

Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis

Studia Psychologica IV (2011)

DISABILITY IN THE CONTEXT OF INCLUSION AND CULTURE

Miloň Potměšil

Institute of Special Education, Faculty of Education, Palacký University
Olomouc, Czech Republic

The sentiments, attitudes and concerns of educators when working under the conditions of inclusion

Research background

In regards to the fact that our research is directed to the field of special needs education, which represents, in the context of pedagogy and education, a very good example of an inter-field approach, we shall first define the respective terminology. To begin, it is necessary to mention normalization, integration and inclusion. Probably the most fundamental statement in relation to upbringing and education was expressed in the Salamanca Statement (1994) by the representatives of 92 UNESCO member states. This declaration outlines the tendencies that lead to the elimination of discriminatory attitudes by establishing open inclusive schools and, subsequently, by creating social consciousness directed also towards the principle of inclusion. The main issue discussed therein was education and, as a result, the principal theme for the entire process was: "Education For All". A significant attribute was the notion of *normalization*, which is closely linked with the necessity of adjusting conditions ensuring a "normal" life for people with intellectual disabilities. It was first introduced by a Danish lawyer, Niels Erik Bank-Mikkelsen (1999). This concept was evolved further, especially in the northern European countries, and it was from there that it disseminated to other countries as a set of principles. These principles ensure the adjustment of the environment and the attitudes of society in such way that they comply with the needs of people with intellectual disabilities. Adjustment / normalization refers to common every-day activities and the involvement in every-day life of the society to an extent acceptable for each particular person. We are convinced that this concept then gave rise to a similar view on the process of education (Gilbert, C. and Hart, M. 1990) and socialization of people with other types of disadvantages.

One of the most frequent definitions in our target sphere is *integration*. A specification of this definition is found in a regulation (2001) given out by the Ministry of Education of Czech Republic in which individual and group integration is distinguished. *Individual integration* is described in terms of the conditions that are present in kindergarten, primary and secondary schools or college which are not separately designed for pupils with special educational requirements, but simultaneously provide corresponding educational conditions and necessary special

pedagogical or psychological care. The second type of integration is, according to the stated material, the education of pupils with special needs in a class at a specific school, designed specially for pupils with other types or intensities of impairments.

Group integration is, in this article, characterized as the education of pupils in a special class or a specialized class formed under specific regulations. Pupils can join other pupils from the school for certain subjects and are, within their capacities, brought in on all extracurricular activities.

Another essential term for this study is *inclusion*. In Czech sources, the difference between integration and inclusion is, in some instances, not clear. E.g., Průcha (1998) defines inclusion in education as the result of a movement, which aims to create conditions for integrated education even for severely disabled individuals. The precise line between the two concepts is not always clearly specified. Written materials focusing on current educational issues usually apply both notions only in a limited extent (e.g. Průcha, 2002). The term inclusion is associated with a change in the special-needs-education paradigm (Forlin 2006). Let us remind you of the fact that the first pioneering steps in this field in our country are attributed to J. Jesenský (1998). This takes us back to the conference in Spanish Salamanca where inclusion became the key word. The final resolution calls for programmes focused on the education of pupils with disabilities in conditions that are available in general schools and highlights the principles of individualization, both in planning the contents and pace of education, as well as in the requirements necessary for adjustments to the educational environment. In regards to this, it is fundamental that the pre-school educational phase is included in the entire educational process and is considered an equal developmental phase. The concept of inclusion follows basic human rights, which – if they are to be abided by – cannot exclude a group of people with special needs (Meijer, 2001). From our point of view, it is also important that this does not represent only a phase of educational activities, as a rule fulfilled by intellectually disabled individuals at the age of twenty, but that it is envisaged as a life-long process – inclusive of finding a place for the individual in society and his/her involvement in working life. At present, the process of inclusion is, in the Czech Republic, reflected e.g. in the implementation of general principles in a social services law as well as in standards of social services applied to real life practices.

Inclusion thus, for our purposes, represents a set of conditions which, if they operate mutually/bilaterally, provide people with intellectual disabilities with an approach by the majority of society that focuses on developing their potentials in individual sectors. Furthermore, it supports their abilities so that they become fully functional tools in a maximally independent life within this society.

