

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54937/ssf.2022.21.2.7-17>

Fenomén inklúzie v modernej spoločnosti

The Phenomenon of Inclusion in a Modern Society

Paula Maliňáková

Abstract

The study compares the essential theoretical background of the issue of inclusion as a phenomenon of the present. It presents the basic concepts related to the phenomenon of inclusion and inclusive education in our conditions. We look at inclusion in the study from a terminological, historical, and strategic point of view. Accepting inclusion as a standard part primarily requires a change in the thinking of all actors in the educational process and a difference in the way of organization, culture, and measures for everyday practice concerning all its participants.

Keywords: Integration. Inclusion. Heterogeneity. Inclusive environment. Integrability. Inclusiveness.

The phenomenon of inclusion in a modern society

Inclusion is a phenomenon that is talked about a lot of, but in reality the values of inclusion are rarely fulfilled. Therefore, we can speak of inclusion as a trend that brings innovation, which we can observe exceptionally, and it is still an extraordinary process in education. Inclusion is considered an innovative educational process where every student can provide a complete education. At the same time, inclusion can be viewed as a particular innovation to increase the quality of the educational process at school. Lechta (2018) states that the phenomenon of designing inclusive education was a sign of the optimistic views of many teachers at the turn of the 20th - 21st century, which was adequately supported by several theoretical aspects, while in practice, they encountered many complications. Establishing inclusive education is not an easy or short-term task for the school and its participants. There is a clear need for an in-depth focus on inclusive education solutions for the benefit of all participants. It is related to the setting and direction of acceptance of heterogeneity on the part of the school and its culture in the given country, region, etc. Not only a sufficiently elaborated theoretical basis of inclusive education is sufficient, but also its broader transdisciplinary connection and a legally fulfilled framework in full with the praxeological anchoring in the school or classroom. Therefore, the essential ideological

starting points and sources of current inclusive thinking draw attention to the possibilities and the **limits**, which we describe below (Table 1).

Table no. 1: Limits of inclusive education.

Limits of inclusive education.	
Narrowing the understanding of inclusion as a pragmatic approach is perceived as a good strategy for rapid (problem) solving in an environment of problematic multiculturalism.	The risks of a formal application, which is based on several policy decisions and legislative documents (up to the borderline experience of "inclusion for inclusion"), without a deeper examination of its starting points and implications.

Source: Bullock, Brestovanský, Lenčo, eds. (2015), graphic design - author's processing

Terminological aspects of inclusion

Baďuríková (2006) argues that concepts such as inclusive education, inclusiveness, and inclusive didactics began to be used in the 1990s **to prevent integrated education** (corresponding to the joint education of children with disabilities in mainstream classes). In this context, Kováčová (2010) writes about the integration process as a precursor to inclusion, when it is necessary to create conditions and successfully implement them into the environment. We present the mutual comparison and the subsequent difference in the following view (Table 2).

Table no. 2: Defining the concepts of education in school.

integration	inclusion
It is the incorporation of an individual or group into a new environment (society) or other new conditions. The domain does not change - the student adapts. Integration is more oriented to material needs , to their sufficiency. Integration requires adaptation of the integrated conditions (Košťrnová, Ustohalová, Verešová, 2020, p. 9).	Not only the inclusion, but incorporation, acceptance, acceptance of all children as equal members of the school community, but also the creation of conditions to develop the potential of each child and to remove barriers (racial, national, cultural, social, economic, health, etc.), which hinder the right of every child to education and equal opportunities in access to education. According to Kováčová (2010), inclusion rejects the concepts of indirectly differentiating - distinguishing society into majority and minority.

Source: graphic design - author's processing.

According to Biewer (2009), one may encounter an ambiguous definition of **mainstreaming, integration and inclusion**. The author argues that these unclear definitions may be that their substitution was made in a brief period (approximately in the range of 1990-1995). Changes in the conceptual view of cultural and political conditions also contributed to this, and last but not least, it also influenced the established practice in schools. Based on the above, it can be argued that inclusive education is not a static phenomenon (more Lechta, 2010; Šuhajdová, 2018; Špotáková, 2018, Kováčová, 2019 et al.). Integration is known as a concept that developed in the 1980s. On the contrary, inclusion was reflected in professional discussions in the 1990s and early 21st century.

