

Initial Teacher Education for Inclusion: A Literature Review of Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in the United Kingdom and in South Korea

Jiah Seo¹

¹Wonkwang University, South Korea

HOW TO CITE:

Seo, J. (2020). Initial Teacher Education for Inclusion: A Literature Review of Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in the United Kingdom and in South Korea. *International Journal of Special Education*, 35(2), 83-92

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Jiah Seo;
Jiah9295@gmail.com

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.52291/ijse.2020.35.16>

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2020 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to examine the Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in relation to Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in South Korea and in the UK in order to suggest relocation of ITE of Korean inclusive education. Research has identified effective ITE as a significant contributor to the inclusive education context of both countries. This article examines current conceptualizations and trends in ITE related to SEND. Specifically, this study conducts a review of the literature that discusses Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in South Korea and in the UK by presenting the reasons why people have negative attitudes towards people with disabilities and to consider expanding the effective ITE, and more directly, its impact on Korean inclusive education. This article concludes with implications for the Korean ITE.

Keywords: inclusion; Initial Teacher Education; South Korea; UK

INTRODUCTION

The number of inclusive education settings where students with and without disabilities are educated together has been increasing worldwide over the last few decades (You, Kim, & Shin, 2019). According to the Ministry of Education, Republic of Korea (2017), the number of students with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) who are placed included in regular schools has risen from thirty students in 1971 to more than four hundred fifty-thousand students in 2017, and roughly seventy percent of students with SEND are placed in regular schools.

In order to meet the needs of these students, substantial focus has been placed on Korean inclusive education, and its rapid development has been implemented through policies, legislation, and infrastructure for inclusive education (Song, 2016). The Korean education policy proposes to enhance disability awareness and positive attitudes towards disability in inclusive settings in local communities, and the aim of disability awareness is to form a precise understanding of disability and to view people with disabilities as equal citizens (Chae, Park, & Shin, 2019).

Nevertheless, a lot of difficulties have been reported when trying to efficiently implement inclusive education in South Korea (You, Kim, & Shin, 2019). South Korea's educational system is well known for its intense academic competitiveness, which induces high levels of pressure and stress on students (Kim, 2014). Increased pressure on students to achieve excellent academic performance in the regular schools (Park & Kang, 2003) can work against the ethos and practice of inclusive education. Though inclusive education within regular classrooms demands educators to be familiar and well rounded with SEND pedagogies and curriculum as well as outstanding collaborative skills between both special and regular education teachers, a lot of mainstream teachers are not equipped with this necessary knowledge and skill (Kim, 2014).

The reason for this is that teacher education programmes in South Korea have required a single compulsory subject connected to special education as part of regular education teacher qualification (Son, 2012). Despite completing a compulsory subject on special and inclusive education, most in-service teachers find it difficult to work with students with SEND in inclusive classrooms

(Song, Sharma, & Choi, 2019). Educators have identified some concerns including low confidence in teaching students with SEND, a lack of time and resources, and negative perceptions towards inclusion (Min, 2013). Therefore, most mainstream education teachers have a reluctance to take inclusive classes (Min, 2013) and this can bring negative effects on the implementation of inclusive education (Kim & Kang, 2008; Min, 2013).

Though enhancing inclusivity features as an essential goal for initial teacher education (ITE) programmes throughout the USA, UK, Canada and other highly diverse countries (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008), newly appointed teachers continue to feel unprepared to deal with issues of diversity in their classrooms (OECD, 2010). When considering ITE within the UK context, a lot of prospective teachers enrol in a one-year postgraduate teacher education programme that includes little scope to develop inclusive professionals, compared to the USA, Canada, and Australia where four-five year programmes are offered (Coates, Harris, & Waring, 2020). The so-called 'achievement gap' between those who achieve least and those who achieve most, is also a chief concern in a lot of places, particularly the United Kingdom (OECD, 2007). This trend results in the British having negative attitudes and low expectation toward students with disabilities (Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005). This resulted in the relocation of responsibility for covering a lot of ITE content to placement schools, specifically on topics such as SEND and inclusion (Florian & Rouse, 2009).

This current article reviews the literature in order to initiate discussion and examine decisions concerning ITE for inclusion, as it has been shown that there are similar issues related to ITE for students with SEND between the two countries, such as a lack of pre-service teacher training, and negative attitudes and low expectations toward these students (Coates, Harris, & Waring, 2020; Son, 2012; Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005; Park & Kang, 2003). While there is a considerable amount of research on ITE (Coate, Harris, & Waring, 2020; Song, Sharma, & Choi, 2019; Symeonidou, 2017; Cochran-Smith et al., 2016; Musset, 2010; Florian, Young, & Rouse, 2010), this body of research still has substantial gaps, as it relates specifically to SEND in South Korea and in the UK. Therefore, this article attempts to examine the ITE in relation to SEND in South Korea and in the UK in order to relocate ITE of Korean inclusive education.

