort, the final analysis of which has not yet begun.

**Key words:** inclusion, education, residential school, concept, Canadian perspective.

### Introduction.

In many ways, British Columbia, Canada has been innovative concerning inclusive education. As the province strives to build communities of belonging for a universally diverse population, many innovative and experimental frameworks in support of universal inclusivity have emerged. Canada was the first nation to enshrine the rights of persons with physical and mental dis/abilities within its foundational legal structures with its Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Still, British Columbia and Canada are not without a difficult and exclusionary past. Canada's history of the exclusion of those with dis/abilities, racial, gender, ethnic, and linguistic minorities, as well as First Nations children concerning accessing quality and ethically sound Western-style education is well known. Most importantly, Canada is only now beginning to uncover and come to terms with truths surrounding the systematic and horrific trauma, abuse, murder, and cultural genocide of First Nations children associated with Canada's residential school history.

According to Cuthbertson (N.D.), the first attempt to provide a system of Western education within British Columbia began in 1849. Two Christian religious scholars were brought to British Columbia with a mandate to teach the children of company managers for the Hudson's Bay Company, the leading western enterprise in British Columbia at that time. One from the Church of England, taught protestant children while another of the Catholic faith taught Catholic Children. While these initial company schools were free for children of company executives, these two Western educators opened some other schools charging a fee to attend. Girls were able to attend schools specifically designed for 'young ladies'. These also charged a fee. Ethnic, linguistic, economically disadvantaged, and ability diversities were largely excluded from these initial public schools. (Cuthbertson, N.D.) These initial Western-style schools were exclusionary [1].

Public Western-style education struggled throughout the late 1800s in British Columbia. Most schools consisted of a one-room wooden schoolhouse, supported through local efforts and featured teaching multiple aged students within one classroom. Teachers were often untrained, and

school supplies were scarce (Cuthbertson, N.D.). While still exclusionary in many ways, these one-room schoolhouses forced teachers to teach at multiple levels and use all available resources (including students themselves.... outdoor resources, etc.) to teach all students at the same time in the same room. This history in part, paved the way for inclusive education methodologies in modern Canada today.

I hope to provide you with an overview of Canada's journey from educational exclusion toward embracing inclusion to spark dialogue regarding worldwide efforts to teach and support the education of all children inclusively.

Compulsory public education in Canada did not begin with a noble ambition to educate all children. Instead, the Canadian story begins with the creation of 'residential schools' for indigenous children. Run by the Catholic and Protestant churches, these residential schools housed indigenous students who had been removed from their homes by the government and forced to live full-time at these schools in an attempt to eliminate all indigenous culture from the children. These students were subjected to severe neglect and abuse, sometimes ending in their deaths. The last of these schools did not close until 1995.

The recent Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Canada found that the Canadian government had committed 'cultural genocide' upon these indigenous students. The legacy of 'residential schools' is a stain on Canada's education system and greatly influences today's drive toward inclusive educational practices in Canada.

Compulsory public education in Canada began in 1871. These schools were open to white students only, lessons were conducted in French or English, and the schools were operated within Christian religious traditions. The goal of the schools was to prepare Canadian youth for participation in the workforce [2].

Historically, non-white, non-Christian students were restricted to segregated, sub-standard schools. The last racially segregated school in Canada finally closed in the year 1983. Children with dis/abilities were excluded entirely from the public education system.

The education of children with disabilities began to appear in Canada in the mid-1960s and coincided with racial equality and education integration demands within the United States. Parents of children with disabilities began to demand access to education for their children with dis/abilities. Beginning in the late 1970s, Canada committed to providing an education to students with dis/abilities.

Significant in the Canadian context is the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, adopted in 1982. Section 15 of this founding document states:

"Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination... [based on] race, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability".

This document forms the legal foundation of inclusive education in Canada today.

Canada later endorsed the Salamanca Statement from the World Conference on Special Needs Education. This statement (in part).

"Reaffirms the right to education of every individual as enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and [renews] the pledge made by the world community at the 1990 World Conference on Education for All, to ensure the right [to education] for all, regardless of individual differences".

In the year 2006, Canada supported the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. This agreement was designed to: "promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity".

These international agreements have led to Canada's gradual movement toward including all children in our public education system.

