

Attitudes of teachers towards the inclusion of students with disabilities

Vedrana Šušvar, Ivana Babić, Edin Mujkanović

Abstract:

The Croatian education system encourages the inclusion of students with disabilities into the standard school system. However, the most important role in the success of these students is played by the teachers. Since the term disabilities includes congenital and acquired impairments it is extremely difficult for teachers to successfully conduct the inclusion because they are often not trained enough to work with students with disabilities. Therefore, the main tasks of this research were to determine how often teachers encounter students with disabilities, to evaluate the teachers' varying degrees of satisfaction with working conditions and to determine the relevance of the different responses given by teachers based on their gender, school location, work experience, whether they are form or single-subject teachers, professional qualification and the number of students with disabilities in their classes. 109 teachers in four elementary schools in Split-Dalmatia County took part in this research: 45 form teachers and 65 single-subject teachers. The results show that both form teachers and single-subject teachers often encounter students with disabilities in their classrooms. Although all teachers support the inclusion of students with disabilities, form teachers show a greater satisfaction with the available working conditions allocated them when working with students with disabilities. Variables of teachers' gender, working experience, professional qualifications and the number of students with disabilities in class do not affect the level of satisfaction when working with students with disabilities. This paper can serve as a catalyst for future research as the determining predictor in the successful implementation of inclusion as a modern teaching practice.

Keywords: form teachers, single-subject teachers, inclusive educational practice, regular class

1 INTRODUCTION

Every child has the right to education under equal conditions, corresponding with their psychophysical abilities. Democratic School, whose task is, among other things, to make the school a place in which all students will feel happy and accepted, advocates the inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular education system so as to ensure everyone receives equal social opportunities (Guidelines for Inclusion, 2005). Students with disabilities are those who have been established a certain degree and type of a psycho-physical developmental disability, such as: visual impairments, hearing impairments, speech impediments and specific learning disorders, intellectual disabilities, behavioural and mental health issues, and those who have been diagnosed with multiple types of psycho-physical developmental disabilities, who are included into regular or special needs schools, and who are taught in a regular, individualized, or a special program (Regulation on Primary and Secondary Education of Students with Developmental Disabilities, 2015).

Providing educational possibilities for such students within the regular education system opens up the possibility for more successful impact on their psycho-physical development and social components. Precisely because of the above mentioned regulations, there are more and more students with disabilities in the regular system rather than in special education institutions. Although the physical presence of students with disabilities in regular classes complies with the principle of the availability of

education, in accordance with the right to education –in addition to availability – the principle of quality education must also be met (Tomaševski, 2006). Therefore, according to Dmitrović (2011), every child has the right to be accepted, to spend time and learn with their peers. It is extremely important that we direct the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular schools towards social acceptance. There is a large number of children with less severe disabilities who regularly attend classes with other students. It is the duty of the professional and pedagogical service (pedagogues and psychologists) as well as the teachers to develop a special and adapted curriculum and evaluation system for each of them. Students with disabilities make a very heterogeneous group; among them there are numerous differences with regard to the type and degree of the disability, as well as the effects of the disability and social environment on various aspects of social interactions (Žic Ralić & Ljubas, 2013). Regular primary education is more than ever available to most students with disabilities, so today only a small number is educated in special institution. So as to make a valuable contribution to the successful inclusion of these students, at the very beginning of their education in regular classes, a proper pedagogical intervention into the work of teachers who work with students having some form of disability is necessary. Good inclusion does not mean providing only technical conditions, but also an educational approach with the teaching content adapted to the appropriate individual needs and potentials of the students with disabilities. The inclusion in regular schools is based on the fact that the work and behavior of students with disabilities is primarily assessed based on their similarities with peers, and only

then taking their differences into consideration (Kiš-Glavaš, Fulgosi-Masnjak, 2002). Furthermore, in this process, schools should enable teaching processes, tools, and resources to provide equal opportunities for all students (Bouillet, 2010).