The main differences concerning the mentioned terms include the following premises:

- the fact that **inclusion is a broader concept than integration**, which deals with the inclusion of pupils with specific disabilities or disabilities, while inclusion is about accepting all, resp. acceptance of diversity; which is also claimed by many authors such as Lechta (2010), Kováčová (2010), Šuhajdová (2018), Špotáková (2018).
- Another crucial aspect is that **integration respects the dual way of learning** (special and mainstream schools). Still, inclusion encourages the admission of all pupils based on the "school for all" thesis (i.e., the removal of two parallel "two-track approaches"), cf. Bagalová, Bizíková and Fatulová (2015).
- **group heterogeneity** is perceived as a valuable part of society with an emphasis on the gradual creation of one heterogeneous group, i.e., it is a gradual transition from the process of integration to inclusion (Belková and Zólyomiová, 2019).
- integration is expected to **change the pupil's adaptation to school education**; inclusion includes the opposite approach, namely the transformation of school education to the pupil and the acceptance of pupils' diversity (Lechta, 2016).

The very concept of inclusion in the school environment can be viewed from two perspectives. The first view is inclusion, which deals with the possibilities of optimal education for children and students with disabilities, disruptions, or threats, or the second view is defined by researching and clarifying the educational processes of the target group concerning conditions in mainstream schools and out-of-school environment (Lechta, 2016). The inclusion index understands inclusion itself as an approach to education and society development. Inclusion is closely linked to democratic participation in education but also beyond schooling. It is an effort to ensure the coherence of the school's activities by supporting the education of all children without distinction, including family members of children, school staff, and all who come into contact with the school (Booth, Ainscow, 2019).

It is primarily essential to provide an educationally heterogeneous environment (Balážová, 2018), where a full-fledged environment will be provided for each student in the process of education. Pupils are not differentiated into groups with and without SEP (Special Educational Needs); they work together using appropriate methods and procedures to achieve adequate socialization and education. Lechta (2012) states that the problem of how to teach effectively in a heterogeneous educational environment is often addressed, which is taken as a didactic problem in inclusion. However, it can be appealed that this is only a kind of narrowed perception of inclusive education. The shortcoming is not only specific pedagogical methods and procedures, but it is necessary to build a new approach for educators. Thus, the failure of inclusive education from one point of view is the inability to ensure optimal education for all members of a heterogeneous school group. On the one hand, we know that one of the main attributes of inclusive pedagogy is a heterogeneous community. In contrast, this fact can further "heterogenize" the entire inclusive education due to the diversity of school groups, resp. to divide. Therefore, we can state that it is necessary to change the fact of looking at heterogeneity. The problem of integrated and inclusive education is the acquisition of the content of education, i.e., the standards of education that are set in the individual components of the State Education Program. **There is often a mismatch between the specific requirements of the curriculum and the opportunities for pupils with special educational needs.**

The same views on understanding and accepting inclusion should be taught to children/students from an early age to correctly identify the given opinions of the environment. However, it is not only a matter of raising children/pupils but also of the whole generation, resp. we should be an inclusive society that is not stigmatizing someone different, etc. However, a common fact in our community is that we look to "someone with a difference" with regret, compassion, or in a negative sense with underestimation or incompetence itself (Kováčová, 2015).

Inclusive education, which is currently powerfully proclaims and understandably faces positives and negatives due to the conditions of readiness of individual schools and their philosophy. These become possible risks in the "introduction" of inclusion in schools. At the same time, we consider these risks to be problems that every school that registers children and pupils with special educational needs has already encountered. We believe organizational, economic, technical, legislative, and pedagogical conditions to be significantly risky, whereas Šuhajdová (2018) describes them as conditions of a global and personnel nature.

The facts forgotten above suggest that we can talk more about **integrability** in the current context, as inclusion is more of a vision that we want to move closer to. That is, concepts such as **inclusiveness** and **integrability** are used in the context of school readiness and their environment

for integration (integrability) or inclusion (inclusivity). The preparedness of schools undoubtedly includes the training of teachers, which can be another risk, as a lot of theoretical knowledge will not be translated into a practical level respectively into practice (Kováčová, 2014). Hájková (2005) characterizes **integrability** as the readiness of schools to accept and effectively educate children/pupils without distinction concerning health status, i.e., without a disability and with a disability in one school group, class, or community, etc. The readiness of individual schools depends on the ability to meet the needs of all without distinction. Each school facility should achieve a certain degree to increase the level of integrability of a particular facility. In addition, intensive, high-quality services and services of **special pedagogical counseling facilities for the success of inclusion** is an essential factors (Bagalová, Bizíková, Fatulová, 2015). Svoboda (2013) argues that a pro-inclusive education system is as effective as the work of available counseling and support services for schools.