Previous to the 1970s, students enrolled in Canadian public schools were culturally homogeneous.

Teachers were taught to teach lessons in one way to meet the learning needs of *most* students in their charge. Diverse students, including children with disabilities, were excluded and thus diversity was not considered in lesson planning or delivery.

When children with disabilities were allowed to attend public schools, their education was provided in segregated settings.

This created two separate schooling environments. The 'general education' setting continued to operate as before. A new setting was created to educate 'special' children with disabilities. This new 'special education' setting required new teaching skills since these students were extremely diverse and little was known about how to meet their educational needs at that time. Those teaching 'special' children in 'special' settings were now known as 'special education teachers'.

Problems were soon identified regarding teaching students with disabilities in segregated settings. Among them was...

1) Separate education is not equal education. 'Special' Education was often substandard. Children receiving special education or individualized curriculums were not meeting their full potential.

2) Social norms within segregated education settings were often not aligned with typical social behaviors of the community. Children in these segregated settings often learn inappropriate behaviors displayed by their peers, thus perpetuating these inappropriate behaviors within the disabled population.

3) Students who learned within segregated environments were not prepared to live in a non-segregated community as adults.

Because of these problems, and as human rights demands grew, special education teachers, researchers, and parents of children with disabilities began to demand the 'integration' of children with disabilities into the classrooms with their typically developing peers.

This began a period of 'integration'. Students with disabilities attended classes with their typically developing peers however they were often 'pulled out' of the classes to receive 'special' instruction [3].

The result was that children with disabilities were physically present in typical classrooms but they were not actively engaging in the lessons provided to their typically developing peers. This structure of education was also referred to as "mainstreaming".

Up to this point, teacher education programs were able to prepare teachers (both special educators and general educators) to teach using a linear lesson approach.

A linear lesson is designed one way only. Students 'enter' the lesson, then engage in a singular learning experience and finally exit with knowledge or skills. Failure to obtain the knowledge or skills of the lesson meant that such students were 'dropped' as lazy or simply 'not intelligent enough'. Some of these dropped students then entered the realm of 'special' education.

Whether a special educator or a general educator, the linear lesson was the foundation of teaching & learning in schools up to this point.

The general education teachers continued to provide one linear lesson to their students. The special education teachers used an 'individual education plan' or IEP to change the curriculum for 'special' students and then provided linear lessons to each student to meet that student's individualized educational goals.

Teaching credentials (licenses) remained separate. Two different teachers were being trained in two different teacher education programs... the general and the special education teacher.

Today, we find ourselves in an evolving period of inclusion.

Upon closer inspection of the diagram however, we can note that the conception of inclusion illustrated here retains the notion that most students are homogeneous or 'normal' (as represented by the blue dots), while others are heterogeneous or 'special' (as represented by the colored dots).

This is not a reality in British Columbia today.

British Columbia, like most urban centers worldwide, has become more and more diverse. While the overall percentage of children designated with disabilities has remained relatively consistent through 2018, the types of disabilities have changed. For example here, we see the increase in children diagnosed with autism attending BC public schools between 2000 and 2018.

This chart describes the diversity within our local Vancouver schools...

44.5% of students are designated minorities

Over 70 different languages are spoken in Vancouver schools

Over 50% are designated as low-income

14.6% have labeled disabilities

This graph demonstrates the increase in special education students by grade level in 2019. As students progress through each grade, more and more are identified as 'special' under current district special education policies. I argue that this is due to a process of referral rather than a genuine increase in diversity as students progress through the grades.

Among current popular methods of identification and support of 'special' learners is the framework: Response to Intervention. This is a multi-tiered system designed to identify, support, and categorize struggling students in public education.

Beginning at the bottom, all are provided core instruction. Those that fail to meet the instructional goals are then referred to tier 2 (middle). Here, this subset of students receives 'targeted' instruction in a small group setting. If a child still fails to meet the instructional goal, the child is then referred to tier three for individualized instruction.

When a student fails in tier 1 (main classroom instruction), they move down

When they receive small group instruction in tier two and fail, they move down.

Now that the student receives individualized instruction in tier 3. If they fail, they move to an individualized education plan and are categorized as a 'special' education student.