Teachers' attitudes and their professional desire to work with students are imperative for a quality inclusion. It is considered that the positive attitudes of form and single-subject teachers, as well as their values regarding teaching in accordance with the individual needs of students with disabilities, are a main guarantee for the implementation of inclusion. They are an important pedagogical driving force in the process of inclusion, both by their approach in work and by the proper detection of individual difficulties that are specific for each child and are manifested in their own particular way. In accordance with Karamatić-Brčić's (2012) assertion that teacher attitudes towards students with disabilities are not innate but taught, measures need to be taken to ensure that teachers and all associates who work with students with disabilities develop positive attitudes towards inclusion. In order to devise a strategy for strengthening of positive attitudes on inclusion, a number of studies on teacher attitudes have been carried out. These have shown that form and single-subject teachers do not have favourable attitudes towards educational inclusion of children with developmental disabilities (Dulčić & Bakota, 2008) and that there is a difference in the attitudes of elementary and secondary school teachers, where elementary school teachers, to a lesser extent, think that the students with developmental disabilities could have a poor influence on class success (Ljubić, Kiš-Glavaš, 2003).

Teachers are expected to effectively teach all students, regardless of their abilities, potentials, and interests, as well as to promote tolerance and social connectivity, to effectively respond to the needs of students with disabilities and keep up to date with new knowledge and approaches in teaching, learning, and evaluation (OECD, 2005).

In the Croatian education system, students with disabilities are recognized in regular classes, above all by teacher volition. They are involved compatibly, as per their needs and abilities, into the educational process, and teachers have an important role in ensuring they are happy, and that they go through the process of inclusion as successfully as possible. In elementary school, form teachers, and then subject teachers as well, are an important factor that can make inclusion a success for every student with disabilities. As direct creators of the educational process, teachers play the most important role in early discovery, and then in the adaptation period, creating positive collaborative relationships that are almost always a

precondition for a well-planned, methodically designed individual educational approach. For a teacher who encounters a student with a disability in their work, proper acceptance and understanding of the disability as something that makes this student different, rather than seeing it as a handicap, makes their whole work a lot easier. Early recognition and detection of developmental disabilities will protect the child from many frustrations that arise from unrealistic expectations of the community (Lugonja, 2014). A positive teacher-student interaction is helpful not only for the student, but also for the teacher who is faced with a demanding didactic and methodological process in which challenges in work and, finally, satisfaction with work are in correlation. Here it is important to emphasize that the student needs to be accepted as a value with all his or her individual characteristics as well as the diversity of their family, in which case kindergarten teachers, school teachers, and parents all need to be equal partners interested in students' well-being (Booth & Ainscow, 1998; Lorenz, 2002; Elmore, 2007). Therefore, the task of the teacher is, above all, to create preconditions in the classroom for the arrival of a new, by some characteristics different student, to prepare other students, to adapt the working conditions, place in the class, to create a positive classroom climate.

The main message of inclusive education is, as is emphasized by Zrilić (2012: 90), "that it does not segregate a single student, but that it provides adequate conditions for everyone." Therefore, the purpose of this paper was to find out how often the teachers encounter disabilities in students, and what kinds, and how contented they are in their work with students with some form of disability. Opinions are extremely important in the context of the school, work experience, professional qualifications and the number of students in the class, because all of the above contribute to activities in inclusive work. Research results, as per Cassady (2011), show that many teachers find themselves unable to work effectively with students with some form of disability and those with none at the same time. The above mentioned assertion has been confirmed by local research as well. Hence, according to Ivančić and Stančić (2013) it can be concluded that inclusion in Croatia seeks further strengthening of the process in the schools, as well as the development of a comprehensive, network and interpersonal support system that is in line with the needs of students with disabilities. The results of the research carried out by Kudek Mirošević and Jurčević Lozančić (2014) show that teachers find that students with disabilities make better progress in special educational programs within regular schools than when attending classes with peers with no disabilities, and believe that students in special educational institutions can get the necessary

attention and individualized procedures which they would not have been provided with in regular schools. The results of the research carried by Bouillet and Kudek Mirošević (2015) show that students with disabilities have a need for additional support in the educational process, as well as support for developing appropriate relationships with peers. The results show that students with disabilities do not achieve the expected level of socialization and academic success in regular classes, indicating that inclusive policy is still inadequately implemented into the educational practice. The results of the research by Kudek Mirošević

and Bukvić (2017) are very interesting; they suggest there is a difference in providing individualized educational support to students with disabilities between form teachers and single-subject teachers. The results show that form teachers (fourth grade of elementary school) show greater support than single-subject teachers (sixth and eighth grades), therefore it is important to detect factors which will influence the development of positive teacher attitudes on inclusion and improvement of the inclusive pedagogical practice.