As stated earlier, this approach was reflected in the change of the special needs education paradigm, which has subsequently become a comprehensive pedagogical branch. In comparison with the preceding concept of being handicapped, understood mainly from the medical point of view, special needs education is envisaged today as a supportive line of education.

The objective is thus to prepare a disabled individual for his/her life in society so that his/her experience is of the highest possible quality and as close as possible to the life of the (unimpaired) majority of the population. With respect to the fact that the educational stage partakes in the quality of life to a great degree, we mention

here *inclusive pedagogy* or *inclusive education*. Inclusive pedagogy represents, in our current conceptual view, an approach which treats diversity as a principal idea in educational process. It is possible to claim that the line of inclusive pedagogy is a successor of integrated pedagogy. The fundamental difference lies in the fact that pedagogy, in the event of inclusion, operates in connection with human rights. To simplify things, it may be stated that a school must be conformed to a child, not the child to the school (Groma, 2008).

For the purpose of our study, we summarize the fundamental difference between integration and inclusion, which lies in a diverse conceptualization of the child/pupil. The concept of integration respects the diversities that arise between a group of impaired children and a group of unimpaired children. The main effort is to include or join two different groups (different in health conditions or educational needs) within the educational process and provide necessary support to special needs education wherever required. Inclusive pedagogy views children or pupils from a position that does not distinguish among differences caused by the above-mentioned reasons, but works with a group where each individual has comparable needs (Milovanovitch, 2009).

The relation between integration and inclusion can be clearly defined according to Kocurová (2002) as follows:

Integration – focus on the needs of a disabled individual, the expertise of professionals, special intervention, contribution to the integrated pupil, a partial change of the environment, focus on the educated disabled pupil, special programmes for the disabled pupil, and evaluation of the pupil by a professional.

Inclusion – focus on the needs of all pupils, the expertise of common educators, substantial teaching for everybody, contribution to all pupils, an overall change of the school, focus on the group and school, a general strategy implemented by the teacher, teacher evaluation, and focus on educational factors. Education in this sense is not only meant to setup specific knowledge in accordance with a particular subject, but means upbringing as well. A description of different attitudes to upbringing methods and goals is made by Pospisil (2009).

The aims of the educational process are stipulated in a national, and later in the school, educational curriculum and, if need be, in an individualized plan serving as a tool that corresponds to specific needs. From the point of view of pedagogical policies and principles, there is no evident difference between inclusive and integrated education. Modern educational philosophy views, within the framework of general pedagogy, the current trend as comprehensive. In this respect, R. Barrow and R. Woods (2006) mention on pages 94 – 95 the requirements for educators and teachers who implement an educational process; they characterize this process as “rational”. It is further explain from the perspective of the modern concept of pedagogy and the necessary competencies of teachers. The competencies of teachers towards disabled children and pupils are dealt with in a publication by A. W. Brue and L. Wilmshurst (2005) who list the competencies of educators that are essential for working with children and pupils with various types of impairments and special educational needs. With reference to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and especially section 504, there are specific requirements for teachers regarding strategies focusing, for example on process organization, manifestation of behaviour,

adjustments of the environment and conditions, etc. Also a publication by K. Hull (2002) describes the characteristics of inclusion and inclusive education and sees the following assumptions as fundamental (p. 13):

- Disabled children may take part in the same educational programmes as their contemporaries.
- They can visit an environment which reflects their real age.
- They can, if need be, use an individual approach in the form of an individualized educational plan (IEP).
- They have the right to receive support from special needs education, according to their needs.

