

Value orientation and character education as a key attribute of inclusive education in primary schools

(overview essay)

Alžbeta Hortová, Pavol Janoško

Abstract: *The purpose of the present review is to contribute to discussions on inclusive education and school development with an emphasis on systematic values and character education in primary schools. The study summarizes some patterns of moral and character development of pupils and points to the significant role of schools in their next development. It highlights the in-depth transformation of educational priorities and the school culture, based on the concept of character education in the holistic view of Jubilee Center (2017) and prof. Berkowitz (2020). It specifically draws attention to the personal dimension of values and character education, in terms of an educational impact of a favourite teacher. It highlights that a teacher worth following can notably influence character and values orientation of his pupils. The study deals with some of his characteristics that occur in the literature. The study further describes the contribution of values and character education for promotion of health and flourishing life of all people involved in education. In the context of the salutogenic concept of health (Antonovsky, 1996), the study shows values as salutary factors (factors actively supporting health). Reflects on their key characteristics, the meaningfulness available to deliver meaning, and their willingness to support the resistance of pupils. The study draws a wider relevance of values in the context of an inclusive school that it supports by linking the theoretical basis of salutogenesis with those of values and character education.*

Keywords: *value orientation, values education, character education, teacher's role, inclusion, salutary factors*

1 Introduction

The transition to inclusive education (O'Brien, Forest, 1989; Booth and Ainscow, 2019) has brought new demands on primary schools. Their task is to create condi-

tions for the creation of supportive relationships and cooperation between all actors in the educational process. An important role in this process is played by the holistic perception of each subject (whether pupil, parent, teacher) in its bio-psycho-socio-spiritual unity and the implementation of this approach in specifying and preparing educational plans and priorities of a particular school.

Naming barriers to communication and cooperation between members of the learning community, increasing teachers' competencies and readiness for inclusive forms of education, and focusing more on value education and character education are important tasks for the development of any school. This area has been addressed so far in the context of Slovak schools mainly through various preventive projects or initiatives, which often had a rather random and singular character, they lacked system and ambition of a profound transformation of educational priorities toward holistic human development, including their orientation and value character (Brestovanský, 2013; 2019). The values of the school, realized by the systematic practice of value education and character education, with their potential to influence the quality of education and training, climate, relations, and overall image of the school, can be considered a remarkable research area in terms of school development in the direction of inclusion.

2 Value Education and Value Orientation

Values can be understood as certain implicit or explicit concepts of the desired characteristic of the individual or group, which influence the choice of forms, means, and goals of its action (Kluckhohn, 1951, according to Brestovanský, 2019). According to the pedagogical dictionary, value orientation is a value system or hierarchically arranged set of values that reflects the importance of the values of a certain group of the population in a certain period (Průcha et al., 2013). In humans, it is individually modifiable over time, influenced by age, personality, degree of adaptation to the social environment, as well as social factors such as cultural environment or education (Barnova et al., 2019). Thus, a person's value orientation can be perceived as a personal direction to a certain system of values, which he considers important and to which he relates, acquires, re-evaluates and adjusts them. It is a reflection of what is really important to him, what values he personally prefers and how this preference is reflected in his future actions.

In understanding values as potential resources for man and society, it is natural that society seeks to protect, pass on, develop, and teach certain values how to live in harmony with them. This happens at different levels of the environment (family, school, community) and age. Potočárová (2019) distinguishes two approaches in value and attitude education in the family and school. The proponents of the first approach promote the provision of specific cultural content and ideas to the children,

the best that has been gathered in it, and based on this, the educators have modified their own values in the best possible form. The second approach emphasizes the ability to evaluate, instead of specific content, focusing on the process of evaluating and creating one's own values, as well as making and prioritizing choices in accordance with those values, whatever they may be.

However, it would probably not be possible to make conscious choices based on personal values without assessing the value without a certain basic cognitive disposition. It gradually becomes more and more obvious with age. Among the processes involved in the creation of value orientation, the development of evaluation thinking and character maturation, resp. moral development (see, e.g., Kohlberg, 1981, according to Colby et al., 1983) and character development (Arthur et al., 2017; Kristjánsson, 2014; Sokol, Hammond, and Berkowitz, 2010).

As Kohlberg's theory of moral development shows, the way of thinking about moral dilemmas from early inability to evaluate, through taking over the evaluation criteria of the environment to evaluation according to one's own internal starting points, is largely conditioned by age or maturity. In the process of internalization and, so to speak, awareness of our own value orientation, we move at the level of the so-called postconventional moral reasoning, where a young person should be able to autonomously reconsider what they are following in life (Kohlberg, 1981, according to Colby et al., 1983). However, the fact that such a disposition is categorically categorized into the period after the twelfth year of life does not necessarily mean that age corresponds to optimal maturity. For truly authentic decisions about values, one often has to mature through life experiences and acquire the necessary strengths, respectively virtues.