2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Based on the results of the aforementioned studies, the objectives of this paper were: (1) to identify the attitudes of form and single-subject teachers in elementary schools towards inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular educational process, (2) to determine how often form and single-subject teachers encounter students with developmental disabilities, and (3) to determine whether they are contented with their work with students who have some form of disability.

Bearing in mind that the teachers are faced with a series of difficulties that accompany successful inclusion, and that the teacher role is important throughout the process, the following tasks and hypotheses were set:

Tasks

1. To determine how often teachers encounter students with any kind of disability.
2. To examine the level of teacher satisfaction with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities.
3. To investigate and determine the significance of differences between teacher attitudes regarding working conditions based on their gender, school location, work experience, type of the teacher, professional qualifications, and the number of students with disabilities in their class.

Hypotheses

H1: Teachers frequently encounter students with disabilities.

H2: Teachers are satisfied with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities.

H3: There is a statistically significant difference in teacher attitudes regarding the current conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities based on their gender, school location, work experience, type of the teacher, professional qualifications, and the number of students with disabilities in the class.

Sample

Research included 109 respondents from 4 elementary schools in Split-Dalmatia County: Elementary School Stjepan Ivičević (24.8%) and Elementary School Petar Perica from Makarska (22%), Elementary School Stjepan Radić from Imotski (47.7%) and Elementary School Zagvozd (5.5%). Out of the total number of respondents, there were 19 male teachers (17.4%) and 90 female teachers (82.6%). The research involved 45 (41.3%) form teachers and 64 (58.7%) single-subject teachers (Table 1).

Table 1. The number of teachers by gender, school location, type of teacher, and work experience

		Frequency (f)	Percentage %
Gender	Men	19	17.4
	Women	90	82.6
	Total	109	100.0
Location	ES Stjepan Ivičević, Makarska	27	24.8
	ES Father Petar Perica, Makarska	24	22.0
	ES Stjepan Radić, Imotski	52	47.7
	ES Zagvozd	6	5.5

	Total	109	100.0
Type of teacher	Form teachers	45	41.3
	Single-subject teachers	64	58.7
	Total	109	100.0
Work experience	Up to 10 years	40	36.7
	11 – 20 years	30	27.5
	21 – 30 years	25	22.9
	More than 30 years	14	12.8
	Total	109	100.0

Measuring instrument

For the purposes of this research, a measuring instrument was constructed –A Scale of Attitudes for the Assessment of Teacher Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities. The measuring instrument consists of two parts. The first part is made of a set of independent variables: gender, type of teacher, professional qualifications, work experience, and the number of students in the class (respondents chose one of the answers offered). The second part is composed of 10 items regarding satisfaction with the inclusion conditions for the students with disabilities with Likert-type response options from “1 – I am thoroughly dissatisfied” to “5 – I am thoroughly satisfied”. To determine reliability of the measuring instrument, metric characteristics of the items and the scale as a whole were analyzed by means of the standard Reliability test from the SPSS statistical package. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, as an indicator of internal homogeneity, for this scale is 0.783; we can say that the internal consistency of the scale is satisfactory, and that the scale has satisfactory validity.

Collection and processing of data

This research was conducted in April 2017. Upon receipt of the administrative consent from the principals of the targeted elementary schools, the questionnaires were, through the principals, distributed to form and single-class

teachers. Of 110 submitted questionnaires, 109 were valid. Participation in this research was voluntary, and anonymity was guaranteed. A descriptive analysis of the obtained data was used in the research. A chi-squared test, one-factor analysis of variance, and regression analysis were used to verify the set hypotheses. All data was processed through the Statistical Program for Social Sciences 17 (SPSS17).

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive indicators that demonstrate how frequently the teachers encounter students with different types of disabilities are shown in the Table 2. From the results, it can be seen that teachers are least likely to encounter deaf and partially deaf students ($M=1.60$), blind and other visually impaired students ($M=1.66$), and students with a pervasive developmental disorder (autism spectrum disorders) ($M=1.63$). Most frequently they encounter students with attention deficit and hyperactivity disorders ($M=3.36$). Further on this list are students with reduced intellectual abilities ($M=3.14$), as well as students with some of the specific learning disorders, such as dyslexia and dysgraphia ($M=3.06$). Nonetheless, as more and more teachers point out a large number of students with observed behavioural problems, the results show that teachers can successfully recognize students with attention deficit and hyperactivity disorders, and students with behavioural problems.