In a study, the same authors address the requirements imposed on educators working under the conditions of inclusion and, apart from practical competencies, try to refer to other presumptions which they claim essential for performing this specific work. For our purposes, we can state in line with the above-mentioned authors that the list of requirements and spectrum of pedagogical competencies are much more extensive in the case of inclusive education (as in integrated education). We take into consideration general educational work focused on children and pupils, both impaired and unimpaired, which naturally demands readiness and competencies of respective pedagogical personnel. Hájková (2005) as well as Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., Standish, P. (2006) define professional competencies of a teacher as a set of prerequisites for performing teaching activities, and also as a capacity to act intelligently in situations, which are constantly new and unique with the aim of finding a suitable on-the-spot response. If a teacher possesses these abilities to evaluate and make decisions, he/she is apt to choose suited responses in situations which can be completely new and unexpected (more on this topic can be found in Lambe (2007)). With respect to the fact that our aim is not to present the specific competencies that are expected of teachers specialized in the education of disabled children (in terms of the type of disability), and taking into account the specificities of such a disability, we present only as an illustration the requirements of educating a child with impaired hearing. Apart from communication competencies in Czech and sign languages at the common user's level, in order for the educational process to be performed without any communication barrier as a limiting factor, we shall enumerate other fields where the teacher's awareness is assumed: emotional literacy – introduction to theory and practice of emotional life, definitions and descriptions of individual emotions and experiences; self-control – conscious behaviour motivated through a pre-set goal; social competencies – establishing and developing social skills adequate to the child's age, corresponding to the culture and environment in which the child is based; the development of positive relationships with his/her contemporaries – exercise and development of social skills in a group of his/her contemporaries; and finally, the skill to solve problems in inter-personal relationships. We are intentionally omitting the field of knowledge because we assume its definition in accordance with the national curriculum and success in the given subject if the following conditions are met: the educator's communication competencies, on the one hand, and intellect corresponding to the requirements for completion of primary education, on the other hand (Potměšil, 2007).

The research results of studies conducted by D. J. Bjarnason (2005) in Iceland indicated a close correlation between changes in conditions as part of the transformation of traditional approaches to the form of inclusive education and their reflection in the preparation of future educators. In regards to the monitored competencies and attitudes, the author clearly talks about "... [the] changed general educator's roles in the face of growing student diversity".

It's these requirements bestowed on the educator and his/her personality in the process of inclusive education that prompted us to cooperate on the above-stated research. Inclusive education in conditions present in the Czech Republic is more similar to integrated education. Terminology deduced from the notion of inclusion occurs, at present, in our pedagogical documents merely in three instances: the Bílá kniha (White Book) – the 2nd revision uses this term in chapter 10, "*speciální vzdělávání (special needs education)*," parallel to the term integration and in relation to the elimination of segregated education. Furthermore, Directive No. 17/2005 Coll., dated 27th July 2005 concerning the further education of educators, the accreditation committee and career system for educators, as amended in the Directive No. 412/2006 Coll., dated 14th August 2006, mentions the term inclusion in relation to the requirements for the education of educators with reference to the scope of their competencies. The third document is the Methodological Guideline for the reimbursement of educators and other school employees, pre-school and school facilities and their ranking within the 16–wage-tariff catalogue of works, Ref. No.: 30 207/2003-2. Therein, *inclusion* is mentioned only once in relation to the required professional competencies for qualifying for the 11th wage tariff. The respective legislation (School Law Act, No. 61/2004 Coll., dated 24th September 2004 for pre-school, primary, secondary, college and other education (School Law) as amended (the latest amendment No. 49/2009 Coll., dated 28th January 2009) or the Methodological Guideline for integration of handicapped children and pupils into schools and school facilities in the course of the school year 1997/1998, MŠMT ČR (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports), ref. No. 18996/97-22, Directive No. 73/2005 Coll., dated 9th February 2005 for education of children, pupils and students with special educational needs and for children, pupils and students of prodigious talent, as amended by regulation No. 62/2005 Coll., dated 19th March 2007) is being applied in real every-day education. We are convinced that there are many variants, forms and methods of work relating to the mentioned educational forms. We were, like our colleagues from abroad, mostly interested in the attitudes, feelings and concerns of educators, who can, in their every-day practical life, expect a situation when they might educate a disabled child and they should, naturally, succeed in their role as a teacher and fulfil their required educational objective. The target group was selected from educators who were just about to start a 3-year specialized study of special needs education for teachers who had completed their Master's degree with specialization in teaching the unimpaired population.

In order to be able to collaborate on the research, it was necessary to fill out the same questionnaire (Loreman et al. 2007) as our foreign colleagues, with the exception that it was in Czech (unaltered in respect to meaning and presentation of items from the English original).

Analysis of the acquired data

First, we processed the returned questionnaires in terms of the demographic information from the first and the second phases of the study.

