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Abstract

In a time when education and inclusion, are very much on the political agenda, what makes some teachers confident and competent teachers of special educational needs (SEN) and others less so?

This thesis aimed to explore a variety of factors; attitude to inclusion; school climate; burnout and general teaching self-efficacy as they relate to self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. It also aimed to explore the teaching practices of teachers who report high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores.

66 participants, selected from seven primary schools took part in the first phase of the research. From this sample, five participants were selected for their high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores and were interviewed about their inclusive teaching practice.

A mixed methods approach was used; utilising questionnaires in the first phase to explore the six factors and the correlations between them. Interviews were employed in the second phase to explore the inclusive practices of participants.

Initial statistical analysis from the questionnaires indicated that years teaching experience, as well as aspects of attitude to inclusion, school climate, burnout and general teaching efficacy are predictive of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores. Regression analysis indicated that attitude to inclusion; school climate and general teaching self-efficacy were together the best predictors of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

Thematic analysis from the interviews suggested that stress was a major factor for the participants. It also identified that participants who were good at including children with SEN were those who got to know their children well, and who were engaged, motivated members of staff.

The study concluded with a consideration of how the above results are relevant to educational psychologists by suggesting that their role is vital in supporting teachers to get to know children holistically and in supporting staff with stress management through supervision or staff clinics.
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The following table shows the abbreviations used through this thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Educational Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCo</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEdPsych</td>
<td>Doctorate in Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs and Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>Trainee Educational Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>School Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA+</td>
<td>School Action Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHCP</td>
<td>Education, Health and Care Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Free School Meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT</td>
<td>Senior Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>Department for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>British Psychological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPC</td>
<td>Health and Care Professions Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT</td>
<td>Speech and Language Therapist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Table of Definitions
Chapter 1 – Introduction

1.1 Thesis Overview

This research has its basis in the new Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Code of Practice (2014) which reiterates the role of the class teacher in teaching and including children with SEN and considers the inclusion debate which has lodged itself as a key topic in education and has been debated many times to no conclusion. The inclusion debate has its roots in the signing of the Salamanca Statement (1994) by the United Nations (UN), a little over 20 years ago. This statement called for all children, regardless of their need, to be educated in mainstream school.

The research aims to cast a light on the teaching practices of teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs in including and supporting children with SEN. The final discussion will consider the implications of this research for the role of the Educational Psychologist (EP).

This research has been conducted in two phases. The first phase aims to investigate self-efficacy beliefs of teachers in terms of their inclusive teaching of children with Special Educational Needs (SEN). This phase considers a number of factors to assess the impact of school climate, attitude to inclusion and burnout on self-efficacy scores. This research draws on Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012) who developed a measure of teacher self-efficacy for inclusion.

The second phase investigates the perspectives of teachers identified in phase one as having high self-efficacy for inclusion scores through semi-structured interviews. This phase aimed to understand their teaching practice.
A mixed methods approach is taken in this research with each phase taking a distinct methodological difference. Quantitative data are collected via questionnaires in the first phase and qualitative data through semi-structured interviews in the second phase. The data from the first phase of this research is analysed using correlational analysis to ascertain whether any of the additional factors are predictive of self-efficacy for inclusion. The data are then further analysed to identify the participants with the highest self-efficacy for inclusion scores for the second phase of the research.

The participants for the second phase of the research were identified from the results of the first phase. In total five participants were interviewed during the second phase with the aim of investigating what teachers who hold high self-efficacy beliefs around teaching and including children with SEN believe are important to their practice. This stage is therefore a more thorough and in-depth exploration of the views, pedagogy, and teaching ethos of each individual participant. The interview data are collected and analysed using thematic analysis.

The thesis is organised across 10 chapters so as to make clear the distinction between phase one and phase two of the research. Both phases include their own discussion, with a wider, overall discussion found at the end of the research.