Table 2. Descriptive indicators demonstrating how frequently teachers encounter students with disabilities

How often have you, during your work at school, encountered students with:	Min	Max	Arithmetic mean (M)	Standard deviation (SD)
<i>Reduced intellectual abilities</i>	1	4	3.14	0.76
<i>Pervasive developmental disorder (autism spectrum disorder)</i>	1	4	1.63	0.77
<i>Attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder</i>	1	4	3.36	0.78
<i>Blind and other visually impaired children</i>	1	4	1.66	0.80
<i>Deaf and partially deaf children</i>	1	4	1.60	0.73
<i>Physical disability</i>	1	4	2.31	0.93
<i>Chronic diseases</i>	1	4	2.65	0.83
<i>Behavioural problems</i>	1	4	3.02	0.83
<i>Specific learning disorders (e.g. dyslexia, dysgraphia)</i>	1	4	3.06	0.91

The results shown in Table 2 show that more than 80% of respondents encounter students with disabilities every day or several times a week, while for only 16% of them this happens once a week or never, which confirms the first hypothesis (H1) about the high frequency of encountering students with disabilities in class. These results support the fact that a large number of children with disabilities are involved in the regular education system in Croatian schools.

According to the data from the Ministry of Science, Education, and Sports (MZOS) in the school year 2012/2013, 18816 students with disabilities were included into regular elementary schools, or 5.61% elementary school students. Out of the total number of included students with disabilities, 14909 of them (4.45%) are integrated into the regular classes, so a large number of form and single-subject teachers encounter these students every day (Table 3).

Table 3. Representation of the frequency of encountering students with developmental disabilities during the current school year

	Frequency	Percentage
Every day	56	51.4
Several times a week	35	32.1
Once a week	7	6.4
Never	11	10.1
Total	109	100.0

For the purpose of examining the level of teacher satisfaction with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities, one-factor analysis was used, and its results indicate that there is a statistically

significant difference between the respondents' attitudes relative to the location of the elementary school, gender, type of teacher, professional qualifications, work experience, and the total number of students in the class.

Table 4. Descriptive data on respondents' attitudes on the variables of satisfaction with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities

Elementary School	Number of respondents	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Standard error	95% acceptability of interval arith. mean	
					Lower limit	Upper limit
ES Stjepan Ivičević, Makarska	27	32.04	4.824	0.928	30.13	33.95
ES Father Petar Perica, Makarska	24	31.17	6.120	1.249	28.58	33.75
ES Stjepan Radić, Makarska	52	30.23	4.837	0.671	28.88	31.58
ES Zagvozd	6	30.83	1.941	0.792	28.80	32.87
Total	109	30.92	5.035	0.482	29.96	31.87

For a better overview of response frequency, the arithmetic mean of the obtained results was weighted, i.e.

the importance of each of the values was determined (Table 5).

Table 5. Representation of the weighted arithmetic mean

Response	Response frequency (f)	$x \cdot f$
1. I am completely dissatisfied	55	55
2. I am mostly dissatisfied	130	260
3. I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	283	849
4. I am mostly satisfied	359	1436
5. I am completely satisfied	154	770
Σ	981	3370

The weighted arithmetic mean of the responses regarding the level of satisfaction with conditions under which teachers are working with students with disabilities equals 3.44, which shows that the respondents do not have clearly defined attitudes, because their answers were, based on the value of the weighted arithmetic mean, mostly "I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied". To check the distribution of teacher satisfaction with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities, the chi-squared test was used. The value of chi-squared is 58.119 with 4 degrees of freedom, which means that there is a statistically significant deviation in the obtained results compared to the expectation that the teachers are satisfied with conditions under which they are working with children with disabilities. The aforementioned results support the

rejection of the hypothesis H2 "Teachers are satisfied with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities".

In Table 6, one-factor analysis of variance is presented, showing the sum of squared deviations in the results from their mean value, degrees of freedom, arithmetic mean of the squared deviations, the F-ratio, and the value of significance. Based on the obtained results, there is no statistical significance between the teachers in relation to the school they are coming from at the level of $p < 0.05$. The value obtained by variance analysis is $F = 0.783$ at the significance level of 0.506 (Table 6).