Developmental psychologists Sokol, Hammond, and Berkowitz (2010) present the definition of character as a set of psychological characteristics that motivate the individual and allow him to function as a moral actor. According to Berkowitz and Bier (2004), this set includes seven psychological aspects of character: moral deed, moral values, moral personality, moral emotions, moral reasoning, moral identity, and basic characteristics. Each of these aspects develops throughout life and in a special way in childhood and adolescence (Damon, 1998; Berkowitz and Bier, 2004). Mareš (2008) refers to an interesting theory that says it seems more difficult to acquire some of them in a certain period due to age specifics. Peterson and Seligman (2004, according to Mareš, 2008) in the analysis of results. The VIA – Youth Questionnaire on the Strengths of Children and Adolescents states that, e.g., for the value of “humanity” the children had significantly higher and for the value of “moderation” significantly lower scores than other variables. In most variables, girls scored higher than boys. With increasing age, the values of the variables in general increased in proportion to age, with only respondents aged around 15 and 16 showing a slight decrease in the values of ‘memory’ and ‘spiritual spirituality’ (Peterson and Seligman, 2004; Park,

Peterson, 2010, according to Mareš, 2008). As this is information that would reveal the specifics of child acquisition, it is still a matter of further research. In any case, it can be stated that the character is not entirely innate but can be shaped and shaped. The family has a decisive influence here, of course (Berkowitz, Bier, 2005; Potočárová, 1996), but schools also have a strong field of action and the potential to have an impact on pupils' character development (e.g., Seider, 2015; Brestovanský, 2019).

3 School as a Formation Factor for Students and Society

The school has a duty to educate and cannot do that. The question is what to raise and how. Kučerová (1996, p. 115) describes humanity as the *“goal and chance” of education*. In its understanding, humanity is manifested by authenticity, creativity, freedom, responsibility, completeness (versatility), and wholeness. Horňáková (2019, p. 6) similarly characterizes education as a personal and interactive process, which is based on possibilities, from a perspective, happens all the time and is *“holistic, focused on development and self-employment”*. She adds that learning and changing for the better is also related to inner balance, for which meaning and values are very important. Brestovanský emphasizes that *‘a person with a morally mature character should be a priority topic and the general aim of any educational endeavor’*, which, according to the author, was built by Socrates through many practitioners from antiquity to modern times (Brestovanský, 2013, p. 76). The author adds that *“[t]he moral character leads a person to a full quality life,”* which is supported by research by current personalities in the field of psychology or character education (Berkowitz, Covey, Mareš, and others) in terms of prevention of stress, trauma, destructive conflicts, and *“in the proactive enrichment of life, in the creation of credible, stable relationships, resilience, and strength of family co-existence, complex prosocial projects, and finally the awareness of the meaning of one’s own being”*, Brestovanský (2019, pp. 230–231) adds, referring to Viktor Frankl and others.

In connection with the school's value education, its strategies and successes were in Slovakia and the Czech Republic conducted several researches in the Republic, such as value education in the first stage of primary school (Mazalová, 2012), comparing the value orientation of students of different universities (Kohoutová, 2010), or the study of subjective interpretations and the meaning of some values in students (Klčovanská, 2004; Krásna, 2014). School culture, relations, and climate as a process of implementation, as well as an indicator of values in the school, were the subject of in-depth research in three Slovak elementary schools, carried out by Brestovanský (2019). One of them was characterized by an exceptional value culture. The needs of the children were at the heart of her vision and educational design. Teachers were encouraged and systematically guided to take responsibility proactively, cooperate in integrated learning, share didactic procedures, etc. According to Brestovanský

(2019, p. 65), the students behaved highly characteristically, were able to concentrate above average and did not need supervision during breaks, due to the fact that *“the school managed to create a climate of respect and internalized discipline in students.”*

