

Miriam Sonntag

University of Innsbruck, Austria

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1325-9447>

Multi-Professional Cooperation in the Austrian School System and its Implications for Inclusive Education

ABSTRACT: The Austrian school system faces the challenge of breaking down barriers to learning for all students in view of the increasing heterogeneity of the students. With the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Austria faces the challenge of guaranteeing an inclusive education system. A brief overview of inclusive education in Austria is followed by the focus of this article: the multi-professional cooperation in the context of inclusive education in Austria. The cooperation on the part of the educators is discussed as a key condition for the implementation of inclusive educational systems. An ongoing research project about multi-professional cooperation in secondary school in Austria is presented below. The author identifies critical issues in this area based on selected research results.

KEYWORDS: inclusion, multi-professional cooperation, secondary school, Austria

Kontakt:	Miriam Sonntag miriam.sonntag@uibk.ac.at
Jak cytować:	Sonntag, M. (2022). Multi-professional cooperation in the Austrian school system and its implications for Inclusive Education. <i>Forum Oświatowe</i> , 34(1), 69–80. https://doi.org/10.34862/fo.2022.5
How to cite:	Sonntag, M. (2022). Multi-professional cooperation in the Austrian school system and its implications for Inclusive Education. <i>Forum Oświatowe</i> , 34(1), 69–80. https://doi.org/10.34862/fo.2022.5

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN AUSTRIA

Since the beginning of the 1990s, there has been a uniform federal law for schools in Austria that enables integrative schooling for children with and without disabilities. In 1993, parental rights to choose between an inclusive or special education setting were introduced. As a result, the integration rate initially rose for around 10 years but then stagnated again. There are currently also major regional differences between the individual federal states (cf. Biewer, 2021). In this respect, a parallel system of joint schooling and special schooling has been able to hold up over the years (see Feyerer, 2019, p. 64). In 2008 Austria ratified the “United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” (UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD). Article 24 of the UN Disability Rights Convention recognizes the right of disabled people to education: “In order to realize this right without discrimination, the contracting states ensure an inclusive education system at all levels and lifelong learning (...)” (BMSGPK, 2016, p. 19). This results in far-reaching changes for the Austrian education system. As a result, the National Action Plan Disability 2012 – 2020 (NAP) was prepared with the aim to achieve full inclusion by 2020. One of the central measures was the anchoring of inclusive model regions (IMR). The plan was to gradually convert the special school system into an inclusive system by implementing model regions and thus increase the integration rate at all Austrian schools (cf. BMSGK, 2012, p. 65). The previously independent training for special needs teachers was replaced by new curricula from 2014. Teacher training was restructured (NEW pedagogical training), and “specialization including pedagogy” was introduced in training. Teachers should do justice to the heterogeneity of the students in terms of (subject) didactics and methods and, together with colleagues, design school and lessons in such a way that (learning) barriers can be broken down (cf. Feyerer, 2019, p. 72). But despite these changes, there are still 36.9% of pupils in special schools or taught in special education classes. Accordingly, the inclusion rate throughout Austria is 63.1%

(Statistik Austria, 2020). This rate has changed little in recent years. Moreover, the proportion of students in special schools rose again slightly between 2011 and 2019, although the number of students overall has decreased (Statistik Austria 2021, p. 25). In addition, both the Court of Auditors (Rechnungshof, 2019) and the evaluation

of the National Disability Action Plan (BMSGPK, 2020) point to significant shortcomings in the implementation of inclusive education and training in the Austrian education system. In summary, Austria is currently characterized by a very expensive parallel system (cf. Accounts Court, 2019). The so-called “multi-track system” (Feyerer, 2019, p. 64) refers to a well-developed system of different special schools with their own curricula on the one hand and the parallel pursuit of inclusive education in primary and secondary schools for pupils with special educational needs.