Historical aspects of inclusion

It is necessary to look at the concept of inclusive education from the point of view of retrospective, i.e., in terms of historical context. We consider it quite important because it contains certain important specifics that have been translated since the beginning of religion. From a historical point of view, we rely on the statement of Šuhajdová (2018); here, we could state that we have gone a long way in the introduction and implementation of inclusive education and inclusion. As part of stopping and looking back, we must self-critically admit that, in addition to positive steps forward, we sometimes met, "got lost," did not overcome major or minor obstacles, or took a step or two back. The margin of the written one can appeal to Slowík's (2007) claim that inclusion is a never-ending process. It can also mean that we don't even have to get to our destination. The basis should be to work on the revitalization of inclusive education in search of an answer to the question "Why implement inclusive education?", which is connected with philosophical and anthropological reasoning Kudláčová (2012). That is why it is necessary to know the historical context, represent the way and find the answer to the mentioned question.

We know various moral and religious commandments in the Jewish and Christian religions. The Jews had their ethical system, the **Decalogue** (since the time of Moses, about 1500 BC). According to Rajský (2012), quality of life is an essential axiological imperative from which other possibilities for inclusion derive. This is a moral and social consequence of society's philosophical and religious awareness about equality without the accidental characteristics of individuals (i.e., health status, social background, or status, nationality, religion, etc.). The acceptance of every human being is based on religion, where God cares about every person, and he has his value

and dignity, and other people should accept him with tolerance. The mentioned values and pillars are also a prerequisite for successful inclusion. We also find pro-inclusive ideas in ancient Rome, whether in law or legislation. The laws of Solomon of Athens are also known. With other similar values as the expression of love or understanding towards loved ones, even enemies, Christianity crossed cultural, national, and racial boundaries, thus the boundaries of human heterogeneity. From the 4th century, charitable activities became a public function, and various philanthropic institutions (orphanages, hostels, hospices, hospitals, shelters, etc.) officially began to emerge. The term person has its origins in theological discussions in the 4th and 5th centuries and in the theology of the early Middle Ages when personality began to be understood as a basic ontological principle that emphasizes 4-uniqueness. Another source of contemporary inclusive thinking can be found in philosophy. The essence of man, understood in antiquity as *physis*, in the Middle Ages as *natura* in modern times replaces the notion of **humanitas**, which provides sufficient reason for the universal value of individual human dignity, as defined in the 1948 **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**. However, the tradition of humanistic and Enlightenment rationality (universality) proved vulnerable and overly optimistic, especially in the first half of the 20th century, after historical experiences with wars and totalitarian regimes (Bullock, Brestovanský, Lenčo, eds., 2015).

From our point of view, the optimal model of an inclusive culture is one that, on the one hand, respects the requirements of freedom and autonomy and, at the same time, reflects the valuable resources that can provide the basis for its anchoring and sustainability. We are thinking of a specific dialogue-personnel model, which is not radically new, but instead uses a reflection of human history and experience and, at the same time, takes into account the challenges and sensitivities of the present. Its designation combines two key elements: **the dignity of the human person and the constitutional social space**, which is dialogue. The value of a person is calculated based on his benefit, resp. the grouping of its empirical conditions (health, race, age, performance, power) can lead to very inhuman social and political conclusions (Bullock, Brestovanský, Lenčo, eds., 2015).

The liberal-democratic system of the West was the hope that would last after the changes after 1989. However, the ideas of democracy ended prematurely. One of the problems is defining social inclusion. Today's society is facing a growing wave of multiculturalism with social disparities. Each party calls for the recognition of equality and equal treatment, which we can also see as the European Union's efforts to address social exclusion through various programming documents. Education shapes a person for a better life. Still, here, given the information mentioned, we conclude that it is not an easy task for society's composition, groups of students at school, etc. Therefore, it is necessary to create and strive to build a model of education leading to the possibility of full-fledged education for all without differences and differences.