To begin, this article provides a review of literature that discusses SEND in South Korea and in the UK. Next, it examines the reasons why people have negative attitudes towards people with disabilities to consider expanding the effective ITE, and more directly, its impact on Korean inclusive education. This article concludes with implications in the Korean professional context.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES (SEND) IN SOUTH KOREA AND IN THE UK

The history of special education in South Korea is not long compared to other countries (Kwon, 2005). Though the special education policies and legislation in South Korea have been greatly influenced by the United States, there have been remarkable independent developments in special education (Yoo & Palley, 2014). In the 21st century, South Korea has begun to show concern for children and young people with SEND in education, with Korean educational practitioners and experts fostering and amending special education legislation to secure the rights of students with disabilities in an inclusive education context (Kim, 2014). Also, the number of students with disabilities in the general schools has grown and roughly forty thousand students with disabilities (sixty five percent of all students with disabilities in the country) were included in general education in 2007 (Seo, 2014). In 2012, the total budget of South Korean Special Education was two trillion Korean won (US\$ roughly two billion). Much of this budget, almost thirty four percent, was allocated to support special education (Yoo & Palley, 2014).

There has been more national legislation created to extend and support inclusive curricula in schools (Kim, 2014), as inclusive education has become part of the focused efforts to guarantee the right to learn without discrimination for students with SEND in South Korea (Kim, 2013). In this regard, the government has been putting a lot of effort into the development of human rights of foreigners (Yoo & Palley, 2014) as well as offering educational services such as after-school classes for children from multicultural families and providing teacher training services to strengthen positive awareness to teach these children (Kim, 2007). Recent positive changes of the government involve legislation in terms of people from different backgrounds, from restraint and administration to respect and understanding (Kim, 2009).

Meanwhile, teamwork between educators and policy makers plays an important role in helping children to be active learners by sharing their own ideas and encouraging children to get involved in various activities in schools. The *Every Child Matters* agenda in England and *Getting It Right for Every Child* in Scotland are good examples to show how UK national policies are well organized to support children (Florian & Kershner, 2009). For instance, the *Every Child Matters* (ECM) framework aims to bring about root-and-branch reform of children's services at every level to ensure that every child, whatever their circumstances or background, have the support they need to be healthy, stay safe, enjoy and achieve through learning, make a positive contribution to society, and achieve economic well-being (Crawley, 2006). *Getting It Right for Every Child* also has the potential to be world-leading in its national, strategic approach to promoting the well-being of all children through universal public services (Coles, Cheyne, Rankin, & Daniel, 2016). In England, The Association of Educational Psychologists co-operates with the government by providing written manuals to develop inclusion (Farrell & Venables, 2009), and medical and educational psychologists work together with schools for the development of inclusive education. Furthermore, they respond to schools' demands to assess students with learning difficulties (Farrell & Venables, 2009). In addition, there is something remarkable in the way Scotland has been addressing the current world situation, by widening the categories of SEND. In 2003, the Scottish Executive gathered and made a list not only for children with SEND who are recorded but also children who are not recorded (Scottish Executive, 2004).

However, since the late 1900s, inclusion in the UK has been developed slowly and unevenly (Florian, 2010). SEND in UK is not specifically indicated in law and the predominant model of SEND in policy texts has concentrated on individual impairments and pathology (Smith, Florian, Rouse, & Anderson, 2014). In England, though the number of separate special schools has constantly reduced during the last twenty years, education authorities tend to dislike change in education (Florian, 2007). In a knowledge-based global economy, successive UK governments have clearly acknowledged the significance of a well-educated and skilled population, and both increasing standards of achievement at all stages of education and inclusive education are national priorities (Pumfrey, 2008); however, most schools aim to encourage students to have high academic achievement, and this trend tends to overlook low performing students and problematic students

(Florian, 2014). Therefore, the *Scottish Parliament* reported that negative attitudes and low expectations toward students with disabilities are the biggest obstacles (Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005). Though the care, love and interaction between teachers and students from different background groups has been emphasized in England (Bhopal & Rhamie, 2014). Rhamie (2007) reported that a significant number of African Caribbean students gained less attention and support from their teachers and they felt discrimination in the class. In addition, not every parent who has children with disabilities wants a normal education. Several parents raised their voices to indicate that they want their children to attend separate special schools because they cannot combat the discrimination in the mainstream schools (Runswick-Cole, 2008).

There are also disadvantages in the South Korean inclusive education system as there is a huge difference between the possibility of fulfilling inclusion and the reality (Kim, 2014). Though the government provides practices of early identification of children with disabilities such as free screening and health check-ups, child identification activities, assessments and evaluations etc. (Kang, Kang, & Plunkett, 2015), there are some obstacles to early recognition of disabilities such as a lack of knowledge on early intervention, and a paucity of information regarding this practice (Cho, 2004). In terms of early intervention for children with SEND, South Korea lags behind other OECD countries (Yoo & Palley, 2014).

Furthermore, there has been a lot of legal support and effort to provide impartial educational opportunities for young people with SEND but many students with disabilities are still educated in separate educational environments (Kwon, 2005). Though sixty five percent of students with SEND are involved in inclusive education both in special and regular schools, only special education teachers teach these students in the special classrooms in regular schools. It means these students are not included in regular educational curricula (Kim, 2014). Practically, the major educational environments are only special schools and special classes in general schools for students with SEND (Kwon, 2005).

