TEACHERS' OPINIONS AND EXPERIENCES WITH AN INCLUSIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

[a]VLASTA BELKOVÁ, [b]ŠTEFAN PETRÍK, [c]PATRÍCIA ZOLYOMIOVÁ

Matej Bel University, Faculty of Education, Ružová 13, 974 11 Banská Bystrica, Slovakia
email: [a]vlasta.belkova@umb.sk, [b]stefan.petrik@umb.sk
[c]patricia.zolyomiova@umb.sk

The paper was developed with support under KEGA project no. 040UMB-4/2018 called 046UMB-4/2018 "How do we understand Inclusive Education? Creating an optimal Learning Model".

Abstract: The paper reports part of the results of a study where the teacher's level of education effectiveness in inclusive classrooms (TEIP) was examined. There were 1216 (N) pedagogical employees of various school types and levels who participated in the research in the Slovak Republic (hereinafter SR), out of which 98% were teachers and 86% women. A self-designed questionnaire which included a modified range of the standardised instrument – TEIP was used. Respondents filled in an anonymous questionnaire administered online. The main results show that a relatively high level of effective teaching is demonstrated by teachers who work as special teachers, teachers in special primary and high schools, or work with an SEN student (assistants). Teachers with a higher career grade showed a higher attitude score in the perception of their own professional ability to cooperate. There are stimulating results in the area concerning an ongoing society-wide strategy of integrating students with special educational needs (SEN students) into mainstream education. They will be further analysed and discussed in the context of other variables, as well as student samples that were part of the broader context in this research carried out by the KEGA project.

Keywords: attitudes, teachers, personal experience, students with special educational needs, inclusive environment

1 Introduction

Education has been identified as one of the main conditions for human independence and the fulfilment of one's life ideas. Society should strive to create an environment that does not restrict access to education for people with disabilities. Inclusive education is considered appropriate for improving the inclusion of people with disabilities (Čerešňová et.al, 2018, p.13).

School systems aim to move from integration to inclusion, while real inclusion presupposes changes in the perception and organization of the school system and the educational environment, focusing on the different educational needs and abilities of all pupils. Such a shift requires a more fundamental reform based on changes in educational policies (Körner, et.al., online, introduction), developing theoretical aspects of inclusion, and gradually building inclusive education (Špotáková, Kundrátová, Štefková, Vojtová & Zikmund Perašínová, 2018). "*Attention is focused on creating a friendly, accessible, safe, and secure educational environment, which is accessible for all participants in education including teachers and other teaching staff" (*Čerešňová, 2018, p.14).

Inclusive education is perceived as accessible to everyone and at the same time, based on solutions that can be adjusted to abilities of every individual. The preferred learning style, communication, or other specific needs are taken into consideration (Čerešňová & Rollova, 2015 In Čerešňová, 2018, pp.13 – 14).

Slovakia is among the countries with a so-called multi-track approach which has a diverse attitude towards inclusion offering different services between the system of mainstream and special schools for SEN students (Meijer et. al., (ed), EASIE, 2003, p.8).

Several EASIE documents (2011) emphasize that appropriate undergraduate and further teachers' education is a key factor for implementation of successful inclusive practises. For example, the EASIE reports (report *Kľúčové zásady podpory kvality v inkluzívnom vzdelávaní,* 2011, p. 15) appeal to teachers in undergraduate training to acquire skills, knowledge, and understanding to gain their confidence and address different pupils' needs effectively. The report *Vzdelávanie učiteľov v oblasti inklúzie v Európe – výzvy a príležitosti* (EASIE, 2011, p. 18) points out the need to address the structure of undergraduate teacher training to improve teacher education in the field of inclusion...to change the way teachers train for their professional activities and tasks (EASIE, 2014, p.16). Therefore, there is a current need in pedagogic research to study phenomena such as the willingness of teachers to work in an inclusive school environment or the professional (specialized) ability of teachers to work in an inclusive environment (Movkebaieva, Oralkanova & Uaidullakyzy, 2013). It is important to train future teachers to implement inclusive principles at school; they need proper knowledge and skills in the field of education including modern interactive teaching methods as well as personality characteristics and attributes such as patience and tolerance towards people regardless of their physical or other attributes (Movkebaieva, Oralkanova & Uaidullakyzy, 2013).

The implementation of inclusive principles in the school environment depends on the teachers' attitude (Bruggink, Goei & Koot, 2013; Saloviita, 2020; Žitniaková Gurgová, 2013). These attitudes are also based on the subjectively perceived teachers' skills to work with various pupils in mainstream schools (Straková, Simonová & Friedlaenderová, 2019). In the field of research, foreign countries are interested in revealing the readiness of teachers to work with children and youth with disabilities in mainstream schools (Movkebaieva, Oralkanova & Uaidullakyzy, 2013; Golder, Norwich & Bayliss, 2008; Dolan, 2017).