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION – WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

While integration “aims to support pupils with special learning needs in the existing system,” inclusion goes one step further and “starts not with the learners, but with the learning system itself” (BMBWF, 2021, p. 11). The ability of pedagogical institutions to meet the different learning requirements and needs of children and young people, as well as the reduction of institutional disadvantages in the education system, are regarded as the basis for the (further) development of school inclusion. The distinction between a narrow and a broad understanding of inclusive education also becomes clear here: “In the current discourse, there is a broad understanding of inclusion assumed that not only focuses on the different category disability, but also other educational risks such as migration and multilingualism, gender or social background and their interrelationships or intersectionality are taken into account.” (Hoffmann, 2020). According to Dyson, an inclusive school is characterized by the following characteristics, among others: a school culture based on recognition and appreciation, educational opportunities provided for all students at their individual developmental levels,

teachers and educators work closely together, show a high degree of flexibility with regard to the forms of teaching (Dyson, Hows & Roberts, 2004). Werning adds that inclusive schools are also characterized by reliable structures and a continuous process of reflection. Intensive cooperation in multi-professional teams is the central condition for the successful implementation of such a vision of inclusive schooling (Werning, 2018).

MULTI-PROFESSIONAL COOPERATION IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Inclusive teaching requires a wide range of qualifications from professionals. Chief among them is the capacity to cooperate. Based on the organizational-psychological definition of Spieß, cooperation “ (...) is characterized by the reference to goals or tasks to be achieved jointly, it is intentional, communicative and requires trust. It presupposes a certain autonomy and is bound to the norm of reciprocity” (Spieß, 2004, p. 199). This flexible definition is suitable, according to Gräsel et al., especially for the field of school, because it “includes structural openness” (Gräsel et al., 2006, p. 207). It requires the three core conditions “that have been investigated in research – both in organizational psychology and in school research: common

goals and tasks, trust and autonomy” (Gräsel et al., 2006, p. 207). Multi-professional cooperation goes beyond teacher cooperation and can be defined as follows: “If more than two professional groups cooperate with each other, which have a certain degree of specialization, they coordinate their actions and exchange professional information, we speak of multi-professional cooperation (Kielblock et al., 2017, p. 142). The following occupational groups, among others, can be counted as part of multi-professional team for/in inclusive schools: general schoolteachers, special education teachers, school social workers, school assistants, school psychologists, therapists, counselors, and parents (Philipp, 2014, p. 10; Kricke & Reich, 2016, pp. 199–200; Stähling & Wenders, 2015). However, a variety of other professional groups can be included as well, depending on support services and specialists available and needed. Kullmann emphasizes that the forms and types of multi-professional cooperation in schools are as diverse as the schools themselves (Kullmann, 2018, p. 4). Among other things, the difference between the various professions involved in terms of training, access, and hierarchical positions are cited as complicating the implementation of cooperation. The lack of systemic anchoring of multi-professional teams in the German-speaking education systems also represents an obstacle to the implementation of inclusive schooling practices. But the cooperation of different professional groups in and outside the classroom is currently regarded as indispensable. In this context, Köpfer & Lemmer speak of cooperation in inclusive contexts being “negotiated as a sine qua non for successful teaching in inclusive schools” (Köpfer & Lemmer, 2020, p. 80). The European Agency for Development in Special Education Needs (2012) also stresses the relevance of cooperative and multi-professional cooperation at different levels in the context of inclusive school development processes and the professionalisation of teachers for inclusive teaching (European Agency for Development in Special Education Needs, 2012).

Werning emphasizes that inclusive teaching which requires a variety of pedagogical concepts, didactic and subject didactic, as well as diagnostic competences, which can only be brought in and made usable for teaching through cooperative forms of work by teachers with different competence profiles (Werning, 2018, p. 5). Löser points out that “at inclusive schools, cooperation processes with other specialist staff and / or with teachers with different qualifications represent an opportunity to respond professionally to the diversity of the students and to avoid overtaxing the regular school teacher” (Löser, 2013, p. 109). In short, the perceived diversity of the learning group requires diversity in the pedagogical team in order to reduce barriers to learning and stressful and overstraining experiences on the part of the teachers. Schools that work in an inclusive manner show a high degree of (multi-professional) cooperation winning schools of the Jakob Muth Prize for inclusive schools or the German School Award¹. The importance of multi-professional cooperation in inclusive learning is also evident in the internationally used Index for Inclusion to support inclusive school development processes, where regular and cooperative collabora-