Korean education also emphasizes and imposes high academic expectations on students (Seo, 2014), and this tendency causes teachers to concentrate on high academic achievement by imposing a much more competitive spirit on students, instead of respecting individuals' talents or potential. Consequently, this leads to difficul-

ty for students with SEND to be integrated in regular schools (Seo, Oakland, Han, & Hu, 1991).

In addition, there have always been negative attitudes toward children with disabilities (Kim, 2014), and these negative social environments cause parents who have children with disabilities to be reluctant to receive support from social institutions (Park & Chung, 2015). A lot of parents who are financially sound give preference to using expensive private services, because they do not want their children to be known to be enrolling for public services managed by the government (Park & Chung, 2015) because of discrimination within public schools (Kwon, 2005). In reality, school registration numbers are smaller than the actual number of people with disabilities (Park, 2002). In this regard, the reform of the educational system of both countries is required to ensure that it is more responsive to the demands facing teachers and schools today (Song, Sharma, & Choi, 2019; Rouse, 2010).

Why do people have negative attitudes towards people with disabilities?

Even if knowledge and skills relating to SEND students are considered as important factors, educators' positive attitudes and belief towards these students are much more important (Forlin, 2010). In reality, however, these students are regarded as abnormal in classes (Florian, 2009).

Therefore, it is important to examine the historical context of inclusion (Robinson & Goodey, 2017). The old-fashioned idea was that the only way to identify people with disabilities was through medical means (the Medical Model) (Hallett & Hallett, 2010). Religious ideology and ethics were also used to distinguish between the usual and the unusual (Florian, 2007). This only concentrates on individual functional flaws and one of the reasons why medical models have been judged inadequate is that they concentrate on only the things that people cannot do (Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005). This trend influenced society to identify people with disabilities pathologically instead of discovering problems encompassing their lives (Farrell, 2004). The effect of medical models is to classify people by labelling (Rose, 2010). Classification brings about certain ways in which people are divided into normal and abnormal by labelling, thus strengthening discrimination (Florian, 2014). This leads people into identifying who are the disabled in the society and placing a different value on those people (Florian, 2014). This categorization causes people to see the disabled as stupid and to conclude that they should be

separated from normal groups (Ho, 2004). For example, if students with disabilities are categorized from other students in the class, they can be also classified as stupid learners (Florian, 2007). The effect of placing labels on those students is that other people will have lower expectations which would influence their future careers (Ho, 2004).

Likewise, there were labels given to people with disabilities and this frequently led to discrimination in South Korea and many people regarded those people as obstinate, reckless, social misfits, and incompetent (Kwon, 2005). Some Koreans took the view that, if they met a person who had a visual impairment, it was considered a ruined day (Seo, Oakland, Han, & Hu, 1991). It shows that there was a trend to consider disabilities as being a personal disease (Kim, 2013). Actually, this view originated from the Buddhist belief that by doing something wrong in their previous lives, people are born with defects, and though most Koreans no longer believe this, it was once part of the culture (Yoo & Palley, 2014). Due to such negative views, perceptions and attitudes, a lot of Korean parents who had disabled children were reluctant for their children to be identified as the disabled (Kwon, 2005). Even though in the early 1960s, people recognized the necessity for inclusion of students with disabilities, those students did not have opportunities to be educated (Yoo & Palley, 2014).

As we have seen above, educators' negative attitudes and low expectations toward students with disabilities in both countries cause these students to be maladjusted in inclusive education (Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005; Kim, 2014; Seo, 2019). Therefore, there is the greatest need of more teacher training for educating children especially with disabilities in order to successfully implement inclusive education (Kim & Chung, 2012).

INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION FOR INCLUSION IN SOUTH KOREA AND IN UK

Since the 20th century, the importance of educators' beliefs and roles towards inclusion has been highlighted (Kaikkonen, 2010). However, a lot of educators who are presently teaching in schools have not been equipped to deal with such challenging issues (Stanovich & Jordan, 2002). Though the current world is asking educators to take a greater variety of roles in preparing for inclusion (Rose, 2010), educators feel that they are not prepared

for inclusive education (Florian & Camedda, 2020). The project *Educating Teachers for Children with Disabilities* (United Nations Children's Fund, 2013) provides data to discuss various aspects in relation to effective teacher education because it suggests that a noticeable percentage of teachers across countries are not educated for inclusion in their initial teacher training courses.

In South Korea, there are presently thirty-three private universities and six national universities that provide diverse types of pre-service training programmes to prepare special education professionals (Hong, Ryoo, Lee, Noh, & Shin, 2020). Each year, roughly one thousand seven hundred students graduate from these universities and start their careers as certified special education professionals (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology 2011). These pre-service teachers are also required to participate in field experience such as practicum and site visits while studying at their universities to be equipped as professionals (Hong, Ryoo, Lee, Noh, & Shin, 2020). About one thousand seven hundred certified special educators take charge of the education of students with SEND, which means that the approximate teacher-student ratio is one: five (Kim, Park, & Lee, 2015).