Teachers' attitudes to inclusion, which determine the academic success of SEN students, are examined (MacFarlen & Marks Woolfson, 2013; Shelley et.al, 2016). Teachers' evaluation of their efficacy to educate students with special educational needs in mainstream schools is examined as well (Grace, 2014; Bandura, 1997). Some studies offer us the results of examining the attitudes, concerns, moods of teachers at various school levels towards inclusive education in the context of the examined demographic variables such as gender, previous experience with people with disabilities where the impact of demographic variables on attitudes has been identified (Loreman & Earle, 2007). The study by Schmidt & Vrhovnik (2015) analysed the attitudes of teachers at primary and secondary level in Slovenia to the inclusion of SEN students in the context of demographic variables (type of school, age of teachers, number of pupils with special educational needs in the classroom). Studies pointing out links between more positive attitudes towards inclusion and personal experience towards people with disabilities represent another group (Sharma, Forlin, Loreman & Earle, 2006). Among primary and secondary school teachers in the south-west of England, a survey of attitudes towards the inclusion of SEN students in mainstream schools found that those teachers who work in an inclusive environment have a more positive attitude towards school integration (Avramidis, Bayliss & Burden, 2000). Some studies examined the teachers' efficiency in approach, and concerns in integrating SEN pupils into mainstream classrooms and therefore used tools such as SACIE-R and TEIP (Tasnuba & Tsokova, 2015).

2 Research methodology

A positive attitude towards inclusion, demonstrated by both teachers and school management, has been identified as one of the most influential factors in implementing inclusive approaches in school training. Social experiences and interactions with people with disabilities also influence attitudes towards inclusion. Therefore, the goal of this research was to identify the perceived professional ability of primary schools' pedagogic staff to perform an inclusive practice. It focuses on the following research questions based on the set goal:

Q1: Is there a difference in the perceived professional ability of pedagogical staff for inclusive practice in terms of the school type in which they work?

Q2: Is there a difference in the perceived professional ability of pedagogical staff for inclusive practice in terms of the achieved career level of pedagogical staff?

Q3: Is there a difference in the perceived professional ability of pedagogical staff in terms of their personal experience with SEN students?

The research sample consisted of N=1216 pedagogic staff from practice, working in Slovak schools. The available sample of respondents was used and the questionnaire was administered online. The research sample mostly consisted of pedagogical staff and teachers (98%) working at primary schools, vocational high schools, grammar schools, conservatories, special primary, and high schools. Most of the teachers involved in the research were from primary schools (primary 31% and lower secondary level 32%) and vocational high schools (23%). State school teachers represented the largest group in the research (79%). The respondents from the Slovak Republic's regions formed the largest group, namely the Banská Bystrica region (16%), the Prešov region (19%), and the Košice region (17%). In terms of the length of teaching practice the teachers were in the ranges of: 17 – 20 years (15%), 21 – 23 years (9%), 24 – 26 years (11%). The examined data was formed by pedagogic staff from all career levels, the most numerous were respondents with a first (40%) and a second attestation (36%). 8% of respondents were not assigned to any career position – it is assumed that this group mainly includes teachers with the shortest teaching experience 0 – 3 years, n=55), pedagogic staff who were categorized as educators (n=2), teaching assistants (n=3) and primary schools' special pedagogues (n=12).

The empirical data from pedagogical staff was collected in September – December 2019 using a self-designed questionnaire containing items from the „Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices" (TEIP) Scale questionnaire (Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012) which was modified for the needs of this research. The scale (TEIP) was developed from the original 50 items to an 18-point scale through a series of research studies. The final scale was tested on a sample of 609 teaching students at six universities in four countries (Canada, India, Hong Kong, and Australia). The TEIP questionnaire items were translated from English into Slovak by freelance translators and the TEIP scale was modified by adding items related to demographic variables to serve these research purposes. This created a total of 22 items in the research instrument. Teachers had the opportunity to indicate the degree of agreement on an ordinal scale for each statement: *1 - strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 - slightly disagree, 4 - slightly agree, 5 – agree, 6 - strongly agree.*

The exploratory factor analysis with "varimax" rotation which showed a relatively high exhausted variability of the data was used to verify the research tool validity, which facilitated our interpretation. The KMO test result was 0.937 and Bartlett's test result was 0.000, which disprove the hypothesis that the correlation matrix is a unit matrix.

Accordingly, thanks to the factor analysis' results and the TEIP questionnaire 3 factors were identified and named as follows: perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions, perceived professional ability to cooperate, perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour.