Inclusive education, therefore, appears to be the optimal model respectively the road to social inclusion. The Slovak Republic has also committed itself to this direction due to the various international obligations mentioned in this work. The cultural tradition of each country is different, and it predestines it to implement this and that paradigm in education, its possibilities, and limits (Vančíková, Porubský, Kosová, 2017).

Strategic context of inclusion

Inclusion can be considered a specific strategic context, which is also innovative and provides an opportunity for students with special educational needs. In the conditions of Slovak education, inclusion, as we have already mentioned, does not have a long tradition, nor is an optimal system created (which can be accepted to some extent when it comes to beginnings, but at the same time, flexibility is necessary for terms of application in practice, right in an environment where inclusion is to be part of the school) in implementation. The beginnings can be attributed to the 1988 concept of inclusion at the University of Toronto in a global context. The result of the meeting was a formal concept of inclusion, i.e., proposed specific proposals to improve education for children and adults with learning disabilities. These were published in 1989 under "**Action for Inclusion**" (Lechta, 2012).

The right to inclusive education was first declared at the World Conference on "**Educating Pupils with Special Needs**," held under the auspices of UNESCO together with the Spanish Government on 7-10 June 1994 in Salamanca. Representatives of governments from 92 states and 25 international organizations have agreed to change education systems towards inclusive education. The main principle applied in education was enshrined in the so-called **Statement from Salamanca**. Finally, **The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education** was adopted, which is considered the most crucial document in special education. This resolution sets out the principles of inclusion "**school for all**" (co-authors, 2014). The act itself was preceded by a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which since the 1990s has focused on eliminating any discrimination in education. In 1990, a conference was held in Jomtien, which adopted the Declaration "Education for All." Since then, we can see the preference and drive to promote inclusion in the political and professional world. Vančíková, Porubský, and Kosová (2017) critically define the term inclusion as a fashion trend that is used because it is spread by educational policy and is in line with international trends. Often the terms are just confused respectively; integration has been confused with inclusion, but from paradigmatic thinking, both concepts have a different approach to the target group for which they are intended.

UNESCO (2008) further defines inclusive education as a dynamic process of joyous acceptance of student diversity, where individual differences are not perceived as a problem but as an opportunity to enrich the educational process. Another critical international document relating to social inclusion is the **Treaty of Lisbon**. It declares a struggle against social exclusion and poverty. Each state of the European Union guarantees respect for the basic principles of the European Union's social policy. The Lisbon European Council of 23-24 March 2000 undertook, among other things, to ensure that European countries have access to quality education for the social (minority, long-term unemployed, graduates, seniors) or the disabled and to eliminate discrimination (co-authors, 2014, p. 29). In 2008, a meeting of experts in school inclusion took place in Berlin. Katrin Evers-Meyer, representing the rights of people with various disabilities, commented that it needs to be thoroughly examined, and the conclusion was that whoever excludes and stigmatizes these target groups will have to re-integrate them later (Anderlíková, 2014).

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2010) and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities were ratified by the Slovak Republic in 2010. Article 24 declares that each Party recognizes the right of persons with disabilities to education and prefers an inclusive approach. States Parties shall ensure that "persons with disabilities have access, on an equal basis with others, to inclusive, high-quality, free, primary and secondary education in the community in which they live." (2010) compiled, however, from a retrospective view we know that it was a "different period," respectively several changes have taken place in the school systems in our country as well as in the nations around us.

On November 8, 2011, an international conference was held in Bratislava under the Office of the Government of the Slovak Republic and the NGOs Amnesty International Slovakia, People in Need, and the Institute for a Well-Managed Society entitled **Prerequisites for Inclusive Education in Slovakia**. The aim was to define inclusive education from a human rights perspective and discuss the prohibition of all forms of discrimination and segregation in education. Special attention was paid to facilitating access to education for Roma children, children of foreigners, children belonging to national minorities, as well as for children with disabilities, and children from socially disadvantaged backgrounds. Based on the facts mentioned above, Slovakia should have reformed the education system within its international human rights obligations to ensure that all children can exercise their right to education (Jablonský, Polláková, 2014).

In the 21st century, however, optimistic visions faded with the failure to frequently apply the concept of inclusive education to an unprepared educational environment, which was also influenced by the historical and political context of the time.