Character education as a comprehensive systematic school base is a big topic especially in Great Britain and the United States (Arthur, Berkowitz, Lickona, and others), but in various forms and scope it also finds a place in Slovak publications and practice (Brestovanský, Burian, Forum of Proactive Schools, the Narnia and others school network). The numerous materials of the Jubilee Center for Character and Virtues at the University of Birmingham. The Jubilee Center (2017), which focuses on research and mentoring of character education in schools with the support of philosophical, psychological, and pedagogical studies, presents the belief that first and foremost students and school actors, but also school education itself benefits from a deliberate and planned approach to character development. I understand human prosperity (human flourishing) as a widely recognized life goal. To prosper, to flourish is not only to experience happiness, but also to fulfil one's potential. It is also the main goal of character education in the neo-Aristotelian approach of the Jubilee Center. Character education teaches the acquisition and strengthening of virtues, traits that maintain and comprehensively develop the life of man and a prosperous society (Jubilee Center, 2017). Character education, as defined by the Jubilee Center (2017), includes all explicit and implicit educational and upbringing activities that help children and young people develop positive character traits, called virtues. It helps students understand what is ethically important in life situations and how to act on the right motives, thus developing in students the potential for greater autonomy and reflection in character practice. Character education aims to help students develop practical wisdom (good sense), i.e. the ability to make sensible choices between different options in real life (Jubilee Center, 2017). Character education takes place through two processes – character taught and character caught (Harrison, Arthur, and Burn, 2016). The Jubilee Center (2017) explains these concurrent processes as follows. The process of explicit character learning includes in-class and out-of-class educational situations that equip students with language, knowledge, understanding, skills, attributes that support and enable character development (eg ethics lessons, conversations about moral dilemmas, experimental learning in real conditions, reflection of oneself, others, etc.). The learning process in character education takes place on the basis that the school community, both pupils and staff, provide role models, culture, and inspiring influence through a positive ethos, which supports and motivates character development (Jubilee Center, 2017). Berkowitz and Hoppe (2009) defined slightly more general character education as deliberate strategies in schools to strengthen children's capacities and motivations to act as moral actors. In the West, character education is of great interest and is becoming a priority of national

education policies. The concepts of character education are different, from a holistic bio-psycho-socio-cultural-spiritual point of view the concept of Jubilee Center is close to medical pedagogy (field of study in SR / EU, note), because it recognizes the “principle of holistic educational character” defined by Berkowitz and Bierová in the PRIMED model (prepared) (Brestovanský, 2019, p. 251). Professor Berkowitz (2020) expressed the belief that character education is about the holistic development of a young person, so it must be based on a holistic transformation of school. These are not just some added character-building interventions, special lessons, or extra-curricular activities. Transformation of adult culture, school climate as a whole, role-modeling, and networks of relationships between learning partners, including school assistants and parents, must take place. He described his PRIMED model of comprehensive effective school reform, based on character, as follows (Berkowitz, Bier, 2014, according to Brestovanský, 2019; Berkowitz, 2020; Brestovanský, 2019):

- P – Prioritization of character development, the character of students must be the top priority of the school around which everything else is built;
- R – Relationships are in the spotlight, they should be strengthened between anyone and everyone – classmates, teachers, older and younger students, etc., and this includes targeted creation of opportunities to strengthen them;
- I – Intrinsic motivation becomes purposefully supported, students are guided to understand that personal inner satisfaction results from achieving goals and appropriate behavior, and the importance of external motivation decreases;
- M – Models, patterns of behavior, relationships, and character are teachers who, by personal expression of character, multiply their influence on the development of students’ character. Berkowitz (2020) recalls Ralph W. Emerson’s famous statement in this regard: Your actions scream so loudly that I cannot hear what you are saying;
- E – For the development of skills, a certain degree of autonomy is needed, which the school should strengthen in students (empowerment). Pupils should be encouraged to make their own decisions and solve common problems, rather than having the school do it for them. They have to be encouraged to try it themselves, which helps them acquire decision-making skills;
- D – understanding that character development is a process. It is not just about changing behavior or learning some facts that we would report “here and now.” It is about what kind of person our student will be for the rest of their life. Berkowitz (2020) adds that pedagogy focused on development, i.e., process, is often different from pedagogy that is concerned with learning itself, controlling behavior, or changing it.

A practical illustration of the successful practice of character education was presented by a developmental psychologist and education expert, Seider (2015). Over the course

of one year, he conducted in-depth research at three highly successful charter schools in Boston that exhibited strong and productive cultures from three different character backgrounds. These schools were attended primarily by pupils from suburbs, often from disadvantaged backgrounds, from low-income communities. The author researched the practice of character education in schools and confirmed its impact on students, their behavior, and academic achievement.

4 Teacher as a role model

Many children have their favourite teachers with whom they admire a feature and try to imitate it. From the point of view of character education and the transfer of values, the value and character dimension of the teacher, in which he is a role model for children, seems to be particularly interesting.