1.2 Research Context

The 2014 SEND code of practice states that “Teachers are responsible and accountable for the progress and development of the pupils in their class…High quality teaching, differentiated for individual pupils, is the first step in responding to pupils who have or may have SEN.”
These two statements make it clear that the responsibility for the teaching of children with SEN lies with the class teacher. Since the signing of the Salamanca Statement in 1994, the identified 20% (Warnock, 1978) of children who may exhibit some form of SEN in the UK’s schools have become more present in the mainstream classroom. The necessary implication of this is that teachers of one age cohort of children may be catering for very diverse learning abilities within the same class.

1.2.1 Personal Context

Whilst designing this research my own personal experiences very much come into play. From the ages of four to 18, I attended primary school and secondary school in the 1990s through to the early 2000s. For these 14 years there were no easily identifiable children with SEN, in hindsight, in any of my classes. Towards the end of secondary school I began to be aware of young people with developing mental health difficulties, but I was unaware of the impact of these difficulties on their learning and progress. Certainly I was not aware of the role of the educational psychologist until I started my Psychology 'A' Level in the final two years of my school career.

Since finishing university, over the last half decade or so, 2010 to 2016, I have experience of working within three primary schools each of which employed more teaching assistants than teachers. I also draw on my experience of a multitude of primary and secondary schools throughout the UK in my current role as Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) from 2013-2016.

It is my experience working in primary schools that has particularly sparked an interest in the difference between teachers in the way they teach and include children with SEN. I can recall numerous occasions where teachers would go out of their way to ensure a child with additional needs was included in their
class and teachers who would ensure they fully understood the needs of all the children in their class. However, I am also aware of the sense of responsibility I felt as a SEN teaching assistant for the children I supported, because this responsibility was not taken on by the teacher. In addition, I can recall members of staff who were less inclusive in their views and attitudes. These experiences raised questions as to what skills the teachers who were better able to include children with SEN in their class had and used.

Working across three primary schools during these last six years has meant I have been involved in a number of hand-overs and discussions when children moved from one year group to the next. One of the things that stood out to me throughout these discussions was the seeming implicit understanding from SENCos that there were some teachers who would be better placed to have certain children with SEN in their class. This, in addition to my experiences of teachers, added to my curiosity about how different teachers viewed the scope of their role.

1.3 Overall aims

1. To explore if any factors (attitude to inclusion; school climate; burnout and self-efficacy for general teaching) influence or predict self-efficacy for inclusive teaching?

2. To explore to what extent self-efficacy for inclusive teaching is distinct from self-efficacy for general teaching.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

2.1 Overview

This literature review will critically discuss the literature as it relates to special educational needs (SEN) and inclusion, self-efficacy in teachers, school climate and teacher resilience.

The review will first give an overview of SEN and inclusion over the last hundred years with an in-depth assessment of the relevant legislation and acts that have gone before the SEN Code of Practice of 2014. It will then move on to examine inclusion and the debates and dilemmas which have been prominent in the literature in recent years. The review will also look at the implication of self-efficacy for inclusion.

The review will then move on to evaluate the literature on self-efficacy in greater detail as well as considering about how self-efficacy specifically relates to teachers and inclusive practice. Consideration will be given to the measurement of teacher self-efficacy for general teaching practice and teacher self-efficacy for specifically for inclusive practice here too.

The literature review will then critically consider demographic factors, school climate and teacher resilience and burnout, a measure of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and personal accomplishments, and how these specifically relate to teacher self-efficacy both in general and specifically for inclusive practice. The demographic factors will include age and gender, experience and qualifications, current teaching status and attitudes towards inclusion.
The layout of this literature review can be seen below:

2.2 Special Educational Need (SEN)

2.2.1 Inclusion

2.3 Self-efficacy

2.3.1 What is teacher self-efficacy?

2.3.1.1 Measuring self-efficacy in teachers

2.3.1.2 Measure teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practice

2.4 Demographic factors

2.5 School climate

2.6 Teacher resilience and burnout

In searching the literature base for this review I have used the following key words:
Special Educational Needs, inclusion, self-efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, inclusive teaching, inclusive practice, school climate, teacher resilience, teacher burnout.