Table 1: Teacher's perceived professional skill (rotated factor load matrix)

Teacher's perceived professional skill	Perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions	Perceived professional ability to cooperate	Perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour
8. I can control disturbing behaviour in the classroom.	.820	.130	.149
7. I am convinced of my ability to manage disruptive behaviour in the classroom before it occurs.	.778	.178	.115
2. I can calm a student who is disturbing/noisy.	.769	.122	.215
11. I can guide pupils to follow classroom rules.	.670	.317	.180
5. I can conclude if the student has understood what I have explained to him.	.605	.271	.126
1. I can express my expectations regarding pupils' behaviour.	.570	.149	.130
3. I can induce/motivate parents to feel comfortable when visiting the school.	.547	.320	.124
4. I can help families so that their children achieve good school results.	.530	.310	.111
6. I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.	.527	.311	.031
14. I am sure that I can induce/motivate students to work in pairs/small groups of students.	.508	.418	.196
18. I can provide an alternative explanation/example when students are confused.	.472	.304	.371
17. I feel confident when I am in contact with physically aggressive students.	.412	.324	.264
12. I can cooperate with other experts (e.g. external experts, specialized staff) to create individual educational programmes for SEN students.	.199	.813	.106
13. I can cooperate with other experts and staff to teach SEN students in the classroom.	.219	.773	.157
10. I am sure that I can develop an individual educational programme to meet the needs of SEN students.	.215	.696	.219
16. I feel confident in informing others who know little about the laws and policies regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities and SEN students.	.260	.667	.188
15. I can use different strategies to assess students (e.g. portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.)	.410	.560	.171
9. I am convinced of my ability to involve SEN children's parents in school activities.	.411	.497	.091

20. I support everyone's involvement in education.	.071	.101	.869
19. The school is a place for all the educational process' participants.	.167	.156	.852
22. I can provide a safe environment that allows students to participate in the processes that take place during and outside the classroom.	.376	.282	.583
21. I apply the principles of an individual approach concerning the needs of specific students.	.250	.494	.544

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Subscale *"perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions"* consisted of items:

8. I can control disturbing behaviour in the classroom.
7. I am convinced of my ability to manage disruptive behaviour in the classroom before it occurs.
2. I can calm a student who is disturbing/noisy.
11. I can guide students to follow the classroom rules.
5. I can conclude if the student has understood what I have explained to him.
1. I can express my expectations regarding students' behaviour.
3. I can induce/motivate parents to feel comfortable when visiting the school.
4. I can help families so that their children achieve good school results.
6. I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.
14. I am sure that I can induce/motivate students to work in pairs or small groups.
18. I can provide an alternative explanation/example when students are confused.
17. I feel confident when I am in contact with a physically aggressive student.

This subscale explains 24.06% of the total data variability. Cronbach's Alpha showed the value of 0.621. The subscale consisted of items focused on the teacher's perceived professional ability to adapt inclusive instructions based on the needs of students with special educational needs (hereinafter SEN).

Subscale *"perceived professional ability to cooperate"* consisted of items:

12. I can cooperate with other experts (e.g. external experts, specialized staff) to create individual educational programmes for SEN students.
13. I can cooperate with other experts and staff to teach in the classroom with SEN students.
10. I am sure that I can develop an individual educational programme to meet the needs of SEN students.
16. I feel confident in informing others who know little about the laws and policies regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities and SEN students.
15. I can use different strategies to assess students (e.g. portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.)
9. I am convinced of my ability to involve SEN children's parents in school activities.

This subscale explains 18.33% of the total data variability. Cronbach's Alpha showed a value of 0.546. The subscale consisted of items focusing on the teacher's cooperation with SEN students.

Subscale *"perceived professional ability to manage the students' behaviour"* consisted of items:

20. I support everyone's involvement in education.
19. The school is a place for all the educational process' participants.
22. I can provide a safe environment that allows them to participate in the processes that take place during and outside the classroom for all students.
21. I apply the principles of an individual approach concerning the needs of specific pupils.

This subscale explains 12.25% of the total data variability. Cronbach's Alpha showed a value of 0.498. The subscale consisted of procedures that could be part of any general measure because many inclusive guidelines are general methods that are effective in teaching all students in various learning environments.

3 Results of the research

The research was focused on the self-assessment of pedagogical staff for inclusive practices in terms of demographic variables such as school level, career level of pedagogical staff, personal experience with SEN students.

The results of the empirical research are presented in tables T2 to T6. Methods of inferential statistics were used to process data. From the inference statistics methods, non-parametric significance tests such as the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient and Mann-Whitney U Test were used, since not all variables showed a normal distribution within the file and its sub-files, which was verified using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro-Wilkox test ($p < 0.05$).