The first phase included 563 and the second phase 231 informants from all over the Czech Republic. The first phase addressed 22.4% and the second 12.3% of males. Females who completed the entire questionnaire made up 77.6% of respondents in the first and 87.7% in the second phase. Statistically, the prevalence of women was confirmed at a significance level of $p = 0.001$.

Out of the total number of 563 informants, 13 were not working in the pedagogical field and 15 were for various reasons out of the working process at the moment.

The age of informants oscillated in the first phase at 32.8% (and 27.9% in the second phase respectively) for individuals up to the age of 29 years, at 37.8% (42% respectively) for informants between 30–39 years of age and at 29.4% (30.1% respectively) for those above the age of 40.

The education level of our informants was as follows: 59.5% of informants in the first phase and 59.8% in the second phase completed secondary schools education, 24.6% of informants in the first phase and 31.1% in the second phase completed their study with a Bachelor's degree, and 15.9% of informants in the first phase and 8.7% in the second phase completed a Master's degree. A mere 0.5% of the informants in the second phase had completed a doctorate programme (PhD).

Regular and frequent contact with people with intellectual disabilities was reported by 42.5% of informants in the first phase and 68% in the second phase. 57.5% of informants did not have any opportunity for such encounters in the first phase and 32% in the second phase.

The query about previous professional preparation for teaching practice specialized for people with intellectual disabilities was evaluated as follows: without preparation – first phase 50.5%, second phase 15.5%; preparation assessed as very insufficient – first phase 21.9%, second phase 15.1%; sufficient preparation (completion of a specialized course consisting of, at least, 40 hours of training) – first phase 28.1%, second phase 69.4%. Here, the increase in the educational level among the informants of the first and second phases is quite obviously reflected. The statistical significance of the difference in the monitored waves is proved at the level of $p = 0.0001$.

Awareness of the respective legislation and organization of education for people with intellectual disabilities was evaluated by 2.1% of our informants as very good in the first phase and by 4.6% of informants in the second phase and as good by 21.7% and 30.6% of informants, respectively. 32.1% of informants in the first phase assessed their awareness as average whereas in the second phase it was 52.5% of the monitored cohort. Insufficient awareness was reported by 22.9% of informants in the first phase and by 8.2% in the second phase. The last option, no awareness, was selected by 21.1% of informants in the first phase and 4.1% in the second phase. The difference in perceiving one's own awareness of the discussed issue was among the monitored waves confirmed at the level of significance of $p = 0.001$ for the benefit of the second phase.

Another item was the feeling of confidence when teaching disabled pupils. This perception was evaluated as very good by 7.3% of informants in the first phase and 6.5% in the second phase and as good by 25.7% of informants in the first phase and 43.3% in the second phase. The feeling was evaluated as average by 30.3% of informants in the first phase and 33.5% in the second phase. Evaluation as low was reported by 18.4% in the first phase and 8.8% in the second phase. A feeling of prevailing uncertainty was chosen by 18.4% of informants in the first phase and 7.9% in the second one. A feeling of certainty when teaching handicapped pupils increased relatively with the length of the study. We showed a statistically significant difference at the level of $p = 0.001$.

Insufficient experience with education of disabled pupils was perceived by 49.2% of informants in the first phase and 19.8% in the second phase. 26.4% of informants in the first phase and 30.4% in the second phase marked their experience as scarce, but still sufficient. The last option – sufficient (i.e. at least 30 days of training) – was selected by 24.4% of informants in the first phase and 49.8% in the second one. The issue of experience with education of disabled pupils proved to be dependent on the length of the study. At a significance level of $p = 0.001$, we confirmed a difference in the acquired experience among informants in the first and the second phases.

Our analysis focused also on another part of the questionnaire whose results are presented below as well as clarified in the discussion. An evaluation of the statements was as follows: definitely yes (AA), yes (A), no (N), definitely not (NN). These abbreviations will be used in the text below. The levels of significance are presented in the attached table (Table 1).