In his review of the academic literature on the perception of a “good teacher”, Cooke (2013) states that most papers address the topic of competencies, rather than character assumptions. The subject of interest is the measurable and performative aspects of the profession, rather than the personal strengths. Lumpkin (2008, according to Cooke, 2013) states that teachers, regardless of the different roles assigned to them and judged by them, are always in the classroom and role models of integrity by deciding to act correctly even when “no one is watching”. This is just one aspect of the character that manifests itself daily as a teacher. In her contributions, the Jubilee Center (2017) presents that in order for someone to be a good teacher, their character and integrity are more important than personal style in the classroom and at least as important as mastering the content of the curriculum and teaching techniques. According to them, good teaching is supported by ethos and related language, which permeates all subjects, in addition to the transmission of knowledge. Through his commitment and dedication, the teacher is a model for understanding the value of learning and working on what is good and personally meaningful (Jubilee Center, 2017). Ďurič and Štefanovič (1977, according to Pasternáková and Laca, 2011) state that a teacher’s educational influence consists of his behavior, knowledge, abilities, and personality traits. They add that the teacher is *“a they try to be like him an example that students imitate. What a personality a teacher is from that the scope and nature of his educational activities depend”* (Ibid., p. 262).

In the Jubilee Center survey, as many as 84% of the 1001 parents involved agreed that the teacher’s role was to promote good manners and values in students (Cooke, 2013, p. 3). Moreover, if it is true that the teacher has not only a mandate, but also, by the nature of his profession, an inseparable influence on the upbringing and character of children, we, as a society, are interested in supporting the personal aspects of the teacher.

But what should the “good” teacher be like? Empirical experiences with teachers during education, or general statements about good people, provide a certain framework for a person. An interesting observation in the context of English society is a certain dominant perception of a good teacher over time, while in the 1980s he was a charismatic type of teacher, educating in the early 1990s, coaching type in the late 1990s, and pragmatic in the next decade (Cooke, 2013). It would be beneficial to look at a similar model in the context of the Slovak society. In any case, general societal changes suggest that, in addition to knowledge, children need support for the development of their navigational capacities and inspiration for their own ability to navigate the world of values, even in a relentless influx of information of various natures and truths. A good teacher should also constantly think about what enters his interaction with children. It can also weigh a detail, a trifle on the level of non-verbal communication, which the child will support or not. It requires a great deal of his self-reflection (Vodičková, 2020). As Tóth (2013) surveyed among university students, on the issue of the strongest positive and negative impact of a teacher on primary school personality, personal interest and openness for children can be an inspiring model that resonates in students even in adulthood. According to Moore (2004, according to Cook, 2013), the model of an inspiring teacher who is interested in a student is what again demands more social attention and support.

In the literature, there are several characteristics of a teacher who seems to follow in terms of value education and character education. Mitašíková (2021) describes the position of a teacher as a “guide” who follows, accompanies, and supports the child on his unique journey and does not set the ceiling of his possibilities in advance. Chmelárová (2019) adds that a necessary condition for a positive educational influence on students are positive character traits such as honesty, principledness, truthfulness, justice and impartiality, conscientiousness, and more. According to her, character is the very essence of a good and responsible relationship with the teaching profession. According to the author, flexibility, empathy, and self-esteem significantly contribute to the interaction between teacher and student. According to Horňáková (2017), a good teacher is also characterized by a certain ‘childhood’. Such a teacher is not only in the position of an adult with authority, but honestly knows how to give space to the joy of discovering, creating, playing, and stimulating hunger for knowledge. Jubilee Center in its Research Project on Virtues and Values in the Occupations) *Virtues and Values in the Professions (VPP) project*, among other things, explored the place of the strong character pages in the teaching profession. The survey was conducted using a questionnaire method among recent graduates of teacher training who had to select six important character strengths that they think the teacher should have. The project was based on the classification of strengths according to Peterson and Seligman (2004). It turned out that the respondents most often referred to as the most important strengths of the teacher are impartiality

(fairness), creativity, honesty, and love of learning (Cooke, 2013). In addition, in conversations with them, there was an appreciation of enthusiasm, an interesting and engaging curriculum, the ability exhibit fun, but at the same time stimulating lessons, with a certain demand on students. The students last but not least, teachers demonstrate good character in how they behave outside the hours, in the corridors, in the school yard, etc. (Cooke, 2013).

Schwartz (2014) emphasizes the role of practical wisdom (in the Aristotelian ethics of virtues gr. *fronésis*), a virtue that helps to distinguish what is the “right choice” in a particular situation and allows us to use our other virtues (honesty, kindness, courage, humility, perseverance, etc.) at the right time and in the right way. Specifically, practical wisdom manifests itself in life, e.g. the ability to discern wisely when an exceptional situation requires exceptions to the rules or improvisation in changed conditions. In the field of teaching, according to the author, it is associated with understanding the perspectives of others and using its work for the real good of those to whom man serves in his mission. Finally, according to Schwartz (2014), a wise teacher is an experienced teacher, because with the capacity to be wise, we are all born, but wisdom is trained and acquired in life experiences.