Table 2: Perceived professional ability to perform inclusive practice in terms of school types

Perceived professional ability to perform an inclusive practice		Perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions	Perceived professional ability to cooperate	Perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour
Type of school				
Primary level of Primary School	N	386	386	386
	AM	4.95	4.80	5.17
	SD	0.636	0.78	0.868
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	1	1	1
	Max	6	6	6
Secondary level of Primary school	N	388	388	388
	AM	4.78	4.54	5.04
	SD	0.675	0.909	0.892
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	1	1	2
	Max	6	6	6
Grammar school	N	65	65	65
	AM	4.57	4.1	5.1
	SD	0.639	0.957	0.76
	Me	5	4	5
	Min	3	2	3
	Max	6	6	6
Primary school + Grammar school	N	3	3	3
	AM	4.61	3.78	4.08
	SD	0.488	0.481	1.377
	Me	4	4	5
	Min	4	4	3
	Max	5	4	5
Vocational high school	N	281	281	281
	AM	4.70	4.38	5.01
	SD	0.674	0.910	0.907
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	2	1	2
	Max	6	6	6
Special Primary school and High school	N	66	66	66
	AM	5.08	5.14	5.32
	SD	0.731	0.836	0.963
	Me	5	5	6
	Min	2	2	2
	Max	6	6	6
	Max	5	5	6
Special Primary school teacher	N	12	12	12
	AM	5.16	5.22	5.65
	SD	0.43	0.625	0.598
	Me	5	5	6
	Min	5	4	4
	Max	6	6	6
Kruskal-Wallis test		58.707	97.905	33.157
P-value		.000***	.000***	.000***

Explanatory notes: AM – arithmetic mean, Me – Median, SD – standard deviation, Min – minimum value, Max – maximum value
Used scale: 1 - strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 - slightly disagree, 4 - slightly agree, 5 – agree, 6 - strongly agree

T2 data confirmed a statistically significant difference among the respondents in the perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions (p=0.000), perceived professional ability to cooperate (p=0.000), and perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour (p=0.000) in terms of schools where respondents currently work. The special pedagogues in primary schools (AM=5.16) and pedagogical staff working in special primary and high schools (AM=5.08) have the highest perception of their professional ability to use inclusive instructions. Special pedagogues in primary school (AM=5.22), the staff at the first level of primary school (AM=4.80), and staff working in special primary and high schools (AM=5.14) have a high perception of their professional ability to cooperate. The professional ability necessary to manage student's behaviour is perceived as highest in special pedagogues in primary schools (AM=5.65) and teachers working in special primary and high schools (AM=5.32). This also points to the achieved value Me=6.

Table 3: Perceived professional ability to perform inclusive practice in terms of the career level achieved by the respondents

Perceived professional ability to perform an inclusive practice		Perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions	Perceived professional ability to cooperate	Perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour
Career level				
Beginning teacher	N	20	20	20
	AM	4.74	4.44	5.3
	SD	0.804	0.977	0.737
	Me	5	4	6
	Min	3	2	4
	Max	6	6	6
Proficient teacher	N	266	266	266
	AM	4.75	4.43	5.12
	SD	0.669	0.97	0.849
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	2	1	2
	Max	6	6	6
Teacher with the first attestation	N	483	483	483
	AM	4.84	4.67	5.13
	SD	0.698	0.845	0.893
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	1	2	2
	Max	6	6	6
Teacher with the second attestation	N	447	447	447
	AM	4.86	4.64	5.04
	SD	0.635	0.887	0.906
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	1	1	1
	Max	6	6	6
Kruskal-Wallis test		6.215	13.331	3.932
P-value		.102	.004***	.269

Explanatory notes: AM – arithmetic mean, Me – Median, SD – standard deviation, Min – minimum value, Max – maximum value
Used scale: 1 - strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 - slightly disagree, 4 - slightly agree, 5 – agree, 6 - strongly agree

Empirical data in T3 shows the difference among the surveyed respondents in the perceived professional ability to cooperate (p=0.004) in terms of achieved career level. Teachers with the first attestation (AM= 4.67; Me=5) and teachers with the second attestation experience the highest level of professional ability to cooperate. Beginning teachers and proficient teachers perceive their professional ability at a lower level, as pointed out by the achieved AM (4.44; 4.43), as well as Me (4 and 5).

Table 4: Perceived professional ability to perform inclusive practice in terms of personal experience with SEN students

Perceived professional ability to perform an inclusive practice		Perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions	Perceived professional ability to cooperate	Perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour
Personal experience with SEN student				
Yes	N	1159	1159	1159
	AM	4.84	4.64	5.11
	SD	0.667	0.880	0.883
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	1	1	1
	Max	6	6	6
No	N	57	57	57
	AM	4.59	3.83	4.88
	SD	0.716	0.872	0.934
	Me	5	4	5
	Min	2	2	3
	Max	6	6	6
Mann Whitney U test		26310.500	16282.500	27972.000
P-value		.009***	.000***	.049*

Explanatory notes: AM – arithmetic mean, Me – Median, SD – standard deviation, Min – minimum value, Max – maximum value
Used scale: 1 - strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 - slightly disagree, 4 - slightly agree, 5 – agree, 6 - strongly agree

The T4 results confirm a statistically significant difference in the perception of professional ability between teachers with personal experience with SEN students (AM=4.64, Me=5) and teachers who do not have personal experience with SEN students (AM=3.83, Me=4). A statistically significant difference (p=0.000) in the perceived professional ability to cooperate has also been found. While teachers who have experience working

with SEN students achieved an average score of AM=4.64 (Me=5), teachers who do not have such experience showed an AM=3.83 (Me=4). A weak statistically significant difference has been found in the perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour (p=0.049). Teachers with SEN experience achieved a higher average score (AM=5.11, Me=5) than teachers without experience (AM=4.88, Me=5).