On the other hand, since 2009, teacher training programmes in South Korea have required a single compulsory subject concerned with special education as part of regular education teacher qualification (Son, 2012). Most regular school teachers have not taken modules on special education while studying at college. For instance, only twenty five percent of in-service inclusive school educators have taken teacher training during their college career (Kim, 2013). As a result, regular school teachers have a strong tendency to evade or neglect the responsibilities of offering education for students with SEND and shift the responsibility on to special education teachers (Kim, 2013).

Even though the Korean government has been providing teacher training services to reinforce positive awareness to teach these students (Kim, 2007), in reality there was no education on the responsibility and role of inclusive education during their initial teacher training (Lee, 2006). According to a qualitative case study conducted by Kim (2012), general teachers call students with disabilities „disabled students” rather than calling them their own names. This study shows that regular teachers are prejudiced and have negative perceptions toward students with disabilities. The most important personnel in imple-

menting inclusive education are regular teachers (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996), because the environment of inclusive classes should be interactive, and created to boost interaction between students with and without SEND, and it is the regular school teacher of inclusive classes, who plays this role (Kim & Woo, 2014).

In this regard, some researchers have insisted that one single subject course is not enough to cover a number of issues in relation to inclusive classes (Choi & Seo, 2016). A single subject about special and inclusive education has not fulfilled teachers' professional needs to teach in inclusive classrooms because they need to acquire appropriate ability and instruction skills to modify curriculum to teach students with disabilities (Jee, 2010; Kim & Kang, 2008). This situation suggests that more effective teacher education should be offered before they begin a professional teaching career (Yada & Savolainen, 2017). For this reason, teacher trainers need to be continuously exploring ways to create inclusive educational units of study that are more effective, and at the same time negotiate what components are necessary for an effective approach to emphasizing inclusive education in teacher training courses (Symeonidou, 2017).

Different courses highlight different aspects, such as positive attitudes towards inclusion, skills, and competences (Forlin & Chambers, 2011). However, these should take into account the situation in a specific country, such as the historical and political developments in education, the cultural context, and the nature of the education systems and schools in that country (Symeonidou, 2017). As a part of the culture, negative views toward people with disabilities originated from Buddhist belief (Yoo & Palley, 2014), and prioritizing excellent academic performance of students in Korean regular schools (Park & Kang, 2003) will need to be reformed in the Korean context. Therefore, educators' negative attitudes and low expectation toward students with disabilities (Kim, 2014) should be considered first as significant number of studies have reported that completing special or inclusive subjects in one's universities could bring positive impact on pre-service teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education (Sharma, Simi & Forlin, 2015; Varcoe & Boyle, 2014; Taylor & Ringlaben, 2012). Implementing effective initial teacher training will also provide inclusive ideas to teachers in the classroom (Symeonidou, 2017).

Meanwhile, in the UK, there are a few nationally approved higher qualifications for working with students

who have SEND, but it is not a compulsory requirement (Florian & Rouse, 2009). There have been a lot of approaches to training teachers to work with students with SEND, few of which were successful (HMI, 1990). One barrier often cited is the ineffectiveness of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programmes for equipping pre-service teachers to work in inclusive classrooms with learners who have SEND (Loreman, Sharma, & Forlin, 2013). It showed that British pre-service teachers do not have self-reported confidence to teach students with SEND, as well as in their understanding and knowledge about SEND and inclusive practice.

In particular, they do not have direct experience of working with SEND (Coates, Harris, & Waring, 2020). In this regard, Rouse (2008) argues that in order to achieve effective inclusive practice, ITE programmes must get over just expanding knowledge about inclusion, and also put in place opportunities which encourage pre-service teachers to attempt new things and reconsider their beliefs and attitudes. A study that incorporated both a longitudinal quantitative research and a qualitative interview conducted by Coates, Harris, & Waring (2020), it shows the effectiveness of direct experience of working with young people with SEND for developing pre-service teachers' efficacy in their lessons. They demonstrate that the direct experience has increased pre-service teacher's knowledge about SEND and inclusion, but also that the pre-service teachers' belief in their own teaching ability related to inclusive practice has increased. Rouse (2008) also supports these research findings that consider the evidence of 'doing', which refers to changing knowledge into action, going beyond reflection, developing practice and learning how to work with students with SEND.

A study by Boyle, Topping and Jindal-Snape (2013) demonstrates the affirmative attitudes of Scottish teachers towards inclusion. It was conducted with three hundred and ninety secondary teachers and showed that the women in education had more positive attitudes than male educators, and newly appointed teachers and trainee teachers were more positive in their attitudes towards inclusion than experienced teachers. It shows that over recent years, changes to educational policy, the use of a standards driven assessment of pre-service teachers as part of a school and university partnership, and governmental regulation of ITE provision have made more effort in addressing the needs of students with SEND (Coates, Harris, & Waring, 2020).

DISCUSSION AND THE IMPLICATIONS ON KOREAN PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT

While there is a lot of research on initial teacher education, this body of research still has substantial gaps, as it relates specifically to SEND in the South Korea and in the UK.