This is a system by which a student must fail to get support. While the method does focus on teaching quality within the framework, quality of teaching is generally not a focus when practically implemented on a school site basis.

The movement to tiers also becomes physical... and a form of 'pull out' education and thus suffers from the same problems as was present during the 'integration' phase of practice.

Another popular model of instruction involves co-teaching. Within this framework, a general education and special education teacher work collaboratively to provide instruction to a diverse set of students [4].

In principle, the team of teachers provides an adequate breadth of knowledge and skills to ensure appropriate and effective instruction to all students. In practice, this method frequently results in the general education teacher providing the 'main' lesson while the special education teacher provides individualized instructional support to special students.

There are an infinite number of reasons why a student may struggle academically or socially within a school setting. Today's reality is that the term inclusion has become extremely broad. In the Canadian context, our demographics have become more and more diverse over the years.

The 'dot' diagram shown here was developed by one of my recent students, who suggested that the dots should all be different colors in acknowledgment of the fact that all students differ within the educational context. This is a more realistic of today's 'universal diversity' in our students.

British Columbia changed its curriculum substantially in 2016.

The new curriculum recognizes the 'universal diversity' of students and focuses on providing a personalized learning experience within flexible learning environments. In addition, the curriculum is designed to educate students concerning worldwide challenges such as global climate change as well as Canadian-specific social challenges such as understanding and reconciling historical wrongs (including residential school indigenous cultural genocide).

Further, BC issues only one teaching credential within the province. Teachers receive only a ‘teaching’ credential. No special education credential is present. Teachers are expected to teach the breadth of diverse students present in their classrooms.... period.

Also critical to the ‘new’ approach to inclusively is the mandate that First Peoples Principles of Learning serve as a core teaching principle in British Columbia’s classrooms.

These principles include:

- Learning is holistic and relational
- Learning involves patience and time
- Learning involves the exploration of one’s identity
- Learning supports the well-being of self, family, community, land, spirits, and ancestors

This new BC version of inclusive education requires individualization within common lessons. Concepts such as “universal design for learning”, “differentiated instruction”, “embedded instruction”, and “accommodation modification” are now all combined into a single, fluid lesson planning process that results in evolving and dynamic lesson implementation. This very different approach to teaching for the diverse needs of a fully inclusive and diverse set of students is a revolutionary change in British Columbia’s classroom methods.

As an example of this new approach, some public schools in BC (Maple Ridge shown) are now operating entirely outdoors. This provides a vast variety of learning materials, engagement options, and choices as to how students show their learning. Students learn on and from the land, honoring much of the traditional ways in which indigenous peoples have learned for centuries.

Additionally, these schools are fully inclusive, accepting all language and cultural backgrounds as well as ability levels. Diversity is seen as a ‘challenge’ and not exclusionary to participate in these 100% outdoor school experiences. Currently, these schools operate between grades 1 and 7 with plans to expand into secondary options.

Another local district has removed letter grading from the schooling experience. These schools reason that the purpose of education is no longer only to prepare children to engage in the labor market but rather to educate the entire child together with peers rather than to compete among peers. This represents an attempt to match inclusive Canadian culture with an inclusive education experience. Collaboration is valued over competition [5].

Teacher training has also evolved. Rather than teaching specific skills in isolation, SFU’s teacher training program intends to build professional competence, a dedication to lifelong learning, and continuous self-reflection through a commitment to inclusive practice.

Teacher training is viewed as a co-construction of understanding between students, practicing teachers, and university researchers. This approach acknowledges that teaching to universal diversity and the pace of future change has made traditional teacher preparation methods obsolete. A new teacher should hold deep commitments to community ideals and to meeting the changing challenges of all students than to hold a specific set of methods that will certainly change quickly over time.

Teacher training is viewed as a co-construction of understanding between students, practicing teachers, and university researchers. This approach acknowledges that teaching to universal diversity and the pace of future change has made traditional teacher preparation methods obsolete. A new teacher should hold deep commitments to community ideals and to meeting the changing challenges of all students than to hold a specific set of methods that will certainly change quickly over time.

In Canada, we are striving towards fully inclusive, efficient, and relevant educational experiences for all children. However, our reality is that this goal has not been and we have a long way to go. Our reality is that all of these inclusive education models exist in our public schools today.