Table 6. *One-factor analysis of the variance of respondents' satisfaction with working conditions*

		Sum of squared deviations	Degree of freedom	Arithm. mean of squared deviations	F	Significance
Elementary school	Between the groups	59.89	3	19.97	0.783	0.506
	Within a group	2678.36	105	25.51		
	Total	2738.26	108			

For the purpose of examining the statistically significant difference between the respondents' answers with respect to their gender, type of teacher, professional

qualifications, work experience, and the total number of students in the class, one-factor analysis of variance, ANOVA, was applied.

Table 7. *One-factor analysis of variance with respect to gender*

		Sum of squared deviations	Degree of freedom	Arithm. mean of squared deviations	F	Significance
Gender	Between the groups	9.850	1	9.850	0.386	0.536
	Within a group	2728.406	107	25.499		
	Total	2738.257	108			

Based on the obtained results, there is no statistically significant difference in the responses of male and female subjects at the level $p < 0.05$.

Table 8. *One-factor analysis of variance with respect to the type of teacher*

		Sum of squared deviations	Degree of freedom	Arithm. mean of squared deviations	F	Significance
Type of teacher	Between the groups	168.457	1	168.457	7.014	0.009
	Within a group	2569.800	107	24.017		
	Total	2738.257	108			

According to the results shown in Table 8, there is a statistically significant difference between the respondents in relation to whether they are form or single-subject teachers, at the level of $p < 0.05$: $F = 7.014$ with $p = 0.009$ (Table 8). Based on the arithmetic mean value analysis of the subsamples, it can be seen that form teachers show much greater satisfaction with current conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities. The arithmetic mean for form teachers is 32.40, whereas the arithmetic mean for single-subject teachers is 30.92. This is partly due to the fact that form teachers encounter students

with disabilities daily and almost in each class. Single-subject teachers encounter children with developmental disabilities only in one of the classes they teach (e.g. a Croatian language teacher only in Croatian language class, once a day, every working day, or a math teacher once a day four times a week, while an English or IT teacher encounters them only twice a week in one class).

Based on the obtained results, and for the purpose of determining the difference in teachers responses with regard to their professional qualifications, no statistical significance between the respondents was established ($p < 0.05$: $F = 0.075$ with $p = 0.785$) (Table 9).

Table 9. *One-factor analysis of variance with respect to professional qualifications*

		Sum of squared deviations	Degree of freedom	Arithm. mean of squared deviations	F	Significance
PQ	Between the groups	1.910	1	1.910	0.075	0.785
	Within a group	2736.346	107	25.573		
	Total	2738.257	108			

There was also no statistically significant difference in the teachers' responses in relation to their work experience ($p < 0.05$: $F = 1.242$ with $p = 0.298$) (Table 10).

Table 10. One-factor analysis of variance with respect to work experience

		Sum of squared deviations	Degree of freedom	Arithm. mean of squared deviations	F	Significance
Work experience	Between the groups	93.818	3	31.273	1.242	0.298
	Within a group	2644.439	105	25.185		
	Total	2738.257	108			

As with the analysis of data related to teachers' work experience, no statistically significant difference between the teachers in relation to the total number of students in the class was found, at $p < 0.05$: $F = 1.887$ with $p = 0.157$ (Table 11).

Table 11. One-factor analysis of variance with respect to the total number of students in the class

		Sum of squared deviations	Degree of freedom	Arithm. mean of squared deviations	F	Significance
Total number of students	Between the groups	94.128	2	47.064	1.887	0.157
	Within a group	2644.129	106	24.945		
	Total	2738.257	108			

A regression analysis was used to ascertain the predictors for determining the level of satisfaction with conditions under which teachers are working with students with disabilities. The results of the regression analysis point

to a small correlation coefficient, $R^2 = 0.104$, the level of satisfaction with working conditions and the predictor system (Table 12).

Table 12. Results of regression analysis of the level of satisfaction with conditions under which teachers are working with students with disabilities

R	R^2	Corrected R^2	Standard error of the estimate
0.323	0.104	0.051	4.904

According to the standardized and non-standardized coefficients in the questionnaire for teachers, the greatest contribution to the model of prediction is the

predictor type of teacher (form or single-subject teacher) at the significance level of $p = 0.015$, and then the predictor school location (Table 13).