Table 5: perceived professional ability to perform inclusive practice in terms of the SEN students' presence in the classroom

Perceived professional ability to perform an inclusive practice / **SEN pupil in the classroom**		Perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions	Perceived professional ability to cooperate	Perceived professional ability to manage students' behaviour
Yes	N	1093	1093	1093
	AM	4.83	4.63	5.09
	SD	0.681	0.898	0.892
	Me	5	5	5
	Min	1	1	1
	Max	6	6	6
No	N	123	123	123
	AM	4.83	4.33	5.17
	SD	0.580	0.830	0.834
	Me	5	4	5
	Min	3	2	2
	Max	6	6	6
Mann Whitney U test		66417.000	52102.500	64087.500
P-value		.828	.000***	.392

Explanatory notes: AM – arithmetic mean, Me – Median, SD – standard deviation, Min – minimum value, Max – maximum value
Used scale: 1 - strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 - slightly disagree, 4 - slightly agree, 5 – agree, 6 - strongly agree

The results in T5 point to a statistically significant difference in the perception of professional ability (to perform an inclusive practise) between teachers who have an SEN student (students) in the classroom (AM=4.63; Me=5), and teachers who do not have an SEN student in the classroom (AM=4.33; Me=4).

4 Discussion

Several foreign studies measured teacher effectiveness in inclusive classes using a research instrument developed for examination of inclusive practices (Park, Dimitrov, Das Cardona-Molto, Ticha & Abery, 2020; Sharma & Sokal, 2013; MacDonald, 2015; Yada & Savolainen, 2017; Miesera, DeVries, Jugjohann & Gebhardt, 2018). If teachers want to effectively implement inclusive procedures, they must have a high self-assessment of their ability in teaching SEN students, which testifies to their beliefs, i.e. a belief that they can influence how successful these students will be in the educational process (Vanderloon, 2020). The study presents the results of research on perceived professional ability for inclusive practice, which are in terms of socio-demographic variables categorized into the following areas: type of school where respondents currently work, career level of pedagogical staff, personal experience with SEN student, current presence of SEN student in the classroom.
Special school teachers and special teachers at mainstream schools are assessed as proficient in all three areas: perceived professional ability to use inclusive instructions, perceived professional ability for cooperation, perceived professional ability in managing pupils' behaviour. Teachers may feel more confident in these areas due to better preparation for working with SEN students. This is because the theoretical, as well as practical undergraduate training of special pedagogues and teachers at special schools focused mainly on SEN students. The successful implementation of inclusive procedures in education is supported by the knowledge and skills of teachers acquired during undergraduate training in the field of inclusion, i.e. inclusive education, as confirmed by Hecht, Petra & Aiello, Paola & Pace, Erika & Sibilio, Maurizio (2017). Beuse, Merz-Atalik and O Brien (2016), Sharma and Jacobs (2016) perceive the theoretical and practical experience gained during undergraduate training as one of the most important factors necessary for successful use of inclusive procedures. The research by Koppa (2009) pointed out that workshops about inclusion during undergraduate training positively increase the attitudes towards inclusive education.

De Boer et.al. (2011) suggests that based on this research, practice in inclusive classrooms (classrooms with one or more SEN students) should be included in the undergraduate training of teachers and special pedagogues. The mentioned authors discovered that pedagogical practice implemented within the undergraduate training increases positive attitudes towards inclusive procedures of future teachers, which can also increase the effectiveness of the inclusive procedures' use in their future pedagogical practice.

Teachers with the first attestation and teachers with the second attestation perceive a higher level of professional ability for cooperation than their colleagues at lower career levels (beginning and proficient teachers). A higher career level in pedagogic staff implies longer teaching practice and more educational experience gained by performing the activities associated with improving one's career level, according to the rules for pedagogic staff professional development (Regulation of The Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic no. 361/2019). Professionally more skilled teachers have higher levels of the perception of self-efficacy for cooperation with other experts, e.g. to create individual educational plans for SEN students, for cooperation with SEN students' parents, as well as implementing various strategies of students' assessment and evaluation. Teachers at a higher career level have a higher score in self-efficacy in cooperation which can be derived only from the non-confirmed assumption that they are more professionally experienced, more informed and are better at cooperation with experts which has been acquired through practice. This is also confirmed by the research of Burke and Sutherland (2004) Dessemontet et.al. (2011) which focused on personal variables such as age, pedagogic experience, teachers' opinions.

