UĆITEE AKO SOCIÀLNY INŻINIER V INKLUZIVNEJ EDUKÀCII

THE TEACHER AS A SOCIAL ENGINEER IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Wojciech Welskop

Abstrakt

Inkluzivna edukàcia ako vzdelàvanie vset-kych ziakov v jednej śkole bez selekcie, można vd'aka variàciàm, je vyzvou pre sù-casné śkoly. Aby sa dało hovorit' o ùspechu procesu inklu/ivncho vzdelàvania, je pot-rcbììé poskytnùt' pristup k vzdelàvacim a socialnym prilezitostiam v plnom rozsahu vsetkym studentom a vytvorit' opatrenia so-ciàlnej inklùzie, ktoré nebudù iba v teore-tickej rovine. Ciel'om prispevku je analy-zovat' rolu ucitel'a v procese inkluzivnej edukàcie z pohl'adu sociàlneho inzinierstva.

KPucové slovà: *Inkluzivne vzdelàvanie. Ucitel'. Sociàlny inżinier.*

Abstract

Inclusive education as education of all students in one school, without selection due to any variation is a challenge of the contemporary school. To be able to talk about the success of the process of inclusive education we need the social individuals, which provide access to the full range of educational and social opportunities for all students and make social inclusion action will not only theoretical. The aim of this article is to analyze the role of the teacher in the process of inclusive education from the perspective of social engineering.

Key words: *Inclusive education. Teacher. Social engineer.*

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education as an alternative to integration and special education is becoming more and more educational practice now. Including all students to the education process in one school or class, regardless of the diversity of special educational needs prevents from social exclusion and marginalization. Lack of selection and segregation of students promotes learning of tolerance and acceptance of all people, and above all, appreciation of individual differences in shaping the identity process of young people. Openness to variety of social units favors building a society with no place for stigma and discrimination.

To be able to talk about the success of inclusive education, and thus the effective implementation of all its objectives, we need individuals who will be guided in their actions by standards and principles based on social inclusion. It is

also important for individuals to implement in social life all the ideas forming the educational space promoting inclusiveness and also to interact with other individuals or groups, in order to disseminate inclusive education, which is classic social engineering activities.

The role of the teacher in inclusive education from the perspective of social engineering has not been describe in subject literature yet. Social engineering as a social activity in contemporary society has a pejorative connotation because it is mainly associated with the manipulation. Activity in the area of education aiming at achieving the intended social objective, does not have to be a negative behavior. Social engineering can also be seen as a positive activity.

What then is the role of the teacher in inclusive education? Can we call the teacher a social engineer of educational space? Is the teacher responsible for the success of inclusive education? The aim of this article is an attempt to answer the above questions with a particular focus to clarify the concepts of inclusive education and social engineering and their mutual connotation in relation to the role of the teacher.

1 INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Inclusive education, according to the definition adopted by UNESCO is an education process focused on providing high-quality education, taking into account the diversity of students' needs, abilities, personality and educational aspirations, eliminating all forms of discrimination (Plichta; Podgórska-Jachnik, 2012, p. 102-103).

Disseminating the idea of inclusion is educationally, socially and economically justified. The inclusive educational system should, inter alia, seek ways in which all children will be able to find their place in a public school and benefit this fact. According to the social justification the inclusive education is an instrument of change in social attitudes towards greater openness to "otherness", and thus minimizing bias and discrimination. Economic rationale is that the charge inclusive education is much cheaper than maintaining a separate, specialized education geared to work with different types of students (Plichta; Podgórska-Jachnik, 2012, p. 103).

Inclusive education can be seen and considered on many levels. Mel Ainscow identifies six perspectives to understanding of inclusive education (Ainscow; Booth; Dyson, 2006, p. 15):
1) inclusive education, in which attention is paid only to students with disabilities and having "special educational needs",
2) inclusive education, in which attention is paid to the students leave school early for disciplinary reasons,

3) inclusive education, in which attention is paid to the different needs of students functioning in risk of social exclusion groups,
4) inclusive education, in which attention is drawn to the conditions of training and preparation of school for students with various needs, so-called, "schools for all",
5) inclusive education, in which the needs of all students are important, so-called, "education for all",
6) inclusive education, in which the development of systematic approach to education and society is important.

I think that global perception of inclusive education will be most appropriate. To be able to talk about an effective inclusive education, it is important to think about education and teaching issues in a broad perspective.