1 For more information about the winning schools: <https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/de/unsere-projekte/abgeschlossene-projekte/jakob-muth-preis/preistraeger/> or <https://www.deutscher-schulpreis.de/>

tion, as well as shared responsibility of a team for a learning group, is emphasized (Booth & Ainscow, 2019, p. 193)

Research on multi-professional cooperation in inclusive education in the German-speaking countries has so far focused on the two occupational groups of special or inclusion educators and regular schoolteachers. In this way, a narrow understanding of inclusion and a dichotomous view of the students or teachers is strengthened (Lemmer, 2018). Other dimensions of diversity, such as those corresponding to a broad understanding of inclusion, are not addressed.

MULTI-PROFESSIONAL COOPERATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOL IN AUSTRIA

Much research and professional discourse on school inclusion and cooperation focus on cooperation between mainstream and special needs teachers within the framework of the so-called interdisciplinary cooperation. Initial studies were published as part of the first accompanying research on the first integrative school models in the 1980s. From the very beginning, they identified the cooperation of the different professions as a central aspect of integration both in Germany and later Austria (Kreis et al., 2016; Werning & Arndt, 2013; Lütje-Klose & Urban, 2014; Urban & Lütje-Klose, 2014). This approach, however, turns out to be fundamentally problematic, as it always shows a “normative inside and a special outside and assumes a corresponding fundamental assignability of pupils into “normal” and “special” – also at the level of teachers, as “general” and “special education”. (Köpfer & Lemmer, 2020, p. 82).

An ongoing research project of the author uses a mixed-methods design and collects various data on multi-professional cooperation. The main methods used include: by means of a quantitative online survey among principals of secondary schools (initially in the state of Tyrol, supplemented by an Austrian-wide survey in preparation), talks and interviews with interested principals and teachers, focus group interviews with multi-professional teams, and participant observation. My aim is to understand tutoring in class and participating in observations and group discussions with multi-professional team group-specific behaviors in the context of multi-professional cooperation, also with regard to teaching design of the teaching. Are there any particularities in professional theory in relation with regard to the division of roles? How are subject teachers and inclusion educators involved in teaching, and what influence do these patterns have on differentiated teaching? The quotations in the following are all taken from the short-sketched research project (period of the school year 2020/2021 and school year 2021/2022). It is important to point out that this is the first compilation; the further qualitative evaluations are currently being carried out. The data will be analyzed in the final report in more detail than is presented in this article below. In this respect, the quotations and notes can only provide clues to individual elements but cannot be presented as confirmed findings.

FIRST RESULTS: ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES FROM A SYSTEMIC PERSPECTIVE

The following interpretation of the quotations and notes is intended to show that the above-mentioned challenges of multi-professional cooperation have to be seen in the context of the multi-level system. Fend distinguishes between the macro-systemic level (education administration, framework conditions, membership of the college, legal requirements), the mesosystemic level (local environment and internal school relationships, roles and responsibilities, areas of work and activity dealt with jointly and separately), and the microsystemic level (direct interaction in the classroom and other funding situations, attitudes and readiness of the participants, satisfaction). Based on this multi-level model from Fend's (2008) school development, it quickly becomes apparent that the different levels cannot be viewed and discussed separately in this context. Rather – and this is how the author's research project is structured – the levels are conditioned to each other, and different approaches are required in order to bring together the clues before theoretical assumptions (Lütje-Klose & Miller, 2017).

Example 1: Macro-systemic level

Quotation from a principal in a tyrolean middle school:

„There are no predetermined structures on the part of the education administration that I could pass on as head of the school. Even counseling teachers must always be actively requested. The conditions are a total difficulty for joint cooperation.”