Conclusion

In Slovakia, it is also possible to record attitudes that hurt inclusion and, on the other hand, overly unrealistically glorify inclusion. Ambivalent attitudes of our society to newly-conceived educational projects and their implementation are one of the other barriers affecting not only the concept of inclusion. Apart from the fact that the idea of inclusion is humanistic, it can be expected that those on whom aid is oriented will suffer the most if misunderstood.

The essential fulfillment of inclusive education is **inclusive education** so that all pupils, without distinction, create conditions that will help them overcome barriers in learning and support the development of their potential. **Each student learns according to their abilities and needs**, uses an individualized approach, and systematically addresses the need for teaching assistants and the connection of cooperating organizations (social services department, adding special schools to mainstream schools, state assistance, cf. Koštrnová, Ustohalová, Verešová, 2020).

Bibliography

- ANDERLÍKOVÁ, L. 2014. *Cesta k inklúzi : Úvahy z praxe a pro prax*. Praha: TRITON. 210 p. ISBN 978-80-7387-765-1.
- BAĎURÍKOVÁ, Z. 2006. Inkluzívna výchova a vzdelávanie detí predškolského veku. In: *Predškolská výchova*, vol. LX, no. 4, p. 1-7. ISSN 0032-7220.
- BAGALOVÁ, Ľ.; BIZÍKOVÁ Ľ.; FATULOVÁ, Z. 2015. *Metodika podporujúca inkluzívne vzdelávanie v školách*. Bratislava: Štátny pedagogický ústav. 154 p. ISBN 978-80-8118-143-6.
- BALÁŽOVÁ, J. 2018. Analýza príčin úspešnej a neúspešnej inkluzívnej edukácie v základných školách Slovenskej republiky. In: LECHTA, V., ŠUHAJDOVÁ I. eds. *Koncept inkluzívnej edukácie*. Trnava: Vydavateľstvo Typi Universitatis Tyrnaviensis, spoločné pracovisko Trn. univ. a VEDY, vydavateľstva SAV. p. 13-37. ISBN 978-80-568-0122-2.
- BELKOVÁ, V., ZÓLYOMIOVÁ, P. 2019 Potreba vytvárania inkluzívneho prostredia v súčasnej škole. In: *Edukácia*. Vedecko-odborný časopis. Vol. 3, no. 1, p. 13-20. ISSN: 1339-8725.
- BIEWER, G. 2009. *Grundlagen der Heilpädagogik und Inklusiven Pädagogik*. Bad Heil-Brunn: Kinkhardt. 240 p. ISBN 978-3-8252-2985-6.
- BOOTH, T. AINSCOW, M. 2019. *Index inklúzie: Príručka na rozvoj škôl s dôrazom na inkluzívne hodnoty*. Bratislava: Nadácia pre deti Slovenska v rámci projektu Kto chýba?, 2019. 252 p. ISBN 978-80-89403-19-6.