Teacher's personal experience with SEN students increases the self-perception of pedagogic staff in all three areas relevant to the professional ability for inclusive practise. This is supported by studies of Olli-Pekka Malinen et.al. (2013), which conclude that personal experience with teaching SEN students is one of the strongest predictors of self-efficacy. Lanfranchi, Moalli and Pulina (2015) in their study also confirmed that personal experience, as well as the actual presence of SEN students, increases the self-perception in all three areas needed for use of inclusive procedures. It supports the assumption that teachers

will be more efficient in using the inclusive instructions as well as in cooperation and control of students' behaviour.

The presence of SEN students in the classroom where a teacher works – teachers who actually have SEN students in the classroom showed a higher score of teachers' professional self-perception in the field of cooperation. It confirms the previous findings that fulfilling SEN students' needs requires a multi-disciplinary approach, i.e. cooperation with experts. If this requirement is fulfilled, the use of inclusive procedures in teaching practice can be more effective. Teachers who have an SEN student in the classroom and cooperate with experts are less concerned about the use of inclusive procedures. The research performed by Megou, Castellini, Vianello (1997) and Vianello (2015) already points this out. In this context, it is necessary to mention research performed by Balboni, Pedrabisii (2000), Cornoldi, Terreni, Scruggs, Mastropieri (1981), Devecchi, Dettori, Doveston, Sedwick, Jament (2012), Vianello et. al. (2015) who have pointed out that development courses, training, workshops, and advice from professional staff within the cooperation of teacher-professional staff all help teachers to properly implement inclusive procedures into teaching in practice.

5 Conclusion

The partial results of the research indicate the need to more closely monitor the personal experiences of pedagogical staff and their perception of self-efficacy in an inclusive environment, i.e. their attitudes towards inclusion. Teachers who were specially preparing for work with SEN students and worked daily with groups of SEN students showed a higher level of perception of their own self-efficacy, i.e. teaching experience of SEN students is the strongest predictor of self-efficacy. The questions for new research in this field are: What are the personal experiences with SEN students, what activities the teachers performed to increase their career level, which of them had an impact on the perception of their own self-efficacy for cooperation and what support they received from this cooperation for their own teaching practice.

6 Limits

The chosen data collection procedure was not able to achieve a representative sample of teachers from all Slovak regions because collecting data from respondents is difficult in the conditions of Slovak schools.

Literature:

1. Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., Burden, R. (2000). A Survey into Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Educational Needs in the Ordinary School in one Local Education Authority. *Educational Psychology*, 20(2), pp. 191 – 211. DOI: 10.1080/713663717
2. Balboni G., Pedrabissi L. (2000). Attitudes of Italian teachers and parents toward school inclusion of students with mental retardation: The role of experience. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Development Disabilities*, *35* (2), pp.148 – 159.
3. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
4. Beh-Pajooh, A. (1991). The effect of social contact on college students' attitudes toward severely handicapped students and their educational integration. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 35(4),* pp. 339 – 352. Available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1365-2788.1991.tb00406.x
5. Beuse, K., Merz-Atalik, K. & O Brien (2016). Sentiments, concerns and attitudes towards inclusive education – A comparison between teacher education students at the University of North Carolina (Charlotte, USA) and the University of Education (Ludwigsburg, Germany). *Zeitschrift für Inklusion.*
6. Burke, K. & Sutherland, C. (2004). Attitudes towards Inclusion: Knowledge vs. Experience. *Education, 125*(2), pp. 163 – 172.
7. Cardona-Molto, Maria C., Ticha, R. & Abery, Brian H. (2020). The Spanish Version of the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) Scale: Adaptation and Psychometric Properties. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(2), pp. 809 – 823. Available at https://www.eu-jer.com/EU-JER_9_2_809.pdf
8. Castellini K., Mega C., Vianello R. (1995). L'integrazione di studenti con handicap mentale nella scuola media: l'atteggiamento degli insegnanti. *I Care*,Vopl. 1, pp. 2 – 16.
9. Cornoldi C., Terreni A., Scruggs T., Mastropieri M. (1998). Teacher attitudes in Italy after twenty years of inclusion. *Remedial and Special Education*, pp. 19, 350 – 356.
10. Čerešňová, Z. et.al. (2018). *Inclusive higher education.* Praha: Gasset-Allan Gintel.
11. de Boer, A., Pijl, S.J. & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary school teachers attitudes' towards inclusive education. *Journal for Inclusive Education*, 15(3), pp. 331 – 353.
12. Dessemontet, R.S., Benoit, V. & Bless, G. (2011). Schulische Integration von Kindern mit einer geistigen Behinderung – Untersuchung der Entwicklung der Schulleistungen und der adaptiven Fähigkeiten, der Wirkung auf die Lernentwicklung der Mitschüler sowie der Lehrereinstellungen zur Integration. *Empirische Sonderpädagogik*, 3(4), pp. 291 – 307.
13. Devecchi C., Dettori F., Doveston M., Sedgwick P., Jament J. (2012). Inclusive classrooms in Italy and England: The role of support teachers and teaching assistants. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, pp. 27(2), 171 – 184, doi:10.1080/08856257.2011.645587.
14. Dolan, R. (2017). Teacher Education Programmes: A Systems View' In Clandinin, D. J. and Husu, J.(eds). The SAGE Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. London: SAGE. https://books.google.sk/books?id=HE8lDwAAQBAJ&pg=PT163&lpg=PT163&dq=Rose+Dolan+Teacher+Education+Programmes:+A+Systems+View&source=bl&ots=9CAOEFK3_1&sig=YgP1Q_yvCmFZqLWsmvPVWUpr774&hl=sk&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjLo96koKDbAhXmO5oKHcQoDtgQ6AEIRzAE#v=onepage&q=Teacher%20Education%20Programmes%3A%20A%20Systems%20View&f=false
15. Golder, G., Norwich, B. & Bayliss, P. (2008). Preparing teachers to teach pupils with special educational needs in more inclusive schools: evaluating a PGCE development. *British Journal of Special Education*, ORE, 1 June 2005, Deposited in ore 17 December 2008. abstract. Available at https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0952-3383.2005.00377.x
16. Grace, Ch. (2014). *Teacher self-efficacy and inclusive practice: An exploration of educator self-efficacy with regards to inclusive practise within the mainstream classroom* (Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology). Newcastle University. Http://thesestest.ncl.ac.uk:8080/jspui/handle/10443.1/2582
17. Hecht, Petra & Aiello, Paola & Pace, Erika & Sibilio, Maurizio. (2017). Attitudes and Teacher Efficacy among Italian and Austrian teachers: A Comparative Study. *European Journal of Research in Education and Training*, pp. 15, 269 – 282.
18. Kopp, B. (2009). Inklusive überzeugungen und Selbstwirksamkeit im Umgang mit Heterogenität Wie denken Studierende des Lehramts für Grundschulen? *Empirische Sonderpädagogik* p. 1, (1), 5 – 24.
19. Körnerová, I. et al. *Smerom k inkluzívnemu vzdelávaniu. Úspešné príklady inkluzívneho vzdelávania v praxi.* Inclusion Europe s podporou Európskej komisie [online]. [cit. 2019 – 06 – 10]. Available atwww.zpmpvsr.sk › dokumenty › Inkluzivne_vzdelavanie_preklad
21. *Loreman, T. & Earle, Ch. (2007).* The Development of Attitudes, Sentiments and Concerns about Inclusive Education in a Content-Infused Canadian Teacher Preparation Program. Exceptionality Education Canada, *17(1/2),* pp. 85 – 106. Available at https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ773914
22. MacDonald, C.A. (2015). Teacher efficacy: moving towards inclusive practices. Master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, pp. 87 – 102. Available at http://research.library.mun.ca/id/eprint/11654
23. MacFarlen, K. & Marks Woolfson, L. (2013). Teacher attitudes and behavior toward the inclusion of children with social, emotional and behavioral difficulties in mainstream schools: An application of the theory of planned behavior.