The quotation from the school administration points to a lack of established structures on the part of the education administration: The guidance teachers established in the system are not clearly assigned to the schools and must be requested on a case-by-case basis via seemingly unclear channels. This points to the fact that problematic situations within the school, which on the part of the students are usually accompanied by negative assignments and experiences of failure, only legitimize support (keyword labeling-resource dilemma). The quotation should also be interpreted as meaning that there is uncertainty about how supporting staff can get to the schools. Two central demands for inclusion education are addressed here: a systemic allocation of resources that goes beyond teaching staff and other professions, such as guidance teachers, should be flexibly available to the school system. Furthermore, a systemic resource allocation, which is generally available in the individual school, has the advantage of being able to work preventively in cooperation with teachers and other actors, and of having fewer negative experiences on the part of the students. Reference to the lack of systemic anchoring of supporting multi-professional resources as called for in the discourse on an inclusive school (and see Canada, for example, is also very successfully established, cf. Oskadottir & Köpfer, 2021, Löser, 2013).

Example 2: Mesosystemic level

Quotation from a principal in a tyrolean middle school:

“The responsibilities of the individual collaborating colleagues are unclear. (...) What do the individual professions actually do?”

What are the roles and responsibilities of the different occupational groups in the cooperation? In fact, this should also be clearly defined by the school board, or clear support structures for the college on the part of the school board should be specified. Co-operators in the early stages of cooperation should be given sufficient time to get to know and negotiate roles and tasks or to attend joint training courses to prepare for the joint task. The quotation points to an undefined working mode and a certain arbitrariness. But perhaps also due to the lack of communication processes between the acting teachers and the school management. This note from a conversation with a school principal also points to a certain ignorance on the part of the school administration:

Example 3: Microsystemic level

Note from an internship in class and a subsequent discussion with the teacher team (consisting of two specialist teachers and one integration teacher)

In this class all students (Note, all performance groups and all pupils with special educational needs) are taught together. In a short conversation after the class I am told that they are reluctant to do so and that they also like to teach the class separately according to their achievements and competences. It is also reported that Ms. T, the integration teacher, often “takes out” students with special educational needs and teaches them separately.

Since the 2019/20 school year, permanent group education in Germany, First Foreign Language and Mathematics has been possible in Austria's secondary middle schools. The teachers cited make use of this group formation and expand it to include a further group, the students with special educational needs. This classification contrasts with inclusive didactic principles, which assume that heterogeneous learning groups have a positive impact on individual learning and development processes. The results show that lower-performing students, in particular, benefit from comparatively large differences in performance in classes and that no performance disadvantages can be observed in higher-performing children and adolescents (Decristan & Jude 2017, p. 117). From an inclusion pedagogical perspective, group formation on the basis of performance levels appears questionable, as it suggests that it could reduce barriers to learning. Rather, in the tradition of the (alleged) advantages of homogeneous learning groups, merit selection is described as a means of differentiation (BMBWF, 2020, pp. 13–15). Against the backdrop of the debate on overall education

in the 1980s, Feuser has already pointed out that a division into performance courses does not make it possible to overcome the segregating school system. According to Feuser, this “orientation on the model of “external differentiation” only leads to the fact that the multifaceted reality of schools is placed inside the schools. (Feuser 1989, p. 10, cf. also Feyerer, 2019). And as mentioned before, the roles of the teachers are carried out according to the division of the pupils into those with and without special educational support needs: the so-called integration teacher feels responsible for the separate instruction of the pupils with special educational support needs and the two specialist teachers for the other performance groups.

So far, multi-professional cooperation appears to be uncoordinated or not structured. Colleagues know little about the work and cooperation relationships in other classes or teams, and there are many different team constellations. The cellular structures of the school system are strengthened and lead to a degree of insecurity in everyday school life. Initial unpublished findings from the research project point to the fact that schools make no systematic use of potentially available occupational groups. The multitude of cooperation occasions, types of teams, and constellations of actors acting are not even aware of the school management. There is a lack of strategies for action at the individual level and clear guidelines at the institutional level so that reality is handled very differently, i.e., the overarching objective of reducing barriers to learning on the student side is used and enabled in very different ways. Indications of the continuing dominance of lone fighters and a continuing exclusionary division and little-inclusive role models between regular and special pedagogues, as well as a persistence of segregating teaching settings.