A large number of integrated schools remain that provide ‘special’ education in ‘special’ settings within a school building. When students are ‘included’, antiquated systems of co-teaching

or general teaching with accommodation and support from a human educational assistant remain prevalent. BC teachers are just coming to terms with how to weave principles of indigeneity and inclusivity into their teaching practice and many do not feel comfortable teaching students with more significant disabilities.

Finally, no discussion regarding the history of education in Canada can take place without acknowledging the role of colonialism and its effects on minority populations as well as First Nations children and their families. The ‘residential school’ system consisted of an expansive system of boarding schools funded by the government and mostly run by religious entities which were designed specifically to forcibly assimilate First Nations children into a colonized Euro-Canadian society.

“Our objective is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic, and there is no Indian problem”.

Within the residential school system, approximately 150,000 children were forcibly separated from their families in early childhood and were brought to these schools to live, often having little or no further contact with their families (Bartlett & Freeze, 2019). Children were forced to abandon their traditional clothing in favor of wearing Western-style clothes. They were forbidden to speak their native languages and largely forced to convert to Christian religious beliefs. Little true education took place but rather First Nations children were taught skills related to industries so that they would later be able to contribute to capitalist enterprise in adulthood [6]. The system is today largely considered cultural genocide against Canada’s First Nations peoples. Most importantly, these ‘schools’ were characterized by “...systematic physical and sexual assault, spiritual, psychological and emotional abuse; ... malnutrition, inhumane living conditions, death, and murder”. The last of these residential schools did not close until the year 1995.

During this same time, people with dis/disabilities were also victims of systematic segregation, abuse, torture, and murder. In the early part of the 20th Century, the institutionalization of those with disabilities was commonplace. While the initial intention of institutionalization was to support skill development and medical advances in cognitive and physical dis/ability, the reality was far different. Most ‘patients’ were forced into confinement within these ‘hospitals’, ‘orphanages’, or ‘schools’, many not meaningfully leaving their confinement throughout their lives. Within these institutions, physical, sexual, and psychological abuse was common, with no recourse on the part of those being abused. Further, the eugenics movement in North America and Europe began to take hold in the early part of the 20th century. Those institutionalized, racial or immigrant minorities, First Nations men and women, those with alcoholism, and others were often forcibly sterilized to prevent pro-creation to build ‘healthier’ societies. Perhaps the most horrific example includes the systematic confinement and murder of thousands of people with significant diversities by German authorities during World War II.

The history of exclusion and abuse concerning diverse peoples as well as the atrocities within institutions and residential schools shape how Canada views inclusive education today. Not only is inclusive education considered a basic human right backed by Canada’s Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but it is also considered an ethical responsibility that is necessary to overcome an exclusionary and abusive past. In most ways, the history of Canada’s education systems mirrored and supported racism and prejudice prevalent in society in historical times. Education was one key to supporting a past that Canada is not proud of and therefore education must be key in the reconciliation of those past wrongs.

Inclusion in Canada today remains a mixture of historical models of past practice. Beginning in the 1960s, parents of children with significant diversities began to demand that their children receive a free public education appropriate to develop their skills and abilities. Initial attempts to meet the needs of these children frequently took the shape of separate, specialized schools intended to meet the unique and specialized nature of each child’s significant diversity. Inclusion of children within the typical school setting with their age-appropriate peers was decided largely based on

medical diagnosis and in consideration of the extent to which the child with the significant diversity was able to approximate the skills and abilities of the typical children in typical public schools. This was a period that moved from full ‘exclusion’ (no free public education for those with significant diversities) to a period of ‘segregation’ (education options available within separate specialized educational settings).

### **Materials and methods of research.**

Soon, problems were noticed as a result of these segregated settings for children with significant diversities. Most notably, separate educational settings were not equal in quality to those of the typical settings reserved for typically developing children. Further, social norms learned by students in these segregated schools conformed to those displayed by their peers and were often inappropriate social behaviors within the greater community. Importantly, those educated within these separate schools were often not fully prepared to live as adults in a non-segregated community.

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, separate schools began to give way to the notion of “mainstreaming” or “integration”. This framework moved away from segregated schools and toward moving students with significant diversities into classrooms and settings alongside their typically developing peers. This period often required students with significant diversities to earn the right to be included with their non-dis/abled peers within typical classrooms while receiving much of their education in segregated classrooms from ‘special education’ teachers.