1. The statement “I don’t mind the company of people with an intellectual disability” was evaluated with strong consent by 97% of informants in both waves (AA or A).
2. Furthermore, 94.9% of informants in both waves stated (NN or N) that they are not apprehensive of direct contact with people with an intellectual disability.
3. The statement that pupils and students suffering from problems with communication in spoken language can be included in classrooms of standard schools was marked as AA or A by 83% of informants.
4. Also, the statement that pupils and students requiring the presence of an assistant can be included in classrooms of standard schools was marked as AA or A by 89.6% of informants.
5. The statement that pupils and students with signs of aggressive behaviour can be included in classrooms of standard schools was marked as NN by 70.8% of informants in the first phase and 68.6% in the second phase. At the level of $p = 0.01$, there exists a significant difference between the evaluations of this statement as valid or invalid in the first and second phases.
6. The statement that pupils and students requiring an individualized educational plan can be included in classrooms of standard schools was marked as AA or A by 64.5% of informants in the first phase and 87.6% in the second phase. Also this item showed a statistically significant difference at the level of, at least, $p = 0.001$ between the evaluations of the statement as truthful in the first and second phases, compared with its negation in both waves.

7. In both waves of the research, informants were addressed with the statement that pupils and students who need special communication techniques in their education (Braille, sign language) belong to classrooms in standard schools. 45.4% of informants in the first phase and 59.9% in the second phase marked this statement as true. Statistical processing of the results obtained in both waves showed that the answers between the first and the second phases differ at the level of significance of $p = 0.001$ detrimental to the acceptance of pupils with specific communicational needs.
8. The statement that pupils and students with attention deficits belong to classrooms in standard schools was evaluated as true by 60.9% of informants in the first phase and as much as 77% in the second phase. The majority of informants in both waves expressed their consent to the presence of pupils with attention deficits in inclusive education, and the level of significance was, at least, $p = 0.001$.
9. Another statement to be evaluated was: "Pupils and students who systematically fall behind in their educational results belong to classrooms in standard schools." In the first phase of the research, 58.9% of informants agreed with this statement and 46.5% in the second phase.
10. Informants were to evaluate the following statement: "I'm convinced that the presence of a disabled pupil or student shall significantly increase my work load." 69.3% of informants in the first phase and 72% in the second phase evaluated this statement as truthful.
11. The statement: "I'm not convinced of the quality and effectiveness of support, which is provided when educating integrated disabled pupils and students on the part of professional workplaces" was evaluated as true by 58.3% of informants in the first phase and 58.8% in the second phase, comparable with findings by Valeo (2008).
12. The educators' own competencies were to be characterized by the following statement: "I'm not convinced that my preparation for working with disabled pupils and students is sufficient for achieving the required results." Accordant evaluation was expressed by 58.9% of informants in the first phase and 46.5% in the second phase. Statistical analysis showed that informants in both waves were worried about the sufficiency of their competencies for working in an inclusive educational environment.
13. The questionnaire also monitored the ideas of the informants about the organization of the educational process through the following statement: "I'm convinced of the fact that on my part it is not possible to pay necessary attention to an integrated pupil or student." 36.4% of informants in the first phase and 31.2% in the second phase evaluated this statement as truthful.
14. Another statement presented to our informants was as follows: "I'm apprehensive that disabled pupils or students shall not be well accepted in a classroom of intact contemporaries." 39.6% of informants expressed their consent with this statement in the first phase, and 41.7% in the second one.
15. Concerns about direct contact were expressed in the last statement: "I regard the presence of a disabled pupil or student in a classroom as a great source of

mental load for myself.” It was evaluated as true by 27.7% of informants in the first phase and 29.6% in the second phase.

Questionnaire item	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Company	62597.5	218558.5	-0.54005	0.589
Concerns	57286	82711	-1.91715	0.055
Problems	58481	200792	-0.65738	0.511
Assistant	54719	77724	-1.09567	0.273
Aggressive	56274.5	82609.5	-2.54772	0.011
Individual plan	54108	79986	-3.52563	0.000
Spec. comm. Tech.	54550.5	80428.5	-3.19875	0.001
Attention 1	48306	71959	-4.0902	0.000
Falling behind	58855.5	84506.5	-1.67871	0.093
Load	61007	87113	-0.93893	0.348
Effective support	61519.5	209759.5	-0.19167	0.848
Preparation of spec. needs education	50748	190404	-3.58397	0.000
Attention 2	54990.5	200520.5	-1.86188	0.063
Acceptance	61977	88083	-0.53676	0.591
Psychical load	61154	86805	-0.62301	0.533