5 The importance of values for health

Salutogenetic model of health for its belief that values are key to growth. In this model, the values represent potential salutors – factors that actively promote health.

Aaron Both Antonovsky and Viktor Emanuel Frankl also examined the question of how it is possible that some people were able to mobilize their inner strengths after surviving the horrors of the Holocaust and to live healthily and fully again. Frankl logotherapy emphasized the area of human freedom, his ability, and ability to decide to “say yes in spite of all his life” (Frankl, 1998). Antonovský in the salutogenetic model corresponded to a sense of coherence (SOC – sense of coherence), respectively. integrity (Kebza, 2005, according to Horňáková, 2010). It could also be called “*life orientation*”, which helps a person to live, cope with challenges, and facilitate a person’s development for health (Jensen, Dür, and Buijs, 2017, p. 225). Antonovský (1996) was convinced that a strong SOC is an important factor in the development of health and the way a person will respond to stress and stressful situations. SOC is based on three variables, which Antonovský (1996) and other authors (Jensen, Dür, and Buijs, 2017; Lindström, Eriksson, 2005) describe as follows:

- **Comprehensibility**, such as the ability of a person to evaluate and understand the situation in which he finds himself, and his belief that he understood the given challenge. It is reflected in the way people are confronted with how the information that cognitively makes sense is organized, consistent, structured,

and clear. The high score in this component predicts that in the future one will perceive other stimuli as predictable, organized, and readable. Comprehensibility is considered a *cognitive component of SOC*;

- **Meaningfulness** corresponds to the extent to which one experiences emotionally, that life makes sense and that it is worth investing energy, devotion, and activity in facing challenges and problems. It also means finding meaning and motivation to move in a direction that promotes health. Meaningfulness is considered a motivational component of SOC;
- **Manageability** is the degree to which one perceives one's capacity to cope with the demands of the stimuli that meet him and who believes in his resources for coping with the burden and is able to use them. Manageability is considered an instrumental/behavioral component of SOC.

The three components of SOC are factors that allow a person to perceive the world (on a continuum) as understandable, manageable, and meaningful (Antonovsky, 1996). Therefore, they open a person to active participation in a fulfilling life. One of the factors of SOC, meaningfulness, seems particularly remarkable in this context. When one builds and manages life in accordance with one's values, one opens up opportunities for one's constant development and the strengthening of a sense of coherence.

In a broader context, salutogenesis has brought a radically new view of health and the human as its bearer. He works with the knowledge that *"we find a lot of healthy people in the sick and, conversely, in a person who feels healthy, there may be some facts that are quite ill"* (Hornáková, 2010, p. 31). Becker et al. (2010) published a study revising the American approach to health 30 years after Antonovsky's introduction of the salutogenesis model. The article began with the statement of Mother Teresa that she would never take part in the march against the war, but if a peace meeting were held, she would add. The statement is a concise illustration of what salutogenesis represents in the approach to health. In our metaphor, the march against the war represents a contrasting approach, pathogenesis.

Pathogenesis, developed in America by Williamson and Pearse as a theoretical framework for access to health, is an investigation into the origin and causes of disease. Its starting point is a disease or disorder, and it is proceeding retrospectively to identify how its people can avoid, manage, or eliminate it. Salutogenesis (Metaphorical Assembly for Peace), on the other hand, deals with the origins and causes of health; its starting point is human health and looks forward to how to create, promote, and improve physical, mental, and social health and well-being. Becker et al. (2010) further compare pathogenesis and salutogenesis as follows:

Table 1: *Comparison of pathogenetic and salutogenetic perspectives (Becker et al., 2010, p. 8, adapted)*

Pathogenetic perspective	Salutogenetic perspective
Starting point: disease, problem	Starting point: health, potential
How to avoid the disease	How to fulfil the potential
Reactive – treatment of the disease	Proactive – generating better health
Idealistic – to be naturally healthy	Realistic – striving for health
Against pain or loss	For profit or growth
Preparing man for life	Discover how to live to the fullest
Avoid deterioration	Continuous improvement
Objective: to minimize problems	The goal, resp. Progress: potential optimization, profit

Salutogenesis is thus a model that builds on and develops a holistic approach to health. Antonovsky (1996) called him a partner of medicine focused on treatment and prevention in the 1990s. The model described three principles:

1. Focus on all the people in the system (not just at risk);
2. Address and promote “salutes”, factors that actively promote health (not just reduce risk factors);
3. To draw attention to the whole person (and not only to individual diseases) (Antonovsky, 1996).