Table 13. Standardized and non-standardized coefficients for variables of satisfaction with working conditions

	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance
	B	Standard error	Beta		
(Constant)	38.559	4.900		7.868	0.000
Elementary school	-1.091	0.535	-0.198	-2.039	0.044
Respondent's gender	-0.280	1.298	-0.021	-0.215	0.830
Type of teacher	-3.125	1.124	-0.307	-2.779	0.006
Professional qualifications	0.934	1.346	0.080	0.694	0.489
Work experience	-0.012	0.520	-0.003	-0.024	0.981
Total number of students in the class	-0.474	0.816	-0.057	-0.580	0.563

In order to establish the existence of statistically significant differences in the level of respondents' satisfaction with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities in relation to the school location, type of teacher, professional qualifications, work experience, and the total number of students in the class, regression analysis was applied. Before the use of the regression analysis, quantification of categorical variable was performed so that the quantifications reflect the characteristics of the original categories. (dummycoding).

The results show that gender, professional qualifications, work experience, and the total number of students in the class do not affect the satisfaction with conditions under which teachers are working with students with disabilities, while the predictor *school location* and *type of teacher* (form and single-subject teacher) showed a statistically significant influence, and thus the hypothesis H3 can be partially accepted in the part regarding the existence of statistically significant difference in the predictors *school location* and *type of teacher*. The results of the regression analysis indicate there is a small correlation coefficient, $R^2=0.097$, between the satisfaction with working conditions and the predictor system.

4 CONCLUSION

This research has shown that both form and single-subject teachers in elementary schools where the research was conducted mostly agree and support the inclusion of students with disabilities into regular educational institutions, which is in line with previous studies carried out in Croatia (Ivančić & Stančić, 2013; Kudek Mirošević & Jurčević Lozančić, 2014; Bouillet & Kudek Mirošević, 2015; Kudek Mirošević & Bukvić, 2017) that show that teachers' attitudes about the inclusion of children with disabilities are relatively positive and that teachers are aware of the

benefits of including students with disabilities into the regular elementary schools (Kiš-Glavaš, 1999).

Despite the positive attitudes about accepting students with disabilities, it is interesting to note that the results of this research reveal somewhat indifferent views of both types of teachers when it comes to the satisfaction with work with such students. Most of the teachers emphasize that they are "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" with conditions under which they are working with students with disabilities. Their answer opens up a series of questions about material and technical conditions as well as didactic and methodological materials that the teachers create mostly independently, primarily by developing custom-tailored programs for each individual student. Memipević and Hodžić (2011) consider that while teachers can support inclusion by more than 50%, they may also experience a sense of inadequate competency for teaching those students since they lack support and additional resources for the implementation of inclusion, which results in skepticism in the respondents' answers. Cassady (2011) believes that the lack of experience and overall skepticism among teachers bring additional tension and stress.

In order to achieve successful inclusion both on the social and educational levels, it is necessary to provide many satisfying objective, subjective, and material assumptions. The results show that form teachers show greater satisfaction with current working conditions for working with students with disabilities. This is partly, in addition to the already mentioned, as well as the empathy which form teachers show generally more in their work, not only with students with disabilities, but also with the other students. As they are starting school, children get close with their teachers, the school becomes their second home, and the form teacher becomes a person who takes a special place in the child's heart. When students with disabilities are recognized in such relationships, and when they are being included in the regular school system, teachers taking a significant place in this process, then it is

very important to find out what their opinions and answers are. By advancing into higher grades, students mature, grow up, and because they now deal with single-subject teachers, who alternate in the educational process on a daily basis, the difference in the type of teacher when it comes to expressing their attitudes has to be taken into account. Gender of the teacher, their work experience, professional qualifications, and the number of students in the class do not affect the satisfaction of working with students with developmental disabilities. The results of this research undoubtedly point to the particular importance of

teacher attitudes when it comes to the inclusion of students with learning disorders. Successful inclusion is not possible if the teachers, as important factors of the overall integration leading to the inclusive educational work for students with disabilities, do not actively contribute to this process. The results of this research are only a small contribution to the science that can serve as an incentive for more extensive research which would identify predictors of the success of inclusion and present concrete suggestions for the process of modernizing the inclusive pedagogical practice.