In terms of SEND in South Korea, special education legislation and policies show remarkable developments such as allocating more of the education budget to support special education, and putting considerable effort into the development of the human rights of foreigners (Yoo & Palley, 2014), however there is still a lack of knowledge on early intervention (Cho, 2004), a lot of students with SEND are still educated in separate educational environments (Kwon, 2005), and teachers only concentrate on high academic achievement by promoting a competitive spirit in students (Seo, 2014) that cause negative attitudes toward children with disabilities (Kim, 2014).

Regarding SEND in the UK, national policies are well organized to support children (Florian & Kershner, 2009), educational and medical psychologists work together with schools for the development of inclusive education (Farrell & Venables, 2009). In addition, the government has extended the categories of SEND such as gathering a list not only for children with SEND who are recorded but also children who are not recorded (Scottish Executive, 2004). However, educators have had a priority of academic achievement in all stages of education (Pumfrey, 2008) that results in ignoring low performing and problematic students (Florian, 2014). The reports of the Scottish Parliament show that negative attitudes and low expectation toward students with disabilities are the biggest problem in inclusive environments (Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005).

It is also suggested that the reason for people's negative attitudes towards people with disabilities are : the medical model, religious ideology and ethics. The medical model was highlighted to identify people with disabilities (Hallett & Hallett, 2010), and religious ideology and ethics were used to classify between the usual and the unusual (Florian, 2007). These phenomenon caused people to concentrate on the things that people cannot do and individual functional flaws (Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005). As a part of the culture, the Korean negative view originated from the Buddhist belief that by doing something wrong in their previous lives, people are born with defects (Yoo & Palley, 2014). These old-fashioned ideas of

viewing people with SEND have caused educators' negative attitudes and low expectations toward students with disabilities that leads to students with SEND to be maladjusted in inclusive education (Nind, Rox, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2005; Kim, 2014; Seo, 2019). Therefore, the greatest need is for more teacher training about educating children with disabilities in order to successfully implement inclusive education (Kim & Chung, 2012).

In terms of ITE for inclusion in South Korea, such education is insufficient to provide for pre-service teachers for mainstream teachers compared to the pre-service training programmes to prepare special education teachers (Hong, Ryoo, Lee, Noh, & Shin, 2020; Son, 2012). According to Yoo & Palley (2014), more effective initial teacher education is required, and their study proposes that school reformation is necessary particularly in regard to the negative views toward people with disabilities that comes from a cultural Buddhist belief as a part of the culture, and also the prioritizing of achieving excellent academic performance in students in Korean regular schools (Park & Kang, 2003). Therefore, educators' negative attitudes and low expectations toward students with disabilities (Kim, 2014) should be considered first, and more effective initial teacher education is proposed in order to implement effective inclusive education.

Regarding ITE for inclusion in the UK, there is not a compulsory requirement of nationally approved higher qualifications for working with children who have additional support needs (Florian & Rouse, 2009). There were many approaches to train teachers to work with students with SEND and few were successful (HMI, 1990). For this, the ineffectiveness of ITE programmes for equipping pre-service teachers to work in inclusive classes with learners who have SEND is pointed out (Loreman, Sharma, & Forlin, 2013). In particular, the direct experience of working with students with SEND leads to effectiveness for improving pre-service teachers' efficacy in their lessons (Coates, Harris, & Waring, 2020).

This current article provides a rationale to support the need for further research and implications based on existing data. Firstly, excessive competitive school cultures must be changed. A lot of effort is needed to create positive school cultures by encouraging individual ability and character, rather than advocating emulation (Kim, 2013). Practical implementation of inclusive education in regular schools may not be possible, if an undue competitive atmosphere is maintained in schools (Kim, 2014).

Second, teacher training that enhances teachers' attitudes should be improved. In order to improve effective inclusive education, both teachers in regular and special schools should co-operate together. In addition, practical and specialized teacher training for SEND should be available for students in every teacher college (Kim, 2014). If these factors are well considered, an inclusive education could advance, therefore the efforts of government and people are needed (Kwon, 2005). The attitude of a person is usually shaped by their understanding, which is formed from their awareness and knowledge (Acar-Çiftçi & Gurol, 2015). In order to increase one's understanding and knowledge, people need to contact with people from different backgrounds (Allport, 1954). As we have learned from the case of UK's initial teacher education, those who had had contact with people with disabilities were more confident, positive, and had lower concern levels in implementing inclusive education than those who had not. This has clear implications for teacher education in South Korea. Teacher educators should consider ways to offer pre-service teachers rich experiences of interacting with people with disabilities (Song, Sharma, & Choi, 2019). Further research should examine the development of field experience and even the possibility of volunteer work, being included pre-service teacher education, as they could be positively influential in developing pre-service teachers' positive attitudes toward students with SEND (Hong, Ryoo, Lee, Noh, & Shin, 2020).