Inclusive education is a common goal for both school system and social policy perspective. To notice the effects of inclusive action, the school should function in such a way in order to provide access to a full range of educational and social opportunities for all students, and thus to prevent isolation and segregation (Mittler, 2012, p. 2). Inclusive education recognizes that all children can learn. It respects the diversity of individuals in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, etc., and there is a part of a wider strategy of promotion of inclusion society. The inclusive education is also a dynamic process which is constantly evolving (Zacharuk, 2011, p. 4).

According to G. Szumski the concept of "inclusion" can be seen from the point of view of the four planes. Inclusion can be a synonymous of integration education. This term can also be a reference to the quality of non-segregation education of disabled in the case when the student not only is admitted to a public school, but he is also included in the group and recognized as a fully-fledged member of it. Inclusion can also be seen as assimilation - the education system which takes into account the diversity of the students and it adapts the school to this diversity. This term can also be understood as the complete elimination of educational segregation (Szumski, 2006, p. 105).

According to Tamara Zacharuk the educational inclusion refers to the right of the child to going to the mass school, in which each student is provided with the support necessary for normal development. Zacharuk notes that enlargement the practice and school policy of equal opportunities in inclusive education is important. The author notes that inclusion is not a permanent condition, it is a process of building a school community that will not only accept, but also valued dissimilarity (Zacharuk, 2011, p. 2).

Inclusive education can help improve the quality of education for all students. It can also overcome the marginalization and social exclusion by the fight against stereotypes which lead to prejudice and discrimination.

The inclusive education is characterized by striving for support and building process of development of each child. All aspects of the development of young people are very important. However, to make inclusive education effective, it is essential that teachers understand the process of development and learning of children.

An inseparable element of inclusive education is not to stigmatize children due to any subjective feelings but allow them to be a part of mass education. Segregation of students based on teacher incomprehensible factors of the behavior results only in marginalization and social exclusion (Baranowska, 2010b, p. 190-193). According to Wanda Baranowska the perception of the sources of difficulties at school, the perception of student's chances of success at school and the level of liking, which the declaration is subject of social approval, affect the attitude of the teacher to the student (Baranowska, 2010a, p. 123-125).

The inclusive education should be seen as an aid in the development of every human being, regardless of the physical, social or emotional obstacles. It is therefore necessary to have wide vision of education intended for everyone and implemented in response to the needs of people who are particularly at risk of exclusion and stigmatization. The vision of education open to the diverse needs of children and young people, in order to increase the availability and participation in education available for all people is also important.

2 SOCIAL ENGINEERING

Social engineering is the activity on the social changes that are the results of conscious and purposeful activity (Podgórecki, 1966, p. 9). Social engineering by *The dictionary of sociological concepts* is "the practical application of knowledge in the social sciences to transform social reality" (Pacholski; Slaboń, 2010, p. 180). According to *The dictionary of sociological* the term "social engineering" is firstly the theoretical science which engage in research and analysis of rational and purpose-oriented social activities. It is the science focused primarily on the effectiveness. Secondly "social engineering" is aware of the use of scientific knowledge in order to achieve the intended social purpose or implement targeted social changes (Olechnicki; Załęcki; Załecki, 2004// 1997, p. 196).

The understanding of social engineering is not clear, and it may contributes to many terminology misunderstandings. Adam Podgórecki proposed a narrow definition, according to which social engineering is a kind of set of recommendations or warnings concerning the rational transformation of social life (Podgórecki, 1970, p. 18). According to Podgórecki social engineering can be seen in many ways. First of all, social engineering is a practical science

which is a rational change of social reality. As stated by the author, the subject of social engineering reflection are primarily: the system of education, the techniques of mass impact, the legal system and the methods to use the power. The source of social engineering are sociological theorems, principles which are developed in the course of social practice and reflections of thinkers. Elementary statements of social engineering are utilitarian assessment, but the assessment of objectives of the action does not belong to the social engineering (Kojder; Kubin; Kwasniewski, 2000, p. 25).

The scope of social engineering can be viewed in three ways. In the first approach the social engineering refers to the methods and techniques provided by social sciences which are used in the planning of social change. Social engineering can also be seen as a separate learning by doing, and its purpose is to develop the teleological proceedings. In other words, social engineering is identified only with the process of teleological proceeding as a way of achieving the intended objectives (Czapów; Podgórecki, 1972, p. 9-10).

The tasks of social engineering can be seen in the context of the functions assigned to the social sciences. First, social engineering is shaping public awareness by providing people the rational tools to description of reality. Social engineering is also involved in forecasting which impact on the management of social processes. Thirdly, the task of social engineering is to formulate directives of rational action, and Podgórecki states that it is directly related to the domain of social engineering (Podgórecki, 1974, p. 561).