Tab. 1. Statistical significance of questionnaire items

In order to conduct further analysis, we divided the above-mentioned items into two groups:

1. Labour input and stress – items 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15.

If we consider the group of statements referring to labour input and stress when working with disabled pupils and students under conditions of integrated education, we can conclude the following from the acquired data:

- More than 90% of informants of both waves do not have a negative relationship towards people with intellectual disabilities.
- Approximately 70% of informants in both waves believe that the presence of a pupil with special educational needs in a classroom will increase their work load.
- 58% of informants in both waves expressed their misgivings about sufficient support for integrated education on the part of professional workplaces.
- The level of one’s own competencies was regarded as insufficient by 58.9% of informants in the first phase and 46.5% in the second phase.
- More than 30% of informants (36.4%, respectively 31.2%) voiced their concerns that it is not possible to pay enough attention to a pupil with specific educational needs.

- The presence of a disabled pupil was regarded as a great source of stress by 27.7% of informants in the first phase and 29.6% in the second.

2. The Education Process and its management – items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 14.

In this set of statements, we were looking for answers regarding the process of inclusive education and the opinions of educators about managing their tasks.

- Statements focusing on the presence of pupils with impaired communication competencies and the possible presence of an assistant were evaluated positively by over 90% of informants in both waves.
- Almost 70% of informants in both waves negated the possibility of incorporating pupils with aggressive behaviour into a standard classroom in the form of inclusive education.
- A shift in the evaluation of effectiveness and acceptability of work according to an individualized plan was demonstrated when comparing the results of the first phase, 64.5%, and the second phase, 87.6%.
- Concerns about the application of special communication techniques were expressed by 45.4% of informants in the first phase and by 59.9% in the second phase.
- 60 to 80% of informants did not show any concerns about working with pupils with ADHD disorders.
- The presence of pupils who are constantly unsuccessful at school was unthinkable for 58.9% of informants in the first phase and 46.5% in the second phase.
- Problems with acceptance of disabled pupils by unimpaired class mates were expected in both waves by approximately 40% of informants.

Conclusion

Conclusions relating to labour input and stress and the process of education and its management:

The informants of our research relate positively to people with intellectual disabilities, more than half of them are concerned about insufficient support for integrated education from professional workplaces, they realize the associated higher work load, but the implementation of inclusive education does not seem to bring about any increased levels of stress for them. Half of the informants sense a lack of competencies and, consequently, are also concerned about whether they will be able to pay sufficient attention to pupils with special needs.

Furthermore, our informants showed a willingness to accept a pupil with specific needs and possibly even cooperate with an assistant. Work based on an individualized plan is accepted by informants and is regarded as beneficial. They, however, refuse to work with students with behavioural disorders of aggression due to the constant lack of success, whereas working with pupils with attention disorders does not seem to cause any concerns. A proportion of informants (40%) expressed their concerns about the acceptance of pupils with specific needs into the society of an unimpaired group in the classroom.

If we are to search for answers concerning sentiments, attitudes and concerns of educators working in conditions of inclusion, then we can state that the sample of informants addressed in our research demonstrated conscious willingness to cooperate on projects of individual inclusion. They, however, feel concerned

about key issues concerning the lack of professional competencies and support and the effectiveness of such educational work. Our research did not, contrary to our expectations, show any significant difference in the stated items, i.e. there was no expected shift towards better results, when comparing data before the commencement of the study and after its completion.

Acknowledgements

Research report on SACIE in the Czech Republic.