The salutogenetic understanding of human integrity as movement on the axis, continuum, in a health-promoting or nonhealth-promoting direction is presented above. Antonovsky (1996) further asked the question “How can we explain the movement of people on the continuum in the direction of health?”. He was not satisfied with the answer that it would only be for a small number of risk factors to which they are exposed. He introduced a new concept of salutor factors). He defined them as factors that actively promote health. Their active nature is very important in his understanding of health promotion (Antonovsky, 1996).

Value orientation can act as a saluator, because the values that a person perceives as important and form his value orientation help him to find meaning, develop, and act freely even in difficult living conditions. The motivating component of a sense of coherence is just meaningfulness. If values are a source of meaning, then there must be great potential for health promotion. Of course, they also have meaning in themselves – values such as love, truth, and humanity are rare even without us looking at them as means, as Kučerová (1996) points out. But in the deep complexity of the human person, in the sense of the bio-psycho-social-cultural-spiritual understanding of man, they have an irreplaceable place in his complex development and prosperity.

Even thanks to values such as love, the common good, honesty, or friendship, one can often withstand a great burden. It helps him, e.g. the knowledge that it forms a world in which these values prevail. Or he realizes that despite the limitations of some options (such as illness or a change in life circumstances), he can still realize other values that are important to him. This thesis is also supported by the well-known statement of an important representative of humanistic psychology, Abraham Maslow (2000), who explicitly argued that values are essential to human health in life. *"We find that being without a value system is psychopathogenic. Human being needs a value framework, a philosophy of life, religion, or a substitute for religion, according to which she would live and understand things, just as she needs the sun, calcium, or love. I call it the 'cognitive need to understand.' Value diseases that come from worthlessness, they are called different – anhedonia, anomie, apathy, immorality, hopelessness, cynicism, etc., and they can also somatize"* (Maslow, 2000, p. 200). Maslow thus appealed, in his terminology, to the need for man to manage his life with a belief in meaning, consciously and in relation to values that transcend him. The formulation of this need is closely linked to Antonovsky's concepts of intelligibility and meaningfulness: The consciousness of meaningfulness, characteristic of both Frankl's and Antonovsky's and Maslow's approach, is closely linked to the values one recognizes, recognizes, adopts, and creates.

A holistic approach to human health can therefore count on the area of values as an important resource. As a result, organizations, including schools that want their culture to be actively focused on values that support human growth, development, and well-being, have the potential to promote health.

6 Conclusions

The purpose of this review study was to explain why values and value orientation are important to a person and what role character education plays in the school environment. Also, we approach the understanding of values as potential salutors, thanks to their key characteristics, meaningfulness, disposition of supply of meaning and their importance for supporting students' resilience in the context of their development and health. The educational and socio-pedagogical views of the human mind (medical, pedagogical, socio-pedagogical) have much in common with visions of character education. Supporting clients, students, and people to live a healthy, prosperous life (so – called flourishing life), in which a person discovers and realizes his potential in healthy and mutually enriching relationships with other people, is the mission and ambition of pedagogical disciplines. From the point of view of character education, the relationship is again a space of learning, modelling, pattern, where we learn from each other about the good life and grow. At the same time, the relationship, the presence of authentic trust and security, is the result of their continuous building. This

requires perseverance, dedication, sincerity, generosity, and other virtues, which are the focus of character education. Building a climate of security and trust is a matter of honestly determined people working for themselves and in an environment that benefits others.

The presented study is part of the project: KEGA 002UK-4/2020 “Supporting a child with a sensory processing disorder through a multisensory environment”.