I searched online databases including EBSCO E-Journals, Education Research Complete, ERIC and PsychARTICLES through the University of Exeter electronic library.

I also followed citation links in key review papers and searched for papers by frequently cited authors. There are also references to key education acts, legislation and books.
2.2 Special Educational Need (SEN)

Throughout the 20th century a number of important acts and reports were published in the UK relating to inclusive education. The 1944 Education Act made education for all available until the age of 15. It also introduced the concept of the 11+. This was recognition of differences between the academic elite, those with technical or artistic ability and the secondary modern accessible by the majority of children over the age of 11. For the first time children with SEN were ‘permitted’ in mainstream schools but special schools were still seen as the most appropriate placements.

The Plowden Report (1967) was published against a backdrop of pressures surrounding the 11 plus. The report was heavily based on Piagetian theories and emphasised learning by play and curriculum flexibility. The report was influential and paved the way for a reduction in streaming in schools in the UK. In 1970, the Education (Handicapped) Act made provision for handicapped children to be educated within the general education system. Previously, education provision for disabled children, including those were physically disabled or had learning difficulties, had been the responsibility of the health services. This act transferred responsibility for their education from the mental health services to the education authorities.

Shortly after this the conservative government at the time appointed a committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people. This was headed by Mary Warnock and formed the Warnock Report (1978). Warnock laid the foundations for the Statement of SEN. She found that around 20% of children have SEN and described them as children with learning difficulties. She reported that there should be a common educational goal for all
children and young people of independence, enjoyment and understanding, and that an inclusive education system was needed.

In 1994, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) arranged the World Conference on Special Needs Education. This was attended by 92 governments and 25 international organisations. It agreed a new declaration for special needs education which argued that all children have the right to education and that inclusion should be the norm for those children who require special educational provision. This Salamanca Statement was an important turning point as it created the ‘Framework for Action’ (UNESCO, 1994) which guided schools on the accommodation of all pupils regardless of need.

2.2.1 Inclusion

The political background of the 20th century described above fed into the early 21st century ideas of inclusion and integration. Norwich (2013) discusses the differences between inclusion and integration: inclusion, he suggests, means “all children under the same roof”, whereas integration means “including all children in the common educational enterprise of learning, wherever they learn best” (Warnock 2005). This highlights the distinction between the concepts of inclusion and integration whereby children with SEN can be physically present in a mainstream school but not included (integration) or in a physically different setting (e.g. a special school) but where they are fully included. Norwich (2013) suggests that a “terminological switch” is likely to have happened because of the opposition between the social model and the medical model. Advocates of the social model, and therefore of inclusion rather than integration, are more likely to be pushing for social, or organisational, change.
Thinking about the two main models of disability: the social model and the medical model have often been considered as dichotomous (Booth and Ainscow, 2011). With regard to SEN, the medical model implies a within child deficit whereas the social model implies that there is a lack of flexibility within society to adapt and change to remove any barriers to participation. Norwich (2013) argues that this is too simplistic a way of thinking about the medical and social models. Rather than a dichotomy it may be more useful to think of the two models in a more integrative way. Ravet (2011) proposes a needs-based perspective. This perspective takes aspects of the medical model such as labelling and aspects of the social model such as inclusive pedagogies and sees them as complementary in allowing a needs-based analysis of the individual child to be reached. However Ravet (2011) looked at this in terms of autism and there may be more complex dichotomies at play within different disabilities.

Norwich (2013) discusses the idea that the term “special educational needs was introduced as abandoning medical categories in favour of a focus on individual educational needs that applied to a wider group than those found in special schools.” However Tomlinson (1985) had already argued that the term SEN had become “an ideological rationalisation for those who have power to shape and define the expanding special education system and have a vested interest in this expansion.” In other words by expanding what is meant by SEN, more children can be seen to have SEN. The more children incorporated into this definition mean more stakeholders and bigger implications as the definition evolves.
Tomlinson (1985), along with Warnock, (1978) created a “switch in focus from the child’s needs to the school’s need for reform and change” (Norwich, 2013). This can be seen in Dyson’s (1990) quote:

“Special needs are not the needs that arise in a child with disabilities with regard to a system that is fixed. Rather they are the needs that arise between the child and the education system as a whole when the system fails to adapt to the characteristics of the child.” Dyson (1990)

This ideological change that began in the 1980s and continued through the 1990s focused on a systems limitation view of schools. Booth, Ainscow, Black-Hawkins, Vaughn and Shaw, (2000) discuss how this created the idea of ‘barriers’ to learning which were seen to be aspects of either the organisational or physical environment. These barriers are seen separate to the child and as “more or less alterable” (Norwich, 2013). However Norwich argues that this removal of emphasis on “internal factors…that children bring to their learning and development” does not take the whole picture into account. Instead he proposes an interactionist model which “takes account of internal and external factors, both strengths and limitations.” He also argues that the dismissal of the medical model and the “divisions” between the social and medical models have made it difficult to conceptualise a model that takes account of both.

The concept of inclusion has been subject to significant debate in recent years. Rix (2011) suggested that this might be because there is a lack of clear definition for what inclusion, or inclusive approach to education, means. Armstrong, Armstrong and Sandagou (2011) suggested that this lack of definition has created an inclusive education illusion because of the difference in what is meant by inclusive education in practice and in policy. Ofsted’s
definition of an inclusive approach is about a school having a supportive and
caring environment. Ylonen and Norwich (2012) found that this mirrored
teachers’ concepts of inclusive schooling. Neither felt that an inclusive school
would be one where no behavioural exclusions occurred or where no pupils
were recommended for special schools.

In 2010, Ofsted published a Special Educational Needs and Disability Review
which aimed to evaluate how well the needs of children and young people with
disabilities and SEN were being met (Ofsted, 2010). One of the particular
criticisms of education was that support at School Action and School Action
Plus was not of good quality and that needs were not being met at this level.
They highlighted the difference in support ‘on paper’ and in real life. The
implications of the review were that the quality of assessment and whole-class
teaching should be improved. They emphasised that children with SEN should
be able to get support from good teachers and pastoral support.

This statement from Ofsted suggests that teaching and pastoral support is not
always of ‘good’ quality for children with SEN. So what is it that makes some
teachers competent and confident teachers and includers of children with SEN?

Research would suggest that teachers who are confident, those who have a
high sense of self-efficacy, are also competent teachers of children with SEN.
These teachers are more willing to include pupils with learning difficulties
(Lifschiz and Glaubman, 2002), are less likely to refer students to special
education (Soodak, Podell and Lehmen, 1998), will work longer and more
effectively with a student who is struggling (Gibson and Denbo, 1984) and view
difficult to teach children as “reachable and teachable” (Bandura, 1997 p242).
More generally research suggests that teachers with a high sense of self-efficacy are better able adapt to changes in their professional life (Sari, Celikoz, and Seçer (2009) have more positive classroom management strategies (Emmer and Hickman, 1991; Jordan et al, 1993), are more open to new ideas and more willing to experiment with new methods to meet the needs of their students (Romi and Leyser, 2006). There is also research that suggests that students’ academic performance (Ashton and Webb, 1986) is positively correlated with teachers’ sense of teaching efficacy.

In contrast, research suggests that teachers who have a low sense of self-efficacy are less competent teachers of children with SEN. They may be hostile to the suggestion of inclusion (Soodak et al, 1998), and display high levels of anxiety towards the inclusion of children with SEN (Roll-Pettersson, 2008). They also may attribute students’ learning problems to the disability (Bandura, 1997) and see children with SEN as a threat rather than a challenge to their professional performance (Hutzler, Zach and Gafni, 2005).

2.3 Self-efficacy

This section will look the development of the concept of self-efficacy in terms of its history and how this might apply to teachers.

“Among the mechanisms of personal agency, none is more central or pervasive than people’s beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs function as an important set of proximal determinants of human motivation, affect and action. They operate on action through motivational, cognitive and affective intervening processes.”