The set of directives mentioned by Podgórecki can be brought into persuasive, manipulative or facilitative action (Pawelczyk; Piontek, 1999, p. 64-65). Persuasive activities are characterized by a high degree of openness for intentions of individuals or groups which control the process of communication. Using persuasive actions and conviction we can attempt to change the views of the individual and the controlled group. Using manipulative actions the steering person or group tries to change the views and attitudes of the population without its knowledge and against its will. True intentions and goals are hidden. Among individuals or groups controlled some states can occur (eg. threats) that justify the application of the measures. The facilitation activities are activities to help achieve a particular purpose, through the creation of real situations. It may increase the chances of success in shaping the views and attitudes of individuals or groups, which could not be achieved by previous forms of social engineering.

In the spotlight of social engineering there are the social objects like sets of individuals and social groups. In the case of sets of individuals the controlling process refers to the common characteristics of the individuals, and the results are individual behaviors directly linked to. Activities of social engineering in relation to social groups relate to connecting its members social bonds. Impact

of objects are divided into micro- and macrostructure due to the dimension (Czesław, 1974, p. 15).

We can distinguish different types of social engineering activities. The control system can be expected to cause changes in the objectives and means of action pursued by the system controlled. It also affects the attitude adopted by the entity. Social engineering activities may also aim to increase the subordination or autonomy of the controlled system. They may refer to the intellectual or emotional sphere and be open or hidden (Pacholski; Słaboń, 2010, p. 181).

In the contemporary characteristics of the social engineering process we depart from a statement that social transformations are always rational and conscious, and we can indicate that they are very often unintentional. Institutions which are attributed to a teleological impact on society use only the relationships in the social environment. Currently, it can be concluded that social engineering is a process of extended reproduction of the social order, during which we can introduce new standards and values in force (Pawelczyk, 2000, p. 101). Social engineering provides the knowledge by which, through the use of appropriate instruments and measures, we can persuade the individuals or groups to behavior expected by the interactions perpetrators.

3 THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER AS A SOCIAL ENGINEER IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

In the educational area there are a lot of processes of education. It is "relatively uniform rational design of social order, social activities (...), the basis for which there are the education system and educational activities, whose main objective is to develop of personality" (Surina, 2010 // 2012, p. 14). Educational space can also be seen as a social area in which there are preserved, as intended or created, some elements of the culture of the social system, and it is distinctive from other systems. Educational space may also be constituted by shared values in the subjective relationships (Pasterniak, 1995, p. 18). In this area individual creates a personal knowledge of reality alone, and the reality is individually constructed using the tools of cultural and investigation to understand the meanings (Balachowicz, 2009, p. 22).

Social space of the educational environment form the individuals, as well as existing relations between them, based on social norms and cultural symbols. In addition to the individuals we can see also institutions which constitute depending systems and governing relationships arising under them (Szmatka, 2007, p. 347-348).

Who creates educational space? Who is responsible for the rules and norms that guide the actors in the social relations? Is the form of the educational area is social engineering activity?

The educational space is created by the teacher and the student and the relationships between them. This space is regulated by school as an institution which in the child educational area mediates between social environment and individuals. Very important for creating a cohesive educational space are relationships that exist between student and teacher.

Lew Siemionowicz Wygotski emphasized the active role of the child in the accumulation of knowledge. However he noted that learning is optimal only in cooperation with others, and collaborative work (Schaffer; Schaffer; Wojciechowski; Brzezińska, 2005, p. 225). Adult, as a more competent person, create external context of child development, and becomes a mediator between child and the social environment.

In order to direct school's actions toward the external environment and inclusive education we need teachers who will create just such a reality. Through their actions they will present the value of inclusive education to society and different social groups the while negate the hermeticity in action at the same time. The way the teachers act is the key role because they are able to shape the actions of young people. If the teacher shows the student the right direction, he probably will be follow it.

The teachers have a fundamental role in the implementation process of open and inclusive environment in the area of education (Szumski, 2006, pp. 23-24). The role of the teacher is to help the child in his individual development, satisfying his needs and stimulate new ones. To be able to do this, the teacher should implement school educational goals, and not just close up in their socio-organizational structure. The teacher should goes outside the school processes, too. The school, which does not see the influence of the environment and does not stimulate efforts to global development is not as a fully-fledged support the development of the individual.