CONCLUSION

Although multi-professional cooperation can be assumed to be a key condition for the success of inclusive schools and inclusive school development, everyday school life can be characterized by a wide gap between aspiration and reality in terms of actual teacher cooperation. On the other hand, establishing the new teacher education system, which no longer trains special-school teachers and therefore has a specialization in inclusive pedagogy, might be the way, at least in the long term, to defuse the issues raised at least at the practical level. As long as a close understanding of inclusion prevails at different levels, it will be difficult to overcome this hurdle within a multi-professional collaboration, and the interdisciplinary collaboration of regular and special teachers will continue to be the focus. In this context, it also seems questionable to overcome the two-group theory that goes with it. In principle, large-scale research projects and a clear educational administrative approach to multi-professional cooperation are needed. The current research project of the author can provide individual hints and further concretize wishes with the following publications.

REFERENCES

- Biewer, G. (2021). Inklusive Bildung in Österreich – Von den Anfängen der Entwicklung eines rechtlich-normativen Auftrags bis zu den Perspektiven für die Zukunft. In A. Köpfer, J. J. W. Powell & R. Zahnd (Hrsg.), *Handbuch Inklusion international. Globale, nationale und lokale Perspektiven auf inklusive Bildung* (S. 239–246). Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Bonsen, M. & Priebe, B. (2013). Unterwegs zu einem Berufsethos in der Schule. Zur Professionalität gehört eine Berufsethik. *Lernende Schule*, (62), 4–7.
- Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. (2019). *Index für Inklusion. Ein Leitfaden für Schulentwicklung* (2. korrigierte und aktualisierte Auflage). Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit, Soziales, Gesundheit und Konsumentenschutz (BMSGK, Hrsg.) (2012). *Nationaler Aktionsplan Behinderung 2012–2020. Strategie der österreichischen Bundesregierung zur Umsetzung der UN-Behindertenrechtskonvention. Inklusion als Menschenrecht und Auftrag*. Verfügbar unter: <https://broschuerenservice.sozialministerium.at/>
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit, Soziales, Gesundheit, Pflege und Konsumentenschutz (BMSGPK, Hrsg.). (2016). *UN-Behindertenrechtskonvention. Deutsche Übersetzung der Konvention und des Fakultativprotokolls*. Verfügbar unter: <https://broschuerenservice.sozialministerium.at/Home/Download?publicationId=19>
- Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung (2020). *Das Pädagogik-Paket. Zeitgemäß. Transparent. Fair. 2. aktualisierte Auflage*, Wien. Verfügbar unter: https://pubshop.bmbwf.gv.at/index.php?rex_media_type=pubshop_download&rex_media_file=pb_2.pdf
- Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung (2021). *Das Pädagogik-Paket. Zeitgemäß. Transparent. Fair. 3. aktualisierte Auflage*, Wien. Verfügbar unter: <https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/Themen/schule/zrp/pp.html>.
- Bundesministerium für Soziales, Gesundheit, Pflege und Konsumentenschutz (BMSGPK, Hrsg.). (2020). *Evaluierung des Nationalen Aktionsplans Behinderung 2012–2020*. Verfügbar unter: <https://broschuerenservice.sozialministerium.at/home/Download?publicationId=750>
- Decristan, J.; Jude, N. (2017). Heterogenitätskategorie Schulleistung/Leistung von Schülerinnen und Schülern. In: T. Bohl, J. Budde, M. Rieger-Ladich (Hrsg.), *Umgang mit Heterogenität in Schule und Unterricht. Grundlagentheoretische Beiträge, empirische Befunde und didaktische Reflexionen* (S. 109–122). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt, #
- Dyson, A., Howes, A., & Roberts, B. (2004). What do we really know about inclusive schools? A systematic review of the research evidence. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Special educational needs and inclusive education: Major themes in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. (2012). *Inklusionsorientierte Lehrerbildung. Ein Profil für inklusive Lehrerinnen und Lehrer*. Brüssel.