*Bandura (1989) p1175*
Efficacy is from ‘efficacious’, a 16\textsuperscript{th} century word with Latin origin; ‘efficere’ meaning accomplish. Self-efficacy in academic literature is first mentioned in Bandura’s 1977 paper “Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change.” This paper was based on the famous Bobo doll experiments of the 1960s which investigated why children showed aggressive behaviours. Later, in 1986, Bandura published “Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory” which expands on Bandura’s work from the 1960s and 1970s and renames the theory ‘Social-cognitive theory’.

Self-efficacy is part of this larger, social cognitive theory. Social cognitive theory describes how personal, behavioural and environmental (social) factors interact in individuals to influence behaviour. Bandura theorised that motivation and goal attainment (behaviour) were influenced by four components; self-observation, self-evaluation, self-reaction and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1989). The theory of self-efficacy is described in more details below.

Bandura describes self-efficacy as “beliefs about capabilities to exercise control over events” (Bandura 1977). He says that self-efficacy beliefs “operate on action through motivational, cognitive and affective intervening processes.” Going further, he states that “people’s perceptions of their efficacy influence the types of anticipatory scenarios they construct and reiterate.” i.e. those with high self-efficacy beliefs will construct success scenarios whereas those with low self-efficacy beliefs construct failure scenarios. In practice this might mean that teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs are more likely to create scenarios that are successful and are therefore more likely to be more confident in the teaching strategies they employ. Teachers with low self-efficacy beliefs, on the contrary, might be more likely to stick with strategies they have always used. This is because they create scenarios that predict failure and are therefore
unlikely to be confident in their abilities to employ different teaching strategies. Palmer (2006) confirmed that the self-efficacy beliefs of teachers impacted on teacher behaviour and that by promoting teacher self-efficacy, teachers were more confident and engaged in more positive teaching behaviours.

### 2.3.1 Teacher self-efficacy

This section will look specifically at self-efficacy as it applies to teachers.

Teacher self-efficacy has been described as “individual teachers' beliefs in their own abilities to plan, organise, and carry out activities required to attain given educational goals.” (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2007). According to Bandura (1989) self-efficacy is not related to level of skills, rather the confidence in holding and using those skills. However, he states that self-efficacy beliefs rely on “performance mastery experiences” which reflects level of skills and suggest that the relationship between self-efficacy and skills may be circular. Bandura goes further stating that “People must have a robust sense of personal efficacy to sustain the perseverant effort needed to succeed.” And “the acquisition of knowledge and competencies usually requires sustained effort in the face of difficulties and setbacks, it is resiliency of self-belief that counts.”

Teacher self-efficacy in terms of SEN is therefore key to understanding why some teachers are considered to be more successful in including children with SEN in their classes that others. The differences between teachers with high and low self-efficacy beliefs has been discussed in the previous section on inclusion. Sharma, Loreman and Forlin (2012) state that “high teacher efficacy can be viewed as a key ingredient to create successful inclusive classroom environments”.


According to Bandura (1997) self-efficacy is situation specific and this has been replicated in more recent research. Engstrand and Roll-Petterssson (2014) defined it as “a contextual appraisal of one’s ability to carry out a specific task”. Therefore a teacher’s self-efficacy beliefs for inclusive teaching would be specific to their class context.

It would seem in such a scenario that some head-teachers and special educational needs co-ordinators (SENCos) have some insight into the consequences, in relation to including and teaching children with SEN, of the self-efficacy beliefs of the teachers in their schools. If this is the case, how can teacher self-efficacy beliefs for inclusive teaching within the context of their class be identified and strengthened?

2.3.1.1 Measuring teacher self-efficacy

There is a history of measuring general teacher efficacy but according to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001, p784) “researchers have had difficulty developing a measurement tool to capture” the construct.

There are two main strands of research that self-efficacy measurement in teaching has taken over the last 30 years. The first is grounded in Rotter’s social learning theory (Rotter, 1966) using Rotter’s locus of control as a base.