According to Margaret Reynolds, the knowledge, beliefs and the teacher value system are important elements in the process of creating educational inclusion (Reynolds, 2001, pp. 465-476). The teacher has a very important role in defining and shaping the future of the students, and thus the entire society. However he can play both a positive and a negative role in shaping the identity of students (Welskop, 2013, p. 126). The teacher's task is to develop the students' ability to choose such a course of action that will be the most optimal in the context of the "adult" social life (Kosiorek, 2011).

In the educational space the relationships between teacher and student are constituted by communication between them. Implications for inclusive education has both verbal and non-verbal communication. Communicating, as a

one of form of social engineering, open to the creation of a common educational space (Sztejnberg; Sztejnberg, 2006. p. 86). Open communication between the teacher and student, running in an atmosphere of acceptance, understanding and trust, strengthens relationships between individuals and groups (Okoń, 2003, p. 51). Due to the compatibility and coherence of communication and the ability to adapt to diversity, the teacher can effectively endeavor to change the social reality, emphasizing the need to promote inclusive education. Communication with people different from us requires awareness that individuals in the community use the specific ways of perceiving the world. Lack of skills for effective communication always leads to confusion (Tanaś, 2013, p. 63). It is also important that social engineering is not turned into a manipulation, and thus a kind of symbolic violence which is hidden from the awareness of the individual that accepts information as self-evident, natural and justified (Kosiorek, 2008). The teacher in the process of communicating with the student transfer the patterns of social action by the hidden curriculum. It affects the process of inclusive education. Awareness for activities of the teacher is important if we want the open communication based on the tolerance towards diversity.

CONCLUSION

In my opinion the role of the teacher as the social engineering is undeniable. Creating of educational space by transformation of social reality is the social engineering activity. The teacher consciously or unconsciously, using scientific knowledge, aims at achieving the goal like inclusive education.

The teacher is often not aware that his activities are example of behaviour for his students. If the teacher will be open and inclusive education will be his goal, this example can be copied by students and inclusive education can become the future education. The teacher is the key to success here. He is an engineer of educational space.

It is substantial not to see social engineering as the negative activities involved in manipulating individuals or groups to achieve intended goal. The negative connotations of the concept of social engineering are inevitable, because the contemporary world uses all forms of influence on people. I would like to note that without the teacher who accepts, consciously or unconsciously, the role of social engineer we could not talk about the success of inclusive education. Acquired knowledge as a part of the socialization, without the introduction of new norms and values, could prove to be insufficient, and the wide inclusive education would only remain a theory.

Welskop, W.:
__UciteV ako socjalny inzinier v inkluzivnej edukacji__

LITERATURE

AINSCOW, M. - BOOTH, T. - DYSON, A. 2006. *Improving schools, developing inclusion.* London : Routledge, 2006. ISBN 1134193459.

BAŁACHOWICZ, J. 2009. *Style działań edukacyjnych nauczycieli klas początkowych. Między uprzedmiotowieniem a podmiotowością.* Warszawa : Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej TWP, 2009. ISBN 978-83-61121-07-7.

BARANOWSKA, W. 2010. *Nauczyciel a uczeń z ADHD.* Kraków : Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, 2010. ISBN 978-83-7587-153-1.

BARANOWSKA, W. 201 Ob. Nauczyciel niespecjalnie - specjalny wobec potrzeb ucznia z ADHD. Ukryty program w edukacji nauczycieli. In *Kultura i Edukacja,* 2010 n. 2, p. 190-193. ISSN 1230-266X.

CZAPÓW, C. - PODGÓRECKI, A. 1972. *Socjotechnika - podstawowe pojęcia i problemy.* Warszawa : Książka i Wiedza, 1972.

CZESŁAW, C. 1974. *Elementy funkcjonalności instytucji.* Warszawa : Książka i Wiedza, 1974.

KOJDER, A. - KUBIN, J. - KWAŚNIEWSKI, J. 2000. *Droga Adama Podgóreckiego do socjotechniki // Socjotechnika.* Warszawa : Instytut Profilaktyki Społecznej i Resocjalizacji; Instytut Profilaktyki Społecznej i Resocjalizacji Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2000. ISBN 83-910411-5-8.

KOSIOREK, M. 2008. *Przemoc symboliczna w edukacji.* Łódź : WSHE, 2008. ISBN 978-83-7405-543-7.

KOSIOREK, M. 2011. *Tutoring w szkole.* Toruń : Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2011. ISBN 978-83-7780-028-7.

MITTLER, P. 2012. *Working towards inclusive education: Social contexts.* London : Routledge, 2012. ISBN 1136605347.