REFERENCES

[1] Booth, T., Ainscow, M. (1998): From them to us: an international study of inclusion in education. London: Routledge Falmer.

[2] Bouillet, D. (2010): Izazovi integriranog odgoja i obrazovanja. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

[3] Bouillet, D., Kudek Mirošević, J. (2015): Students with Disabilities and Challenges in Educational Practice. Croatian Journal of Education, 17 (2), Sp.Ed., 11–26.

[4] Cassady, J. (2011): Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Inclusion of Students with Autism and Emotional Behavioral Disorder. Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education, 2 (7).

[5] Dmitrović, P. (2011): Preduvjeti za primjenu inkluzije. Metodčki obzori, 6 (13), 69–82.

[6] Dulčić, A., Bakota, K. (2008): Stavovi učitelja povijesti redovnih osnovnih škola prema integriranim učenicima oštećena sluha i učenicima s poremećajima govorne jezične komunikacije te specifičnim teškoćama u učenju. Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja, 44 (2), 31–50.

[7] Elmore, R. F. (2007): School Reform from the Inside Out. Cambridge MA: Harvard Education Press.

[6] Glasser, W. (1994): Kvalitetna škola. Zagreb: Educa.

[9] Ivančić, Đ., Stančić, Z. (2013): Stvaranje inkluzivne kulture škole. Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja, 49 (2), 139–157.

[10] Jensen, E. (2004): Različiti mozgovi, različiti učenici: kako doprijeti do onih do kojih se teško dopire. Zagreb: Educa.

[11] Kiš-Glavaš, L. (1999): Promjena stavova učitelja prema integraciji djece usporenog kognitivnog razvoja. Doktorska disertacija. Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

[12] Kiš-Glavaš, L. & Fulgosi-Masnjak, R. (ed) (2002): Do prihvaćanja zajedno: Integracija djece sposebnim potrebama, Priručnik za učitelje. Zagreb: Hrvatska udruga za stručnu pomoć djeci s posebnim potrebama IDEM.

[13] Kudek Mirošević, J., Bukvić, Z. (2017): Differences in the provision of individualised educational support to students indifferent grades. Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja, 53 (Supplement), 265–277.

[14] Kudek Mirošević, J., Jurčević, Lozančić, A. (2014): Stavovi odgojitelja i učitelja o provedbi inkluzije u predškolskim ustanovama i osnovnim školama. Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja, 50 (2), 17–29.

[15] Lorenz, S. (2002): First steps in Inclusion. London: David Futton Publishers.

[16] Lugonja, M., (2014): Osnove defektologije. Mostar: FPMOZ.

[17] Ljubić, M., Kiš-Glavaš, L. (2003): Razlike u stavovima nastavnika osnovnih i srednjih škola prema edukacijskoj integraciji. Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja, 39 (2), 129–136.

[18] Memisevic, H., & Hodzic, S. (2011): Teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of students with intellectual disability in Bosnia and Herzegovina. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15(7), 699–710.

[19] OECD. (2005): Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers. Education And Training. Vol. 31. 20th November 2017. http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/letolt/nemzet/oecd_publication_teachers_matter_english_061116.pdf.

[20] Pravilnik o osnovnoškolskom i srednjoškolskom odgoju i obrazovanju učenika s teškoćama u razvoju: Narodne novine, no. 24/2015.

[21] Stančić, V. et al. (1982): Odgojno-obrazovna integracija djece s teškoćama u razvoju. Teorijski problemi i istraživanja – Izvještaj br. 1. Zagreb: Fakultet za defektologiju Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

[22] Tomaševski, K. (2006): Human rights obligations in education: The 4-A Scheme. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers. 1st December 2017. http://hrčak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=106628 (2017)

[23] UNESCO (2005): Guidelines for Inclusion; Ensuring Access to education for All, Paris. 20th November 2017
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001402/140224e.pdf>

[24] Zrilić, S. (2012): Uloga pedagoga u integriranom odgoju i obrazovanju. *Magistra Iadertina*, 7(7), 89–99.

[25] Žic Ralić, A., Ljubas, M. (2013): Prihvaćenost i prijateljstvo djece i mladih s teškoćama u razvoju. *Društvena istraživanja*, 22 (3), 435–453.

IJSER