References

- Barrow, R., Woods, R. (2006) *An Introduction to Philosophy of Education*. 4th edition, Routledge.
- Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., Standish, P. (2006) *Philosophy of Education*. 5th edition, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bjarnason, D. (2005) Disability studies and their importance for special education professionals. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 25, 339–356.
- Brue, A.W., Wilmschurst, L. (2005) *A Parent's Guide to Special Education*. New York: AMACOM.
- Flynn, R. J., Lemay, R. A. (1999) (Eds.) *A Quarter-century of normalization and social role of valorization: evaluation and impact*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Forlin, Ch. (2006) Inclusive Education in Australia ten years after Salamanca. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, XXI, 3, 265–277.
- Hájková, V. (2005). *Integrativní pedagogika*. Praha: IPPP ČR.
- Hull, K., Goldhaber, J., Capone, A. (2002) *Opening doors*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Comp.
- Gilbert, C. and Hart, M. (1990). *Towards Integration: special needs in an ordinary school*. London: Kogan
- Groma M. (2008) Teoretické východiská pre kariérové poradenstvo v podmienkách sluchového postihnutia. [In:] L. Krocanova, M. Zubová (Eds.) *Špeciálnopedagogické poradenstvo*. Bratislava: MPC, pp. 16–20.
- Jesenský, J. (1998) *Integrace – znamení doby*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Jesenský, J. (1995) *Kontrapunktů integrace zdravotně postižených*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Kocourová M. a kol. (2002) *Speciální pedagogika pro pomáhající profese*. Plzeň: ZČU.
- Lambe, J. (2007) Northern Ireland students teachers' changing attitudes towards inclusive education during initial teacher training. *International Journal of Special Education*, 22, 1, 59–71.
- Loreman, T., Earle, Ch., Sharma, U., Forlin, Ch. 2006. Pre-service Teachers' Attitudes, Concerns and Sentiments about Inclusive Education: an International comparison of the novice pre-service teachers. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21, 2, 80–93.
- Loreman, T., Earle, Ch., Sharma, U., Forlin, Ch. (2007) The Development of an Instrument for Measuring Pre-service Teachers' Sentiments, Attitudes, and Concerns about Inclusive Education. *International Journal of Special Education*, 22, 2, 150–160.
- Meijer, J.W. Ed. (2001) *Inclusive Education and Effective Classroom Practices*. Odsense: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- Milovanovitch, M. (2009) *Teacher Education for Diversity*. ERI SEE Zagreb.
- Pospíšil, J. (2007) Etická paradigmatá a současná výchova. [In:] *Výchova, škola, společnost – minulost' a současnost'*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, pp. 211–215.
- Potměšil, M. (2007) *Sebereflexe a sluchové postižení*. Praha: UK Praha, Karolinum.

- Průcha, J., Walterová, E., Mareš, J. (1998) *Pedagogický slovník*. 2. vydání. Praha: Portál.
- Průcha, J. (2002) *Moderní pedagogika*. 2. přepracované vydání. Praha: Portál.
- Valeo, A. (2008) Inclusive education support systems teacher and administrator view. *International Journal of Special Education*, 23, 2, 8–16.
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Normalisation_\(people_with_disabilities\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Normalisation_(people_with_disabilities)) [20.4.2009]
- The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality, Salamanca, Spain, 7–10 June 1994, United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Ministry of Education and Science Spain
- School law – Act No. 61/2004 Coll., dated 24th September 2004 of pre-school, primary, secondary, college and other education (School law) as amended (the latest amendment No. 49/2009 Coll., dated 28th January 2009)
- Methodological guideline for integration of handicapped children and pupils into schools and school facilities in the course of the school year 1997/1998, MŠMT ČR (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports), ref. No. 18996/97–22.
- Directive No. 73/2005 Coll., dated 9th February 2005 of education for children, pupils and students with special educational needs and for children, pupils and students of prodigious talent, as amended by a regulation No. 62/2005. Dated 19th March 2007.

Annex 1

Items of the questionnaire were selected and sequenced in the following way:

ATTITUDES AND CONCERNS OF EDUCATORS TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

1. I work in teaching:
 - Pre-schools Primary schools Secondary schools spec. needs education
 - others (state)
2. male female
3. Age: below 29 30–39 above 40
4. My highest completed education is: secondary school Bc. Mgr. PhD
5. I have regular and frequent exposure to disabled children: yes no
6. I have completed professional preparation for work with people with an intellectual disability:
 - 0 which I perceive as very insufficient sufficient (at least 40 hours of the course)
7. My awareness of the respective legislation and organization of education for people with an intellectual disability is:
 - very good good average insufficient none
8. Perception of certainty when educating people with an intellectual disability:
 - very good good average low rather uncertain
9. I find my experience in education of people with an intellectual disability:
 - insufficient scarce but still sufficient sufficient (30 days, at least)