- Fend, H. (2008). *Schule gestalten. Systemsteuerung, Schulentwicklung und Unterrichtsqualität* (Lehrbuch, 1. Aufl.). Wiesbaden: VS Verl. für Sozialwiss. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-90867-0>
- Feyerer, E. & Altrichter, H. (2018). Die Entwicklung eines inklusiven Systems. Analyse von aktuellen Reformbestrebungen aus Governance-Perspektive. In E. Feyerer, W. Prammer, E. Prammer-Semmler, C. Kladnik, M. Leibetseder & R. Wimberger (Hrsg.), *System, Wandel, Entwicklung. Akteurinnen und Akteure inklusiver Prozesse im Spannungsfeld von Institution, Profession und Person* (S. 74–92). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Feyerer, E. (2019). Kann Inklusion unter den Strukturen des segregativen Schulsystems in Österreich gelingen? In J. Donlic, E. Jaksche-Hoffman & H. K. Peterlini (Hrsg.), *Ist inklusive Schule möglich? Nationale und internationale Perspektiven* (Pädagogik, S. 61–76). Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Feuser, G. (1989). Allgemeine integrative Pädagogik und entwicklungslogische Didaktik. *Behindertenpädagogik*, 28(1), 4–48.
- Gräsel, C., Fußangel, K. & Pröbstel, C. H. (2006). Lehrkräfte zur Kooperation anregen – eine Aufgabe für Sisyphos? *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 52(2), 205–219.
- Hoffmann, T. (National Competence Center für lernende Schulen, Hrsg.). (2020). 5 Minuten für...Inklusive Pädagogik. 125. Verfügbar unter: https://www.lernende-schulen.at/pluginfile.php/5969/mod_resource/content/0/5mf_2020_2021_Jahresausgabe.pdf
- Kielblock, S., Gaiser, J. M. & Stecher, L. (2017). Multiprofessionelle Kooperation als Fundament der inklusiven Ganztagschule. *Zeitschrift für Inklusion. Gemeinsam Leben*, 25(3), 140–148.
- Köpfer, A. & Lemmer, K. (2020). Die „perfekte“ Kooperationssituation. Rekonstruktionen ambivalenter Kooperationsvorstellungen angehender Lehrkräfte im Kontext schulischer Inklusion entlang von Norm und Expert. *Herausforderung Lehrer_innenbildung – Zeitschrift zur Konzeption, Gestaltung und Diskussion*, 3(1), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.4119/hlz-2485>
- Kreis, A., Wick, J. & Kosorok Labhart, C. (Hrsg.). (2016). *Kooperation im Kontext schulischer Heterogenität (Netzwerke im Bildungsbereich, Bd. 9)*. Münster – New York: Waxmann.
- Kricke, M. & Reich, K. (2016). *Teamteaching. Eine neue Kultur des Lehrens und Lernens* (Pädagogik). Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.
- Kullmann, H. (2018). Kooperation gestalten. Bedingungen und Typen multiprofessioneller Zusammenarbeit. *Lernende Schule*, (81), 4–7.
- Lemmer, K. (2018). Kooperationsvorstellungen und -erfahrungen angehender Lehrkräfte in Bezug auf schulische Inklusion. *Zeitschrift für Inklusion*, (4). Zugriff am 11.11.2021. Verfügbar unter: <https://www.inklusion-online.net/index.php/inklusion-online/article/view/486> [8.11.2021]
- Löser, J. M. (2013). „Support Teacher Model“ – Eine internationale Perspektive auf Lehrkooperation an inklusiven Schulen. In R. Werning & A.-K. Arndt (Hrsg.),