More recently, the United States re-framed their legislation regarding inclusive education to require educational systems to justify removal from the typical educational setting rather than requiring the student with a dis/ability to earn the right to receive an appropriate education with non-dis/abled peers. Canada has largely adopted this ethic, although the legal foundations reside in Canada’s Charter of Rights and Freedoms as well as within provincial and local district mandates and policies. Inclusion is now considered the typical state of being... the starting place... and students should not need to earn the right to belong in Canada’s educational communities.

Moreover, the term ‘inclusion’ in the Canadian context is now viewed broadly. No longer does this term refer only to those diagnosed with specific dis/abilities but rather the term refers to the multitude of diversities present in every group. Linguistic, experiential, ethnic, religious, and identity, as well as cognitive and physical diversity (just to name a few), are all considered natural forms of diversity. Such diversity exists in all communities and thus is also represented within Canadian schools. As children learn and live with such diversity in schools, the goal remains that our communities will likewise understand this as the natural state of being and thus become more tolerant of universal differences in daily life.

Although this is the goal of inclusive education in British Columbia and Canada, it is far from accomplished. In practice, we observe some instances of exclusion, integration, segregation, and full inclusion within typical Canadian classrooms and school systems today. Belonging requires that teachers teach differently, using concepts such as Universal Designs for Learning (UDL), Accommodations, Modifications, Embedded Instruction (EI), and Differentiate Instruction (DI) as the foundation of lesson planning. Teacher training programs are likewise changing, however, movement from the typical linear lesson planning norm toward dynamic facilitation of learning for and with all will continue to take time. Significant professional development, cultivation of inclusive teacher dispositions, and continuing research partnerships that seek to understand and develop better processes for teaching universally diverse students are ongoing.

Inclusive education in Canada and around the world is in a state of change. Current academic terms and vocabulary are presently difficult to use with clarity as these terms are hotly debated to reflect changes in how we perceive inclusive education in Canada and internationally. Additionally, methodologies and cognates such as educational psychology and applied behavior analysis (ABA), frameworks such as Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and Response to

Intervention (RtI), as well as Critical Dis/ability studies and a social model of dis/ability (and various other frameworks and methodologies) continue to inform a transformation inclusive education from a solely diagnosis driven system of accommodating individual diverse learners towards an environment and system of ‘facilitating belonging’ for a universally diverse set of individuals.

Dis/ability studies in education (DSE) in the Canadian context is an effort to create social environments that are accessible to all (physically, socially, and cognitively) rather than accommodate individuals' specific physical and cognitive differences. Here, the model seeks to create classrooms that include universally diverse physical, cognitive, and cultural accessibility to materials, learning activities, and diverse learning environments. This is driven by supporting individual choices as to how students accomplish learning objectives. Flexibility is of the utmost importance. The emphasis is less on accomplishing specific learning goals on a pre-determined timeline using one, linear plan of teaching and learning but rather on educating each ‘whole child’ in an appropriate, effective, and efficient manner. Rather than children being measured as competition between each other, inclusive educators seek to build learning communities where all help to accomplish learning goals.

### **Results and its discussion.**

Key to the Canadian process toward meeting the goal of fully including all within our schools and communities is the international and interdisciplinary approach to understanding and creating frameworks and methods to further this goal. Therapies required to support diverse students transform from the responsibility of one specialist to the responsibility of a team of professionals who interact with students daily. Rather than pull out a student to work on one with a specific specialist, the goal remains to integrate the therapy into the typical classroom lesson structures and routines. This goal has not been fully accomplished in the Canadian context however movement toward this reality is occurring.

The social model of dis/ability is more and more viewed as a key to Canada’s future of belonging. This model is beginning to dominate inclusive education discourse in the Western Canadian context. Rather than maintaining a historical link to the field of educational psychology, the social model of dis/ability infers that “...societal beliefs and practices disable individuals rather than seeing people as inherently having defects, which are described as disabilities”. Within the social model, the context and environment are considered ‘disabling’ rather than considering the individual as ‘disabled’ [7]. For example, if a person uses a wheelchair for mobility and finds that stairs are the only means to access a building, the building is viewed as causing the issue rather than the difference present in the person. This disability studies perspective moves away from the traditional, psychology-dominated medical model of attempting to ‘fix’ the child and challenges the dominant perspective of ‘special education’ in general [8].