- BULLOCK, S., - BRESTOVANSKÝ, M., - LENČO, P. (Eds.). 2015. *Inklúzia, rôznorodosť a rovnosť v práci s mládežou. Princípy a prístupy*. ISBN 978-1-86174-222-3.
- DOHOVOR o právach dieťaťa. [online]. [cit. 2021.10.10.]. Available on the internet: <<https://www.employment.gov.sk/files/slovensky/ministerstvo/narodne-koordinacne-stredisko/dohovor-pravach-dietata.pdf>>.
- HÁJKOVÁ, V. 2005. *Integrativní pedagogika*. 1. vyd. Praha: Institut pedagogicko-psychologického poradenství ČR. 123 p. ISBN 80-86856-05-4.
- JABLONSKÝ, T., POLLÁKOVÁ, S. 2014. Legislatívne východiská inkluzívneho vzdelávania. In: *Pedagogický model inkluzívneho vzdelávania v základných školách PRINED - PROjekt INkluzívnej Edukácie*. Prešov: Metodicko-pedagogické centrum v Prešove. p. 27-44. ISBN 978-80-565-0208-2.
- Kolektív autorov. 2014. *Pedagogický model inkluzívneho vzdelávania v základných školách*. Prešov: Metodicko – pedagogické centrum, 2014. 136 p. ISBN 978-80-565-0208-2.
- KOŠTRNOVÁ, D.; USTOHALOVÁ, T.; VEREŠOVÁ, J. 2020. *Tvorba inkluzívnej kultúry školy a školského zariadenia z pohľadu pedagogických a odborných zamestnancov - východiská tvorby inkluzívneho prostredia triedy a skupiny*. Príručka pre účastníkov inovačného vzdelávania. 1. vyd. [online]. Bratislava: Metodicko-pedagogické centrum. 34 p. ISBN 978-80-565-1464-1.
- KOVÁČOVÁ, B. 2014. Diagnostikovanie integritability prostredia materskej školy. In: *Pedagogická diagnostika v praxi materskej školy: pomocník pri odhaľovaní osobnostných individualít dieťaťa predškolského veku*. Bratislava: Dr. Josef Raabe. p. 1-26. ISBN 978-80-8140-185-5.
- KOVÁČOVÁ, B. 2015. Heterogenita vo výchovno-vzdelávacom procese. In: *Riadenie materskej školy: sprievodca úspešným manažmentom materskej školy*. Bratislava: Dr. Josef Raabe. p. 3-30. ISBN 978-80-8140-185-5.
- KOVÁČOVÁ, B. 2019. *S inklúziou od raného veku*. Hliník nad Hronom: Reziliencia s. r. o, 100 p. ISBN 978-80-972277-5-3.
- KUDLÁČOVÁ, B. 2012. Filozoficko-antropologické zdôvodnenie inkluzívnej edukácie ako reálneho výchovného konceptu. In: LECHTA, V. eds. *Výchovný aspekt inkluzívnej edukácie a jeho dimenzie*. Bratislava: IRIS. p. 38 – 47. ISBN 978-80-89256-89-1.
- LECHTA, V. 2012. Výchovný aspekt inkluzívnej edukácie a jeho dimenzie: uvedenie do problematiky. In: LECHTA, V. eds. *Inkluzívna edukácia ako multidimenzionálny výchovný problém*. 2. vyd. Bratislava: IRIS. p. 9 – 19. ISBN 978-80-89256-82-2.
- LECHTA, V. 2016. Inkluzívni pedagogika – základní determinanty. In: LECHTA, V. eds. *Inkluzivní pedagogika*. 1. vyd. Praha: Portál. p. 36-38. ISBN 978-80-262-1123-5.

- LECHTA, V. 2018. Koncept inkluzívnej edukácie v konfrontácii s jeho aplikovaním: Inkluzívna edukácia v druhej dekáde 21. storočia. In: LECHTA, V., ŠUHAJDOVÁ, I. eds. *Koncept inkluzívnej edukácie*. Trnava: Vydavateľstvo Typi Universitatis Tyrnaviensis, spoločné pracovisko Trnavskej univerzity a VEDY, vydavateľstva SAV, 2018. p. 10-12. ISBN 978-80-568-0122-2.
- RAJSKÝ, A. 2012. Kultúrno-etický fundament idey inkluzívnej edukácie. In: LECHTA, V. eds. *Výchovný aspekt inkluzívnej edukácie a jeho dimenzie*. Bratislava: IRIS. p. 48-61. ISBN 978-80-89256-89-1.
- SLOWÍK, J. 2007. *Speciální pedagogika*. Praha: Grada. 160 p. ISBN 978-80-247-1733-3.
- SVOBODA, M. eds. 2013. *Psychodiagnostika dospelých*. Praha: Portál. 488 p. ISBN 978-80-262-0363-6.
- ŠPOTÁKOVÁ, M. a kol. 2018. *Od integrácii k inklúzii*. [online]. Bratislava: Výskumný ústav detskej psychológie a patopsychológie. 42 p. ISBN 978-80-89698-27-1.
- ŠUHAJDOVÁ, I. 2018. *Ludský faktor – kľúčová podmienka inkúzie?* Trnava: Vydavateľstvo Typi Universitatis Tyrnaviensis, spoločné pracovisko Trnavskej univerzity a VEDY, vydavateľstva SAV. 100 p. ISBN 978-80-568-0121-5.
- VANČÍKOVÁ, K.; PORUBSKÝ, Š.; KOSOVÁ, B. 2017. *Inkluzívne vzdelávanie – dilemy a perspektívy*. Banská Bystrica: BELIANUM - Vydavateľstvo Univerzity Mateja Bela. 102 p. ISBN 978-80-557-1279-6.

PhDr. Paula Maliňáková

Katedra predškolskej a elementárnej pedagogiky
Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku, Pedagogická fakulta
Hrabovská cesta 1, 034 01 Ružomberok
paula.malinakova@gmail.com