References

- [1] Antonovsky, A. 1996 The Salutogenic Model as a Theory to Guide Health Promotion. *Health Promotion International*, (11)1, s. 11–18. online: <https://salutogenesi.org/images/PDF/The_salutogenic_model_as_a_theory_to_guide_health_promotion.pdf>.
- [2] Arthur, J., et al., 2017. Teaching Character and Virtue in Schools. London: Routledge, 2017, 204 s. ISBN 978-0-81536-091-9.
- [3] Barnová, S., et al. 2019. *Školská pedagogika II*. Dubnica nad Váhom: VŠ DTI, 2019. ISBN 978-80-89732-85-2.
- [4] Becker, C. M, Glascoff, M. A., Felts, W. M., 2010. Salutogenesis 30 Years Later: Where do we go from here? *International Electronic Journal of Health Education*, (13)1, s. 25–32. online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228508768_Salutogenesis_30_Years_Later_Where_do_we_go_from_here>.
- [5] Berkowitz, M. W., Hoppe, M. A. 2009. Character Education and Gifted Children, High Ability Studies, (20)2, s. 131–142. online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233102732_Character_education_and_gifted_children>.
- [6] Berkowitz, M. W. 2020. *Effective Character-Based School Reform* [online]. www.youtube.com. Dostupné online: <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vrycFjXme9c>>.
- [7] Berkowitz, M. W., Bier, M. C. 2004. Research-Based Character Education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, [online] 591, s. 72–85. online: <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4127636>>.
- [8] Berkowitz, M. W., Bier, M. C. 2005. Character education: Parents as partners. *Educational Leadership: Journal of the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development*, N.E.A 63(1), s. 64–69. online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285799342_Character_education_Parents_as_partners>.
- [9] Booth, T., Ainscow, M., 2019. *Index inklúzie: Príručka na rozvoj škôl s dôrazom na inkluzívne hodnoty*. Nadácia pre deti Slovenska, 1. vyd. ISBN 978-80-89403-19-6.
- [10] Brestovanský, M. 2013. *Výchova charakteru v džungli krátkodobých programov*. Zdroj: Šauerová, M. 2013. *Zážitková pedagogika a možnosti jejího využití při práci s cílovým skupinami*. VŠTVS Palestra, 2013. s. 76–85. ISBN 978-80-87723-07-4.
- [11] Brestovanský, M. 2019. *Hodnoty, vzťahy a škola*. Trnava: Typi Universitatis Tyrnaviensis, 2019. 365 s. ISBN 978-80-568-0143-7.
- [12] Colby, A., et al., 1983. A Longitudinal Study of Moral Judgment. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, (48)1, s. 1–124, online: <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1165935.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A6e0d22ca83f57a41d8352f1fcc1aada9>>.

- [13] Cooke, S. 2013. Virtues of the Good Teacher: Messages from Literature, Policy and Practice. *The Jubilee Centre on Character and Virtues: Insight Series*. 2013. online: <<https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/insight-series/The%20Good%20Teacher.pdf>>.
- [14] Frankl, V. E. 1998. *Napriek všetkému povedať životu áno*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 183 s., 1998. ISBN 8022009180.
- [15] Harrison, T., Arthur, J. & Burn, E. 2016. *Character Education Evaluation Handbook for Schools*. Birmingham: Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues [online]. online: <<http://jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/charactereducation/EvaluationHandbook/CharacterEducationEvaluationHandbook.pdf>>.
- [16] Horňáková, M. 2010. *Včasná intervencia orientovaná na rodinu*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 2010. 260 s. ISBN 978-80-223-2915-6.
- [17] Horňáková, M. 2017. *Komunikácia v inkluzívnej škole*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, 2017. 116 s. ISBN: 978-80-223-4416-6.
- [18] Horňáková, M. 2019. Paradigmy v teóriách liečebnej pedagogiky. *Revue liečebnej pedagogiky*, (12)1, s. 3–7, ISSN 1337-5563.
- [19] Chmelárová, Z. 2019. Odraz osobnostných charakteristík učiteľa v jeho výchovnovzdelávacom pôsobení. In: Berková, K., et al. (eds). 2019. *Schola nova, quo vadis? Sborník recenzovaných příspěvků 4. ročníku mezinárodní vědecké konference*. Praha: Extrasystem Praha, 2019. 37(1), s. 56–61. ISBN 978-80-87570-44-9.
- [20] Jensen, B. B., Dür, W., & Buijs, G. 2017. The application of salutogenesis in schools. In: Mittelmark, M. B., et al. (eds.), 2017, *The Handbook of Salutogenesis*, Cham: Springer, 2017. s. 225–236. ISBN 978-3-319-04599-3. online: <<https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-319-04600-6>>.
- [21] Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (2017). *Framework for Character Education in Schools*. Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues [online]. Dostupné online: <https://uobschool.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Framework-for-Character-Education-2017-Jubilee-Centre.pdf>>.
- [22] Klčovánská, E. Hodnotová orientácia súčasnej mládeže. *Radosť a Nádej* [online]. 2004, (1)1, s. 15–25, [cit. 23-01-2021]. online: <<http://www.uski.sk/zaklad.htm>>.
- [23] Kohoutová, D. 2010. *Hodnotová orientace mládeže jako sociálně edukativní problém*. Diplomová práce. Brno: Masarykova univerzita,
- [24] Krásna, S. 2014. Subjective Understanding and Individual Interpretation of the Life Value “HEALTH” by the Second-Year Students of Lower Secondary Schools and of the First- and Second-Year Students of Upper Secondary Schools in Slovakia. *Acta Technologica Dubnicae*, (4)2, 2014, s. 1–18. DOI: 10.1515/atd-2015-0001.
- [25] Kristjánsson, K. 2014. Teaching character – but what sort of character? *The Jubilee Centre on Character and Virtues: Insight Series*. 2014. Dostupné online: <<https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/insight-series/teaching-character-kk.pdf>>.
- [26] Kučerová, S. 1996. *Člověk, hodnoty, výchova: kapitoly z filosofie výchovy*. Vyd. 1. Brno: 1996. 231 s. ISBN 80-85668-34-3.
- [27] Lindström, B., Eriksson, M. 2005. Salutogenesis. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 59(6), s. 440–442. online: <<https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.034777>>.
- [28] Mareš, J. 2008. Nová taxonomie kladných stránek člověka – inspirace pro pedagogiku a pedagogickou psychologii. *Pedagogika*, (58)1, s. 4–20.
- [29] Maslow, A.H., 2000. *Ku psychologii bytia*. Bratislava: PERSONA, 2000. 223 s. ISBN 80-967980-4-9.
- [30] Mazalová, S. 2012. *Výchova k hodnotám na 1. stupni základní školy*. Diplomová práce. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, Fakulta pedagogická.