### **Conclusion.**

Although the social model is gaining popularity in the Western Canadian context, links remain with the medical model, heavily influenced by the field of psychology. Applied Behavior Analysis is perhaps the most prominent. Only recently has British Columbia begun to fully embrace these theories and practices, developing recent intellectual infrastructure to support growth in certification based on the United States-based models and practices.

Culturally, the integration of First Peoples Principles of Learning is also having a large impact on inclusive practices in the Canadian context. The realization that Western notions of systematic teaching and learning represent *one* way to educate children but do not represent the only or right way of educating children is having a profound effect on education in Canada generally. Canada is committed to integrating First People’s Principles of Learning into the public education system and thus this is having a profound effect on foundational concepts of teaching and learning, as well as visions of truly inclusive education nationwide.



Internationally, Canada reaches out to learn and share practices and principles of learning inclusively with other nations to improve the practices of all in such partnerships. These partnerships and the sharing of information internationally support building better communities of belonging and open intellectual doors of thought not possible if one remains only within one's context. Inclusive education is indeed a worldwide effort, the final analysis of which has not yet begun. Still, the world has made incredible progress towards this goal, as only decades ago, those with significant diversities were fully excluded and often abused in many contexts. Our communities today seek to do better, honor differences rather than fear them, and build communities where all belong. Continued efforts in Canada and elsewhere worldwide remain crucial in these worthy efforts.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Council of Canadians with Disabilities. Celebrating our Accomplishments. Available at: — URL: <http://www.ccdonline.ca/en/socialpolicy/poverty-citizenship/income-security-reform/celebrating-our> (accessed: 21.04.2023)
- 2 Tomkins J., Gilham C.M. (2019) Inclusion Reconceptualized: Pre-Service Teacher Education and disability Studies in Education. Canadian Journal of Education. №39(4). P. 1-25
- 3 Grove K.A., Fisher D. (2019) Oh, Canada: bridges and barriers to inclusion in Canadian schools. Support for Learning. №30(1). P. 42-54
- 4 Kinsella W. (2020) Organising inclusive schools. International Journal of Inclusive Education. №24(12). P. 1340-1356
- 5 Moberg S., Muta E., Korenaga K., Kuorelahti M., Savolainen H. (2020) Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. European Journal of Special Needs Education. P. 100-114
- 6 Hudson G. (2020) The Genocide Question and Indian Residential Schools in Canada. Canadian Journal of Political Science. №45(2). P. 427-449
- 7 Hockenbury J.C., Kauffman J.M., Hallahan D.P. (2021) What is right about special education. Exceptionality. №8. P. 3-11
- 8 Sharma J. (2019) Parents Attitudes to Inclusive Education: A Study Conducted in Early Years Settings in Inclusive Mainstream Schools in Bangkok, Thailand. International Journal of Special Education. Vol. 33. №4. P. 877-893

## ИНКЛЮЗИЯ: КАНАДАЛЫҚ КӨЗҚАРАС

### Аңдатпа.

Канадалық инклюзивті білім беру перспективасы оның тарихы мен әлеуметтік контекстіне ғана тән. Кейбір жолдармен қарағанда Канада еліндегі инклюзивті білім беру тәжірибесін құру үшін үлкен әсер еткен теориялар, шеңберлер мен тәжірибелердің ортасы болды. Канадалық тәжірибелер дамығанымен, әлі де көп жұмыс жасалуы тиіс. Бұл мақаланың мақсаты Канададағы инклюзивті білім берудің қазіргі формадағы дамуының жалпы контекстің қамтамасыз етілуі. Бұл мақала оқырмандар үшін ағымдағы тәжірибе және инклюзивті білім берудің болашақ көзқарастарына қатысты түсініктерді таба алатын контекст ретінде ұсынылған. Халықаралық деңгейде Канада серіктестік оқу орындарымен тәжірибесін жақсарту мақсатында басқа елдермен инклюзивті оқытудың тәжірибелері мен принциптерін үйренуге және бөлісуге тырысады. Бұл серіктестік және халықаралық деңгейде ақпарат алмасу жақсырақ қауымдастықтар құруға көмектеседі және егер адам өз контекстінде қалса, ойлаудың интеллектуалды есіктерін ашу мүмкін емес. Инклюзивті білім беру – бұл шын мәнінде әлемдік күш-жігер, оның соңғы талдауы әлі басталмаған.