Teaching and Teacher Education, pp. 29, 46 – 52. Available at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.08.006 Elsevier Ltd. *Science Direct*
24. Miesera, S., DeVries, J.M., Jungjohann, J. & Gebhardt, M. (2018). Correlation between attitudes, concerns, self-efficacy, and teaching intentions in inclusive education evidence from German pre-service teachers using international scales. *Journal of Educational Research*, pp.19(2), 2019, 103 – 114. Available at https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12432
25. Meijer, C., Soriano, V., Watkins, A. (eds.) (2003). *Special Needs Education in Europe. Thematic Publication.* EASIE. ISBN 87-90591-77-1.
26. Mega C., Castellini K., Vianello R. (1997). Gli atteggiamenti degli insegnanti verso gli allievi con handicap: dalla scuola media a quella superiore. In R. Vianello e C. Cornoldi (Eds.). *Metacognizione e sviluppo della personalità. Ricerche e proposte di intervento* pp. 265 – 279, Bergamo: Junior.
27. Movkebaieva, Z., Oralkanova, I. & Uaidullakyzy, E. (2013). The professional competence of teachers in inclusive education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science*, 89. pp. 549 – 554. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.892 Elsevier Ltd. Science Direct
28. Olli-Pekka Malinen, Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P. Xu, J., Nel, M., Nel, N., Tlale, D. (2013). Exploring teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices in three diverse countries. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 33 (2013), pp. 34 – 44.
29. Park, M.-H, Dimitrov, D.M., Das, A., Gichuru, M. (2014). The teacher efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP) scale: dimensionality and factor structure. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 16(1). Available at https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12047
30. Saloviita, T. (2020). Attitudes of Teachers Towards Inclusive Education in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 64(2), pp. 270 – 282. DOI: 10.1080/00313831.2018.1541819
31. Sharma, U., Forlin, Ch., Loreman, T. & Earle, Ch. (2006). Pre-Service Teachers' Attitudes, Concerns and Sentiments about Inclusive Education: An International Comparison of Novice Pre-Service Teachers. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21(2), pp. 80 – 93. Available at https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ843609.pdf
32. Sharma, U., Loreman, T. & Forlin, Ch. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs Education*, 12(1), pp. 12 – 21. Available at https://www.academia.edu/18421635/Measuring_teacher_efficacy_to_implement_inclusive_practices
33. Sharma, U. & Sokal, L. (2013). The impact of a teacher education course on pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusion: an international comparison. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 15(4), pp. 276 – 284. Available at https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?AllField=sharma+sokal https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12043
34. Shelley T. Alexander, David L. Brody, Meir Muller, Haggith Gor Ziv, Sigal Achituv, Chaya R.
35. Gorsetman, Janet Harris, Clodie Tal, Roberta Goodman, Deborah Schein, Ilene Vogelstein, Lyndall Miller. 2016). Voices of American and Israeli Early Childhood Educators on Inclusion. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education (INT-JECSE)*, 8(1), 16 – 38. DOI: 10.20489/intjecse.239574
36. Sharma, U. & Jacobs, K. (2016). Predicting in-service educators' intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms in India and Australia. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 55*, pp.13 – 23.
37. Schmidt, M. & Vrhovnik, K. (2015). Attitudes of Teachers Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Needs in Primary and Secondary Schools. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 51(2), pp. 16 – 30. Available at https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:SwR8ePY5szoJ:https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/221004+&cd=3&hl=sk&ct=clnk&gl=sk
38. Straková, J., Simonová, J. & Friedlaenderová, H. (2019). Postoje odborné i laické verejnosti k inkluzivnímu vzdělávání v kontextu obecných postojů k vnější diferenciaci. In *Studia paedagogica*. 24(1). Available at https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2019-1-4.
39. Sucuoğlu, B., Bakkaloğlu, H., İşcen Karasu, F., Demir, S. & Akalm, S. Inclusive preschool teachers: Attitudes and knowledge. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education (INT-JECSE)*, 5(2), pp. 107 – 128. Available at https://www.int-jecse.net/index.php/ijecse/article/view/74
40. Špotáková, M., Kundrátová, B., Štefková, M., Vojtová, Z. & Zikmund Perašínová, D. (2018). *Od integrácie k inklúzii*. Informačná brožúra pre pedagógov základných škôl. Bratislava: VÚDPaP. [online]. [cit. 2019 – 06 – 10].
41. Tasnuba, T., Tsokova, D. (2015). BRAC Primary School Teachers' Teaching-efficacy, Attitude, Sentiment and Concern towards Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in Regular Classrooms in Bangladesh. *Asian Journal of Inclusive Education (AJIE)*, 3(1), pp. 53 – 78. Available at http://www.ajie-bd.net
42. Vančíková, K., Porubský, Š. & Kosová, B. (2017). *Inkluzívne vzdelávanie – dilemy a perspektívy*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum.
43. Vančíková, K., Sabo, R. et al. (2018). *Inkluzívne vzdelávanie*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum.
44. Yada, A. & Savolainen, H. (2017). Japanese in-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education and self-efficacy for inclusive practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 64, pp. 222 – 229. Available at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.02.005
45. Vanderloon, McKenzie, *"Development of Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices in Canadian Teachers"* (2020). Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 7326. Available at https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/7326 T
46. Vianello R., Lanfranchi S., Moalli E., Pulina F. (2015). Tutti in classe normale. Le opinioni degli insegnanti, dei compagni e dei genitori. In R. Vianello, Di Nuovo, S. (Eds.). *Quale scuola inclusiva in Italia?* Oltre le posizioni ideologiche: risultati della ricerca (pp. 17 – 33). Trento: Erickson.
47. Žitniaková Gurgová, B. (2013). Úloha psychológie v príprave učiteľov na realizáciu multikulturálnej výchovy. In K. Vančíková (Ed.). *Multikultúrna výchova - jej miesto v príprave učiteľov*. Banská Bystrica : Univerzita Mateja Bela, Pedagogická fakulta (pp. 93-112).
48. Regulation of The Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic no. 361/2019 on vocational training Available at: https://www.minedu.sk/data/att/15400.pdf

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AM