- [31] Mitašíková, P. 2021. *Inkluzívny potenciál hry*. In: FÁBRY, L. Z., Ed. Možnosti podpory senzorického spracovania dieťaťa v predškolskom veku. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave. 2020. ISBN 978-80-223-5031-0.
- [32] O'brien, J., Forest, M. 1989. *Action for inclusion: How to improve schools by welcoming children with special needs into regular classrooms*. Toronto, Ontario: Inclusion Press, 1989.
- [33] Pasternáková, L., Laca, S. 2011. Ponímanie osobnosti učiteľa v súčasnej škole. In: *Medzinárodná elektronická konferencia pre doktorandov, vedeckých pracovníkov a mladých vysokoškolských učiteľov*. Prešov: PU, 2011. ISBN 978-80-555-0482-7. s. 261–265. online: <<https://www.pulib.sk/web/kniznica/elpub/dokument/Istvan1/subor/Pasternakova.pdf>>.
- [34] Peterson, C.; Seligman, M. E. (Eds.). 2004. *Character Strengths and Virtues*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2004. 800 s. ISBN 0-19-516701-5. In: Mareš, J. 2008. Nová taxonomie kladných stránok človeka – inspirácie pro pedagogiku a pedagogickou psychológiu. *Pedagogika*, (58)1, s. 4–20.
- [35] Potočárová, M. 1996. Výchova k hodnotám v slovenskej rodine. *Pedagogická orientace*, 1996, (6)21, s. 51–62. online: <<https://journals.muni.cz/pedor/article/view/10766/pdf>>.
- [36] Potočárová, M. 2019. *Miesto človeka v postmodernej rodine a otázky jeho výchovy*. Paedagogica. Zborník filozofickej fakulty Univerzity Komenského, 2019, roč. 31, s. 113–126. online: <https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kped/projekty/Archiv_Paedagogica/31-7.pdf>.
- [37] Průcha, J. a kol. 2013. *Pedagogický slovník*. Praha: Portál, 2013, 400 s., ISBN 978-80-2620-403-9.
- [38] Seider, S. 2015. *Character Compass: How Powerful School Culture Can Point Students Toward Success*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2. vyd., 2015. ISBN 978-1-61250-487-2.
- [39] Schwartz, B. 2014. Why a Good Teacher Must Be a Wise Teacher. *The Jubilee Centre on Character and Virtues: Insight Series*. 2014. online: <<https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/insight-series/SchwartzB.pdf>>.
- [40] Sokol, B. W., Hammond, S. I., & Berkowitz, M. W. 2010. The developmental contours of character. In: Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing*, s. 579–603. Springer Science + Business Media. online: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8675-4_33>.
- [41] Tóthová, R., 2013. Negatívny vplyv učiteľa na osobnostný rozvoj žiaka – existencia problému a nutnosť jeho riešenia. In: Sokolová, L., Lemešová, M., & Masaryk (eds). *Psychológia (v) škole. Zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 2013. s. 59–67. ISBN 978-80-223-3483-9.
- [42] Vodičková, B. 2020. Identification of supporting phenomena and barriers of inclusion in the pedagogical practice of teachers in a kindergarten in Bratislava, Slovak Republic. *Journal of Exceptional People*, 2(17), s. 63–73, 2020. ISSN 1805-4986.

(reviewed twice)

Mgr. Alžbeta Hortová
 Jastrabá 95,
 967 01 Kremnica
 Slovakia
 e-mail: betkahortova@gmail.com

Mgr. Pavol Janoško, Ph.D.
Faculty of Education, Comenius University
Department of Therapeutic Education
Račianska 59,
813 34 Bratislava
Slovakia
e-mail: janosko2@uniba.sk