**Негізгі сөздер:** инклюзия, білім, тұрғылықты мектеп, ұғым, Канадалық көзқарас.

## ИНКЛЮЗИЯ: КАНАДСКАЯ ТОЧКА ЗРЕНИЯ

### Аннотация.

Канадский взгляд на инклюзивное образование уникален благодаря своей истории и социальному контексту. В некотором смысле Канада стала пионером теорий, рамок и практик, которые сильно повлияли на то, как страны создают инклюзивный образовательный опыт. Несмотря на то, что канадская практика изменилась, многое еще предстоит сделать. Целью этой статьи является предоставление общего контекста, из которого выросли нынешние формы инклюзивного образования в Канаде. Это представлено как контекст, в

котором читатели могут найти информацию, связанную с их собственной текущей практикой и будущим видением инклюзивного образования. На международном уровне Канада стремится учиться и делиться практиками и принципами обучения с другими странами, стремясь улучшить практику всех участников такого партнерства. Такое партнерство и обмен информацией на международном уровне способствуют построению лучших сообществ принадлежности и открывают интеллектуальные двери мысли, которые невозможны, если оставаться только в своем собственном контексте. Инклюзивное образование действительно является всемирным усилием, окончательный анализ которого еще не начался.

**Ключевые слова:** инклюзия, образование, школа-интернат, концепция, Канадская точка зрения.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Council of Canadians with Disabilities. Celebrating our Accomplishments. Available at: — URL: <http://www.ccdonline.ca/en/socialpolicy/poverty-citizenship/income-security-reform/celebrating-our> [in English] (accessed: 21.04.2023)
- 2 Tomkins J., Gilham C.M. (2019) Inclusion Reconceptualized: Pre-Service Teacher Education and disability Studies in Education. Canadian Journal of Education. №39(4). P. 1-25 [in English]
- 3 Grove K.A., Fisher D. (2019) Oh, Canada: bridges and barriers to inclusion in Canadian schools. Support for Learning. №30(1). P. 42-54 [in English]
- 4 Kinsella W. (2020) Organising inclusive schools. International Journal of Inclusive Education. №24(12). P. 1340-1356 [in English]
- 5 Moberg S., Muta E., Korenaga K., Kuorelahti M., Savolainen H. (2020) Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. European Journal of Special Needs Education. P. 100-114 [in English]
- 6 Hudson G. (2020) The Genocide Question and Indian Residential Schools in Canada. Canadian Journal of Political Science. №45(2). P. 427-449 [in English]
- 7 Hockenbury J.C., Kauffman J.M., Hallahan D.P. (2021) What is right about special education. Exceptionality. №8. P. 3-11 [in English]
- 8 Sharma J. (2019) Parents Attitudes to Inclusive Education: A Study Conducted in Early Years Settings in Inclusive Mainstream Schools in Bangkok, Thailand. International Journal of Special Education. Vol. 33. №4. P. 877-893 [in English]

### Information about authors:

Robert Williamson – **corresponding author**, PhD, associate professor of the Department “Inclusive Education” Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada

E-mail: [robert\\_williamson@sfu.ca](mailto:robert_williamson@sfu.ca)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9244-7920>

### Информация об авторах:

Роберт Уильямсон – **основной автор**, PhD, ассоциированный профессор кафедры «Инклюзивного образования», Университет Саймон Фрейзер, Британская Колумбия, Канада

E-mail: [robert\\_williamson@sfu.ca](mailto:robert_williamson@sfu.ca)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9244-7920>

### Авторлар туралы ақпарат:

Роберт Уильямсон – **негізгі автор**, PhD, «Инклюзивті білім беру» кафедрасының қауымдастырылған профессоры, Саймон Фрейзер университет, Британдық Колумбия, Канада

E-mail: [robert\\_williamson@sfu.ca](mailto:robert_williamson@sfu.ca)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9244-7920>