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Switzerland compared to other European countries

Tableau 1: Proportion (in %) of students excluded from the regular class by country (Source: OCDE: 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt; 1%</th>
<th>Entre 1 et 2%</th>
<th>Entre 2.1% 4%</th>
<th>&gt; 4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chypre</td>
<td>Autriche</td>
<td>Danemark</td>
<td>Allemagne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espagne</td>
<td>Irlande</td>
<td>Finlande</td>
<td>Belgique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grèce</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Hongrie</td>
<td>Estonie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islande</td>
<td>Grande-Bretagne</td>
<td>Pays-Bas</td>
<td>Suisse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italie</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tchéquie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norvège</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suède</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportion of pupils out of the mainstream school (OFS, 2011):

– from 1990/91 to 2003/2004 increased from 5.1% to 6.3%
– from 2003/2004 to 2007/2008, decreased from 6.3% to 5.1%.

High disparity between the 26 states (or canton) that compose Switzerland, each with its own school organization.

The proportion of pupils out of the mainstream school is lower in the latin parts (french and italien speaking parts) of Switzerland than in the german speaking part.
**Graph 1**: proportion (%) of pupils out of the mainstream school (OFS, 2011).
Risk factors

Overrepresentation of foreign pupils:
1/10 foreign pupils; sur 1/40 swiss pupils (OFS, 2011).

Overrepresentation of boys:
62% of boys in special classes;
68% of boys in special schools (OFS, 2011).
• The 8 key competences (EC) are very general and we can only agree with each of them.

• Do they have anything specific for inclusion? Switzerland has also a listing of the key competences for teacher training – mainstream school (11 competences) and for specialised teachers (18 different competences).

• This approach by key competences is actually critizised (for instance Crahay) and is not relevant for evaluation.
Teacher’s Training

Emphasis on
– special needs
– differences between children
– inclusion advantages for children
– exculsion desavantages for children
– collaboration with specialists
...

A majority of teachers are still against inclusion and are very favorable to exclusion (even in states which have an strong inclusive school policy). Search results: Doudin, Curchod-Ruedi & Baumberger (2009): only **22%** of the teachers are in favor of inclusion (Latin Switzerland); Ramel & Lonchampt (2009): **70%** of the teachers are against inclusion; **93%** of the teachers are for a return to special classes (where they have been deleted).

Psychologists can be more opposed to inclusion than teachers

Specialised teachers can be more opposed to inclusion than regular teachers (mainstream school)
• Inclusion (or even an attitude favorable to inclusion) represent a risk factor for teachers health (burnout).
• Exclusion is a way to protect oneself.
• Even if the students have adopted an inclusion favorable attitude, they can change rapidly their point of view in working in a school favorable to exclusion.
• Problem of training and key competences or problem of the school organisation?
• If the school system allows exclusion, teachers will exclude some pupils (protection of oneself).
• The school must propose protection factors to compensate risk factors.
• Social support is the main protection factor (support network).
• Reallocation of specialised teachers to intervene in mainstream classes to support the entire class.