In addition, continually reviewing student programme structures assures that the quality of courses in relation to special education is high enough to equip pre-service teachers to be able to work with students with disabilities more efficiently (Levin, Hibbard, & Rock, 2002). In order to fulfil such things, South Korea needs a decisive reformation in teacher training both in general and special education (Kim, 2013).

Furthermore, Koreans should become aware that the society is steadily changing from a mono-cultural community to a multi-national community and therefore this social flow is inevitable (Kim, 2009). By considering this, students should be educated in terms of anti-biased education and multi-cultural education in schools (Kim, 2009). There is an especially urgent need for taking interest in and caring for the neglected socio-economic groups, and it means changing social attitudes is a key factor to construct inclusion in the regular schools (Beckett, 2009). In this regard, more governmental and academic concern has to be shown (Park, Cho, & Yoon, 2009).

According to the Ministry of Unification (2017), the number of North Korean refugees who came into South Korea reached roughly ten thousand people in 2007, twenty thousand people in 2010, and rose to over thirty thousand people in 2017. Though they run away from the harsh living conditions, resettling in South Korean society is another challenge for them (Um, Chi, Kim, Palinkas, & Kim, 2015). North and South Koreans look like each other (Park, Cho, & Yoon, 2009), but most South Koreans tend to look down and feel pity for North Koreans, so that they find it difficult to make relationships in South Korean society (Kim & Jang, 2007). In spite of support by both NGO's and government associations for their adjustment, North Korean refugees still have a tough time battling against discrimination and bias (Min, 2008). Therefore, South Koreans should be educated to embrace people from different backgrounds (Kim & Jang, 2007).

In addition, by considering the different educational systems between North and South, institutional efforts of government are required in order to help the academic achievement of students from North Korea. Vocational education is also necessary for them to be employed in the society in which they live (Kim, 2007). Thus, various activities from government associations, civic groups, religious groups, individual supporters and corporations have to be combined (Min, 2008).

According to Foreman (2008), schools should offer education for the needs of all the students in their communities, no matter what ability and disability. In this regard, teachers should cooperate with parents and administrators to discover ways in which to include students with SEND into the regular curricula (Jordan & Stanovich, 2003). In order to practice inclusive education effectively, cooperation is needed between teachers, politicians, policy makers and researchers because they have a critical role to play; but the most important thing is that a change of people's perceptions via effective initial teacher education is required (Symeonidou, 2017) by respecting each individual with SEND by listening to them (Rose, 2010).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

None.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

FUNDING

None.