- Inklusion: Kooperation und Unterricht entwickeln (S. 107–124). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Lütje-Klose, B. & Urban, M. (2014). Professionelle Kooperation als wesentliche Bedingung inklusiver Schul- und Unterrichtsentwicklung. Grundlagen und Modelle inklusiver Kooperation – Teil 1. Vierteljahresschrift für Heilpädagogik und ihre Nachbargebiete, (2), 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.2378/vhn2014.art09d>
- Lütje-Klose, B. & Miller, S. (2017). Kooperation von Lehrkräften mit allgemeinem und sonderpädagogischem Lehramt in inklusiven Settings. Forschungsergebnisse aus Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. In B. Lütje-Klose, S. Miller, S. Schwab & B. Streese (Hrsg.), Inklusion: Profile für die Schul- und Unterrichtsentwicklung in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. Theoretische Grundlagen – Empirische Befunde – Praxisbeispiele (Beiträge zur Bildungsforschung, Bd. 2, S. 203–213). Münster – New York: Waxmann.
- Oskarsdóttir, E. & Köpfer, A. (2021). Inklusive Unterstützungsstrukturen in Schulen in Island und Kanada – Eine kulturvergleichende Analyse mit Blick auf schulrechtliche Entwicklungen und In-School-Support. In A. Köpfer, J. J. W. Powell & R. Zahnd (Hrsg.), Handbuch Inklusion international. Globale, nationale und lokale Perspektiven auf inklusive Bildung (S. 277–298). Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Philipp, E. (2014). Multiprofessionelle Teamentwicklung. Erfolgsfaktoren für die Zusammenarbeit in der Schule (Pädagogik). Weinheim [u.a.]: Beltz.
- Rechnungshof Österreich. (2019). Inklusiver Unterricht: Was leistet Österreichs Schulsystem? III–242 der Beilagen zu den Stenographischen Protokollen des Nationalrates XXVI. GP (Rechnungshof, Hrsg.) (Reihe BUND 2019/4). Wien.
- Spieß, E. (2004). Kooperation und Konflikt. In: H. Schuler, K. Moser. Organisationspsychologie – Gruppe und Organisation (S. 193–247). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Stähling, R. & Wenders, B. (2015). Teambuch Inklusion. Ein Praxisbuch für multiprofessionelle Kooperation. Hohengehren: Schneider.
- Statistik Austria (2020). Bildung in Zahlen. Tabellenband. Wien: Statistik Austria. Verfügbar unter: http://www.statistik.at/wcm/idc/idcplg?IdcService=GET_NATIVE_FILE&RevisionSelectionMethod=LatestReleased&dDocName=123233
- Statistik Austria (2021). Bildung in Zahlen. 2019/2020. Schlüsselindikatoren und Analysen. Wien: Statistik Austria. Verfügbar unter: http://www.statistik.at/wcm/idc/idcplg?IdcService=GET_NATIVE_FILE&RevisionSelectionMethod=LatestReleased&dDocName=126036
- Terhart, E. & Klieme, E. (2006). Kooperation im Lehrerberuf – Forschungsproblem und Gestaltungsaufgabe. Zur Einführung in den Thementeil. Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 52(2), 163–166.
- Urban, M. & Lütje-Klose, B. (2014). Professionelle Kooperation als wesentliche Bedingung inklusiver Schul- und Unterrichtsentwicklung. Teil 2 – Forschungsergebnisse zu intra- und interprofessioneller Kooperation. Vierteljahresschrift für Heilpädagogik und ihre Nachbargebiete, (4), 283–294. <https://doi.org/10.2378/vhn2014.art26d>

Werning, R. & Arndt, A.-K. (Hrsg.). (2013). *Inklusion: Kooperation und Unterricht entwickeln*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.

Werning, R. (2018). *Gemeinsam inklusiv unterrichten. Grundlagen zur Kooperation von Lehrkräften im inklusiven Unterricht*. SCHULE Inklusiv (1) 2018, 4–8.

WSPÓŁPRACA INTERDYSCYPLINARNA W AUSTRIACKIM SYSTEMIE SZKOLNYM I JEJ IMPLIKACJE DLA EDUKACJI WŁĄCZAJĄCEJ

ABSTRAKT: Austriacki system szkolny stoi przed wyzwaniem przełamania barier w nauce dla wszystkich uczniów w związku z rosnącą heterogenicznością grup studentów/uczniów. Wraz z przyjęciem Konwencji ONZ o prawach osób niepełnosprawnych, Austria stanęła przed wyzwaniem zagwarantowania systemu edukacji włączającej. Po krótkim omówieniu status quo następuje prezentacja głównego punktu niniejszego artykułu – współpracy interdyscyplinarnej w kontekście edukacji włączającej. Współpraca ze strony edukatorów jest omawiana jako kluczowy warunek dla wdrożenia systemów edukacji włączającej. Poniżej przedstawiono trwający projekt badawczy dotyczący współpracy interdyscyplinarnej w szkole średniej w Austrii. Opierając się na wybranych wynikach badań, autorka identyfikuje krytyczne kwestie w tym obszarze.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: inkluzja, współpraca interdyscyplinarna, szkoła średnia, Austria