The table included the following statements, informants were asked to express their evaluation of the statement from strong consent to strong disagreement:

1. I don't mind the company of people with an intellectual disability
2. I'm apprehensive about direct contact with people with an intellectual disability
3. Pupils and students with problems in the field of communication through spoken language can be placed in classrooms of standard schools
4. Pupils and students requiring the presence of an assistant can be placed in classrooms of standard schools
5. Pupils and students with signs of aggressive behaviour belong in classrooms of standard schools
6. Pupils and students who require an individualized educational plan belong in classrooms of standard schools
7. Pupils and students who require special communication techniques (Braille, sign language) for their education belong in classrooms of standard schools
8. Pupils and students with attention deficits belong in classrooms of standard schools
9. Pupils and students who systematically fall behind with their school results belong in classrooms of standard schools
10. I'm convinced that the presence of a disabled pupil or student shall significantly increase my work load
11. I'm not convinced of the quality and effectiveness of support, which is provided when educating integrated disabled pupils and students on the part of professional workplaces
12. I'm not convinced that my preparation for working with disabled pupils and students is sufficient for achieving the required results
13. I'm convinced of the fact that on my part it is not possible to pay necessary attention to an integrated pupil or student
14. I'm apprehensive that disabled pupils or students shall not be well accepted in a classroom of intact contemporaries
15. I regard the presence of a disabled pupil or student in a classroom as a great source of psychical load for myself.

The sentiments, attitudes and concerns of educators when working under the conditions of inclusion

Abstract

This research is part of the international research project SACIE (Sentiments, Attitudes & Concerns about Inclusive Education). The international research team is formed of Dr. Ch. Forlin – Institute of Education Hong Kong, dr. T. Loreman and Dr. Ch. Earle – Concordia University College of Alberta, Canada, Dr. U. Sharma, Monash University, Victoria, Australia, and the author of this article.

The research was focused on the field of sentiments, attitudes and concerns of educators when working with people with intellectual disabilities. This study aimed at discovering whether the above stated parameters change after qualification was achieved in special education. The results of research, encompassing a period of three years, aimed at describing a group of 794 educators from a developmental perspective of their attitudes, opinions and concerns focused on the process of inclusion.

The research was divided into two phases – the 1st phase before commencement of the university (Bachelor's) specialized study of special needs education, and the 2nd phase conducted a month before termination of this three-year study programme.

Uczucia, postawy i obawy nauczycieli pracujących w warunkach inkluzji

Streszczenie

Prezentowane badania są częścią międzynarodowego projektu badawczego SACIE (Uczucia, postawy i obawy dotyczące edukacji włączającej). Międzynarodowy zespół badawczy tworzą: dr Ch. Forlin z Instytutu Edukacji w Hongkongu, dr T. Loreman i dr Ch. Earle z Concordia University College of Alberta w Kanadzie, dr U. Sharma z Monash University, Victoria, z Australii oraz autor tego artykułu.

Badania dotyczą uczuć, postaw i obaw nauczycieli pracujących z osobami z niepełnosprawnością intelektualną. Badania mają na celu określenie, w jaki sposób wyżej wymienione parametry zmieniają się po uzyskaniu przez nauczycieli kwalifikacji w zakresie pedagogiki specjalnej. Wyniki badań realizowanych w ciągu trzech lat w grupie 794 nauczycieli uwzględniły rozwojową perspektywę zmiany postaw, opinii i uczuć nauczycieli w związku z procesem integracji szkolnej. Badania zostały podzielone na dwa etapy – pierwszy przed rozpoczęciem (licencjackich) uniwersyteckich studiów specjalistycznych w zakresie pedagogiki specjalnej, a drugi na miesiąc przed zakończeniem trzyletniego programu studiów licencjackich. Artykuł przedstawia zaobserwowane zmiany.

Adress for correspondance:

Miloň Potměšil

Institute of Special Education, Faculty of Education

Palacký University, Olomouc

Zizkovo nam. 5, 771 40 Olomouc, Czech Republic

mvpotmesil@gmail.com