REFERENCES

- Acar-Çiftçi, Y., & Gürol, M. (2015). A conceptual framework regarding the multicultural education competencies of teachers. *H.U. Journal of Education*, 30(1), 1-14.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Beckett, A.E. (2009). Challenging disabling attitudes, building an inclusive society: Considering the role of education in encouraging non-disabled children to develop positive attitudes towards disabled people. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(3), 317-329.
- Bhopal, K., & Rhamie, J. (2014). Initial teacher training: understanding race, diversity and inclusion. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(3), 304-325.
- Boyle, C., Topping, K., & Jindal-Snape, D. (2013). Teachers' attitudes towards inclusion in high schools. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 19(5), 527-542.
- Chae, S., Park, E.Y., & Shin, M. (2019). School-based interventions for improving disability awareness and attitudes towards disability of students without disabilities: A Meta-analysis. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 66(4), 343-361.
- Cho, K. S. (2004). Future direction of early identification and services for young children with special needs. *The Korean Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 4, 71-111.
- Choi, H., & Seo, Y. (2016). Analysis of instructor teaching experiences in an introduction course in special education for pre-service general education teachers. *Teacher Education Research*, 55(1), 108-119.
- Coates, J.K., Harris, J., & Waring, M. (2020). The effectiveness of a special school experience for improving preservice teachers' efficacy to teach children with special educational needs and disabilities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 46(5), 909-928.
- Coles, E., Cheyne, H., Rankin, J., & Daniel, B. (2016) Getting It Right for Every Child: A National Policy Framework to Promote Children's Well-being in Scotland, United Kingdom. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 94(2), 334-365.
- Crawley, Heaven. (2006). *Child first, migrant second: Ensuring that every child matters*. UK: Immigration Law Practitioners' Association.
- Crocker, R., & Dibbon, D. (2008). *Teacher education in Canada: A baseline study*. Kelowna, BC: Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education
- Farrell, M. (2004). *Special Educational Needs: A resource for practitioners*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Farrell, P.T., & Venables, K. (2009). Can educational psychologists be inclusive? In P. Hick, R. Kershner & P.T. Farrell (Eds.), *Psychology for Inclusive Education: New directions in theory and practice* (pp. 117-126). London: Routledge.
- Florian, L. (2007). Reimagining special education. In L. Florian (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education* (pp. 7-20). London, Sage.
- Florian, L. (2009). Preparing teachers to work in 'schools for all'. *Teaching and teacher Education*, 25, 533-534.
- Florian, L. (2010). Special education in an era of inclusion: the end of special education or a new beginning? *Psychology of Education Review*, 34(2), 22-29.
- Florian, L. (2014). *The Sage handbook of Special Education: Volume 2*. London: Sage.
- Florian, L., & Kershner, R. (2009). Inclusive pedagogy. In H. Daniels, H. Lauder, & J. Porter (Eds.), *Knowledge, Values and Educational policy: A critical perspective* (pp. 173-183). London: Routledge.
- Florian, L., & Rouse, M. (2009). The inclusive practice project in Scotland: Teacher education for inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 594-601.
- Florian, L., & Camedda, D. (2020). Enhancing teacher education for inclusion. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1), 4-8.
- Foreman, E. (2008). *Inclusion in action* (2nd ed.). Sydney: Cengage.
- Forlin, C., & D. Chambers. (2011). Teacher Preparation for Inclusive Education: Increasing Knowledge but Raising Concerns. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 17-32.
- Forlin, C. (2010). Teacher education for inclusion. In R. Rose (Eds.), *Confronting obstacles to inclusion* (pp. 155-170). London: Routledge.
- Hallett, F., & Hallett, G. (2010). *Transforming the role of the SENCO: Achieving the national Award for SEN Coordination*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI). (1990). *Special educational needs in initial teacher training*. London: DES.
- Ho, A. (2004). To be labelled, or not do be labelled: That is the question. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 32, 86-92.
- Hong, S., Ryoo, J.H., Lee, M., Noh, J., & Shin, J. (2020). The mediation effect of pre-service teacher attitude toward inclusion for students with autism in South Korea: a structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(1), 15-32.
- Jee, J. (2010). Narrative inquiry about implementing inclusive education of elementary school teachers. *The Journal of Special Education: Theory and Practice*, 11(4), 181-205.
- Jordan, A., & Stanovich, P. (2003). Teachers' personal epistemological beliefs about students with disabilities as indicators of effective teaching practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 3(1), no.
- Kaikkonen, L. (2010). Promoting teacher development for diversity. In R. Rose (Eds.), *Confronting obstacles to inclusion* (pp. 171-183). London: Routledge.
- Kang, J., K, J.G., & Plunkett, D. (2015). Inclusion of Young Children with Disabilities in South Korea: Current Status and Challenges. *Childhood Education*, 91(4), 292-299.
- Kim, A.E. (2009). Global migration and South Korea: foreign workers, foreign brides and the making of a multicultural society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(1), 70-92.
- Kim, J.U., & Jang, D.J. (2007). Aliens among brothers? The status and perception of North Korean refugees in South Korea. *Asian Perspective*, 31(2), 5-22.
- Kim, K.O. (2007). Inclusive Education in the Republic of Korea. *Country paper for the Regional Preparatory Workshop on Inclusive Education*, 3, 1-9.
- Kim, M.J., & Chung, K.S. (2012). Relationships among the teacher's factors, professional learning environments and inclusive empowerment of teacher in inclusive child care centre. *Korean J. Child. Care Educ*, 67, 19-42.
- Kim, M. Y. (2012). Qualitative Case Study on School Principal and General Education Teachers' Experiences of Inclusive Education and Classroom Practices at College-Bound High School. *Asian Journal of Education*, 13(4), 59-7.
- Kim, Y.R., Park, J., & Lee, S.H. (2015) Perceptions of Korean pre-service special educators regarding teaching competencies for students with disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education*, 30(2), 107-118.
- Kim, Y.W. (2013). Inclusive Education in Korea: Policy, Practice, and Challenges. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 10(2), 79-81.
- Kim, Y.W. (2014). Inclusive education in South Korea. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(10), 979-990.
- Kim, Y.W., & Woo, J.H. (2014). A Study on General Education Teachers' Attitudes and Relationship between People with Disabilities and Inclusive Education. *Journal of Special Education*, 15(2), 55-84. [In Korean]