OKOŃ, W. 2003. Komunikacja interpersonalna w szkole. In *Edukacja i Dialog,* 2003 n. 1, p. 51. ISSN 0866-952X.

OLECHNICKI, K. - ZAŁĘCKI, P. - ZAŁECKI, P. 2004; 1997. *Słownik socjologiczny.* Toruń : Wydawnictwo Graffiti BC; Wydawn. Graffiti BC, 2004; 1997. ISBN 83-900784-1-4.

PACHOLSKI, M. - SŁABOŃ, A. 2010. *Słownik pojęć socjologicznych.* Kraków : Wydawnictwo Uczelniane Akademii Ekonomicznej w Krakowie; Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego, 2010. ISBN 978-83-7252-498-0.

PASTERNIAK, W. 1995. *Przestrzeń edukacyjna.* Zielona Góra : Wydawnictwo WSP, 1995. ISBN 83-85693-90-4.

PAWELCZYK. P. 2000. *Socjotechniczne aspekty gry politycznej.* Poznań : Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM w Poznaniu; Wydawn. Nauk. Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, 2000. ISBN 83-232-1048-9.

PAWELCZYK, P. - PIONTEK. D. 1999. *Socjotechnika w komunikowaniu politycznym.* Poznań : Wydawnictwo Naukowe Instytutu Nauk Politycznych i Dziennikarstwa UAM, 1999. ISBN 83-87704-05-9.

PLICHTA, P. - PODGÓRSKA-JACHNIK, D. 2012. *Przygotowanie nauczycieli do edukacji włączającej - kontekst europejski // Dobre praktyki pedagogiczne szansą innowacyjnej edukacji.* Łódź : Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP; Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej. ISBN 978-83-62684-28-1.

PODGÓRECKI, A. 1966. *Zasady socjotechniki.* Warszawa : Wiedza Powszechna, 1966.

PODGÓRECKI, A. 1970. *Logika praktycznego działania.* Warszawa : Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

PODGÓRECKI, A. 1974. *Rola nauk humanistycznych w sterowaniu procesami zmiany społecznej (strategia społecznej zmiany).* Warszawa : Książka i Wiedza.

REYNOLDS, M. 2001. *Education for inclusion, teacher éducation and the teacher training agency standards.* In *Journal of In-Service Education,* 27 (3), p. 465^76. ISSN 1747-5082.

SCHAFFER, H. R. - SCHAFFER, H. R. - WOJCIECHOWSKI, A. - BRZEZIŃSKA, A. 2005. *Psychologia dziecka.* Warszawa : Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2005. ISBN 83-01-14534-X.

SURINA, I. 2012. *Rozważania o przestrzeni edukacyjnej - od teorii do praktyki edukacyjnej. Przestrzeń edukacyjna wobec wyzwań i oczekiwań społecznych.* Kraków : Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls; Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls. ISBN 8378500896.

SZMATKA, J., 2007. *Małe struktury społeczne.* Warszawa : Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2007. ISBN 978-83-01-15218-5.

SZTEJNBERG, A. - SZTEJNBERG, A. 2006. *Komunikacyjne środowisko nauczania i uczenia się.* Wrocław : Wydawnictwo Astrum, 2006. ISBN 83-7277-159-6.

SZUMSKI, G. 2006. *Integracyjne kształcenie niepełnosprawnych: sens i granice zmiany edukacyjnej // Integracyjne kształcenie niepełnosprawnych.* Warszawa : Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN; APS, 2006. ISBN 83-01-14711-3.

TAN AS, V. 2013. *Rola komunikacji międzykulturowej w pracy socjalnej.* Gliwice : Wydawnictwo Gliwickiej Wyższej Szkoły Przedsiębiorczości, 2013. ISBN 978-83-61401-88-9.

Welskop, W.:
__UciteV ako socjalny inzinier v inkluzivnej edukacji__

WELSKOP, W. 2013. *Rola nauczyciela-tutora w procesie wspierania rozwoju osobistego uczniów.* Siedlce : Wydawnictwo UPH w Siedlcach, 2013. ISBN 978-83-936635-4-5.

ZACHARUK, T. 2011. Edukacja włączająca szansą dla wszystkich uczniów. In *Mazowiecki Kwartalnik Edukacyjny Meritum* 1(20), p. 4. ISSN 1896-2521.

Contact details

Name and surname, title: dr Wojciech Welskop, PhD
Place of work: Department of Social Sciences,
                           Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu i Nauk o Zdrowiu in Łódź
Address: ul. Piotrkowska 278, 90-31 Łódź, Poland
E-mail: w.welskop@medyk.edu.pl