- Kim, H., & Kang, O. (2008). A survey on the inclusive teachers' perception and management on inclusive classroom. *The Journal of Special Education*, 15(2), 33-55.
- Kwon, H.S. (2005). Inclusion in South Korea: The current situation and future directions. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 52(1), 59-68.
- Lee, E. J. (2006). A Study on How Novice Teachers, Who Took Special Education Course in their Teacher Education, Dispose Attitudes and Perception toward Inclusion. *A Study on children with disabilities*, 8(2), 141-168. [In Korean]
- Levin, B., Hibbard, K. & Rock, T. (2002). Using Problem-based Learning as a Tool for Learning to Teach Students with Special Needs. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 25, 278-290.
- Loerman, T., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C. (2013). Do preservice teachers feel ready to teach in inclusive classrooms? A four country study of teaching self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(1), 27.
- Min, C. (2013). The current status and challenges of inclusive education in Korea. *The Journal of Special Education: Theory and Practice*, 14(3), 49-69.
- Min, S. K. (2008). Divided Countries, Divided Mind 1: Psycho-Social Issues in Adaptation Problems of North Korean Defectors. *Psychiatry Invest*, 5(1), 1-13.
- Ministry of Education, Republic of Korea. (2017). *Annual special education report*. Sejong: Author.
- Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology. (2011). *Special Education Annual Report*. Seoul: Author
- Ministry of Unification. (2017). *Humanitarian Issues: North Korean Defectors*.
In Korean http://www.unikorea.go.kr/index.do?menuCd¼DOM_000000101007001002
- Nind, M., Rox, J., Sheehy, K., & Simmons, K. (2005). *Curriculum and Pedagogy in Inclusive Education: Values into Practice*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- OECD (2010). *Educating teachers for diversity: Meeting the challenge*.
http://www.oecd.org/document/38/0,3343,en_2649_35845581_44572006_1_1_1_1,00.html
- OECD (2007). *Quality and equity of schooling in Scotland*. Paris: Author.
- Park, H.J., & Chung, G.H. (2015). A multifaceted Model of Changes and Adaptation among Korean Mothers of Children with Disabilities. *Journal of Family Studies*, 24, 915-929.
- Park, S.H., & K.S. Kang. (2003). Analysis of inclusive education for students with special needs from elementary school education operation plan. *Elementary Education Research*, 16(1), 423-47.
- Park, J.Y. (2002). Special education in South Korea. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 34(5), 28-33.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/004005990203400505?journalCode=txca>
- Park, K.H., Cho, Y.T., & Yoon, I.J. (2009). Social inclusion and length of stay as determinants of health among North Korean refugees in South Korea. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54, 175-182.
- Pumfrey, Peter D. (2008). Moving towards inclusion? The first-degree results of students with and without disabilities in higher education in the UK: 1998-2005. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 23(1), 31-46.
- Rhame, J. (2007). *Eagles Who Soar: How Black Learners Find Paths to Success*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Robinson, D., & Goodey, C. (2017). Agency in the darkness: 'fear of the unknown', learning disability and teacher education for inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22, 426-440.
- Rose, R. (2010). *Confronting Obstacles to Inclusion: International responses to developing inclusive education*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Rouse, M. (2008) Developing inclusive practice: A role for teachers and teacher education. *Education in the North*, 16(1), 6-13.
- Runswick-Cole, K. (2008). Between a rock and a hard place: parents' attitudes to the inclusion of children with special educational needs in mainstream and special schools. *British Journal of Special Education*, 35(3), 173-180.
- Scottish Executive. (2004). *Pupils in Scotland*. 2003, <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/>
- Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1996). Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming inclusion, 1958-1995: A research synthesis. *Exceptional Children*, 63, 59-74
- Seo, G., Oakland, T., Han, H-s., & Hu, S. (1991). Special education in South Korea. *Exceptional Children*, 58(3), 213-218.
- Seo, H.J. (2014). Promoting the Self-Determination of Elementary and Secondary Students with Disabilities: Perspectives of General and Special Educators in Korea. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 49(2), 277-289.
- Sharma, U., Simi, J., & Forlin, C. (2015). Preparedness of pre-service teachers for inclusive education in the Solomon Islands. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(5), 103-116.
- Smith, R., Florian, L., Rouse, M., & Anderson, J. (2014). Special education today in the United Kingdom. *Special Education International Perspectives: Practices Across the Globe Advances in Special Education*, 28, 109-145.
- Son, J. (2012). The effectiveness of teacher education using video materials on preservice teachers' attitudes and efficacy on inclusive education. *Korean Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(4), 225-246.
- Song, J. (2016). Inclusive education in Japan and South Korea- Japanese and Korean teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes towards inclusive education. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 16(1), 643-648.
- Song, J., Sharma, U., & Choi, H. (2019). Impact of teacher education on pre-service regular school teachers' attitudes, intentions, concerns and self-efficacy about inclusive education in South Korea. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 1-9.
- Stanovich, P.J., & Jordan, A. (2002). Preparing general educators to teach in inclusive classrooms: Some food for thought. *The Teacher Educator*, 37(3), 173-185.
- Symeonidou, S. (2017). Initial teacher education for inclusion: a review of the literature, *Disability & Society*, 32, 401-422.
- Taylor, R., & Ringlaben, R. (2012). Impacting pre-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusion. *Higher Education Studies*, 2(3), 16-23.
- Um, M.Y., Chi, I., Kim, H.J., Palinkas, L.A., & Kim, J.Y. (2015). Correlates of depressive symptoms among North Korean refugees adapting to South Korean society: The moderating role of perceived discrimination. *Social Science & Medicine*, 131, 107-113.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2013). Educating Teachers for Children with Disabilities. Accessed January 8, 2021.
<http://worldofinclusion.com/unicef-project-educating-teachers-for-children-with-disabilities/>
- Varcoe, L., & Boyle, C. (2014). Pre-service primary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *Educational Psychology*, 34(3), 323-337.
- Yada, A., & Savolainen, H. (2017). Japanese in-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education and self-efficacy for inclusive practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 64, 222-229.
- Yoo, J.P., & Palley, E. (2014). The diffusion of disability rights policy: A focus on special education in South Korea. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 61(4), 362-376.
- You, S., Kim, E.K., & Shin, K. (2019). Teachers' Belief and Efficacy Toward Inclusive Education in Early Childhood Settings in Korea. *Sustainability*, 11, 1-12.