Rotter’s social learning theory suggests that behaviour is a result of interaction between personality and environment. One aspect of Rotter’s social learning theory is locus of control. This suggests that individuals either attribute success within themselves (internal) or to luck, chance or other people (external). The key difference between internal and external loci of control is the amount of additional effort individuals believe will make a difference to the outcome of a given challenging situation. An individual with an internal locus of control is
more likely to believe that they can put in additional effort to change, or improve, the outcome of such a situation. Conversely, an individual with an external locus of control will believe it futile to put in any additional effort as their efforts are unlikely to change the outcome.

Comparing Rotter's social learning theory and Bandura's social cognitive theory, it is clear that the two have overlaps in how they relate to self-efficacy. Both have groundings in the interaction between the person and environment and the interaction that goes on between the two in determining behaviour. However, the two theories also have differences. Bandura distinguishes between self-efficacy and outcome beliefs which he believes are covered by an internal locus of control. In Bandura’s theory, locus of control does not therefore

The first strand of research relating to self-efficacy in teachers is grounded in Rotter's social learning theory. Armor, (1976) developed the Rand items in a research study conducted by the RAND organisation, a research body in America. They were designed to assess teachers’ external and internal locus of control. Two questions made up the Rand items;

Rand item 1: “When it comes right down to it, a teacher can’t really do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.”

Rand item 2: “If I try really hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.”

In Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001)
Rand item one measured general teacher efficacy (GTE) and Rand item two measured personal teacher efficacy (PTE). Together the items measured Teacher Efficacy (TE).

There was some concern that a measure which only included two questions could not be reliable and so in response to Armor et al. (1976) several researchers developed longer scales which correlated with the Rand items. In 1981 Guskey developed a scale measuring ‘Responsibility for student achievement’. He separated this into responsibility for student success (R+) and responsibility for student failure into (R-) which he showed to represent separate dimensions (Guskey, 1987). He found that there were significant positive correlations between R+ and R- and TE. However, Guskey found weak correlations for student success and failure and therefore concluded that these attributes were not on a continuum, but were “separate dimensions”. Around the same time, Rose and Medway (1981) examined teacher locus of control which also looked at responsibility for student success and failure. This scale was found to be weakly related to GTE and PTE. Ashton and Webb (1982) developed The Webb Scale which expanded on the Rand items and measured teacher-student interactions. There is no evidence that this measure correlates with the original Rand items. None of these scales received wide acceptance and they have not been used subsequently. One of the criticisms of these strands of research was the researcher’s desire to capture a relatively narrow concept, whilst avoiding social desirability bias (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001). As a result research began to be based within the wider concept of social learning theory, as described below.

The second strand of research is grounded in social learning theory and Bandura’s constructs of self-efficacy. Ashton, Buhr and Crocker (1984)
developed the Ashton Vignettes which asked teachers to respond in both norm- and self-referenced ways to a series of situations. They also assessed stress levels associated with each situation but found that stress and self-efficacy were not correlated. The Vignettes did not receive wide acceptance as only the norm-referenced vignettes were found to be significantly correlated with the original Rand items. Ashton et al. found that the self-referenced vignettes were not significantly correlated and this may be due to socially desirable responses being given by some teachers when asked to judge their own feelings about teaching.

Gibson and Denbo (1984) developed the Teacher Efficacy Scale. It was based on the Rand items research and with Bandura’s social cognitive theory also considered. The scale had 30 items which the researchers found loaded onto two factors. Gibson and Denbo assumed the two factors to reflect self-efficacy and outcome expectancy and they were labelled personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and teaching efficacy (GTE). Later research showed that the Rand items “usually” (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001) load onto their respective factors. The Gibson and Denbo measure received some criticisms in the way it was assumed that their two factors related to PTE and GTE. This is questioned by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy who found that these factor loadings were only “usually” reliable.

Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) highlighted inconsistencies in factor loading of the 30 items in the Gibson and Denbo measure. They developed a shorter measure (10 items) after discovering that some items were loading onto both factors. Following on from these inconsistencies and redevelopments of the original scale Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) questioned what the “optimal level of specificity” was in measuring teacher self-efficacy.
Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) looked at teacher self-efficacy for science teaching, classroom management and special education. They reported that there had been “extensive research” in terms of self-efficacy for science teaching. They report that one of the most widely used scales is the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (STEBI) developed by Riggs and Enochs (1990). This scale is also based on Gibson and Denbo (1984) and is consistent with showing two, albeit unrelated, factors. The researchers have labelled these as Personal Science Teacher Efficacy (PSTE) and Science Teaching Outcome Expectancy (STOE). Research has looked at science teaching more specifically, measuring teacher efficacy for chemistry teaching which has been found to be related to science teaching efficacy (Rubeck and Enochs, 1991). However, this research was based on Gibson and Denbo’s research which has been explored above. The same criticisms would therefore apply to the two factors found in Riggs and Enochs’ study.

In terms of teacher self-efficacy for classroom management, Emer (1990) adapted the Gibson and Denbo (1984) 30 item scale for teacher self-efficacy. They developed 36 items which aimed to measure three factors: efficacy for classroom management; external influences; and personal teaching efficacy. They found that teacher self-efficacy for classroom management correlated with using positive strategies for classroom management and that teachers with high self-efficacy for classroom management encouraged “desirable student responses through praise, encouragement, attention and rewards.”

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) also explored teacher efficacy for special education and found that Gibson and Denbo’s (1984) measure of teacher self-efficacy had been modified to apply specifically to special education (Coladarci and Breton, 1997). Finally, and importantly, Meijer and Forster (1988)
conducted research in The Netherlands and found that teachers who showed high self-efficacy on the Dutch teacher self-efficacy scales were more open to believing that their difficult students were appropriately placed in mainstream classrooms. This research was conducted in The Netherlands and therefore may have different implications if conducted in the UK. Nevertheless, it was the first research to investigate teacher self-efficacy as it applied to special education. The research relating to special education and teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practice will be explored in the next sections.

In addition to the measures referred to above, Bandura (1997) developed a teacher self-efficacy scale which was based on the assumption that teacher self-efficacy is likely to change across different tasks and subjects. He developed a 30 item scale with 7 subscales which looked at the different factors related to self-efficacy in different situations. It is not, however, clear where the 30 items were developed from and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) state that there is no reliability or validity information and so the scale has not been replicated in future research on a large scale.

In response to the multitude of scales aimed at measuring teacher self-efficacy, and the criticisms surrounding them, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) wanted to develop a scale which would balance the need for generality and specificity in the measure. They also raised concerns that some scales were not adequately measuring teacher self-efficacy. They reported that previous scales tended to agree that there were two factors in teacher self-efficacy; PTE and GTE. The first, PTE, is a measure of internal factors, or teachers’ feelings of confidence. However, the second GTE seems less well defined in the research. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy argue that Emmer and Hickman’s (1990) conceptualisation of ‘external influences’ is likely to describe this factor most accurately.
Tschannen-Moran and Hoy developed the ‘Ohio State teacher efficacy scale’ (OSTES) in conjunction with teachers and researchers. The OSTES is reported to be:

“superior to previous measure of teacher efficacy in that it has a unified and stable factor structure and assesses a broad range of capabilities that teachers consider important to good teaching without being so specific as to render it useless for comparisons of teachers across contexts, levels and subjects.”

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) p801-802

2.3.1.2 Measuring teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practice

There is a fairly limited history of measuring self-efficacy in teachers specifically in relation to including and teaching children with SEN in inclusive practice. Chan (2008) suggests that this is because new educational reforms have meant that more and more children with SEN are attending mainstream school. Some studies have looked at teacher efficacy in general (Romi and Leyser, 2006; Weisel and Dror, 2006), others have considered SEN in terms of a medical deficit model (Hutzler et al., 2005).

In response to these studies and in an attempt to change the focus from a medical model of disability to a social model of disability Sharma et al. (2012) devised “Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) Scale.” Sharma et al.’s scale consists of three factors: inclusive instruction; collaboration; and managing disruptive behaviours.

Sharma et al. (2012, p.16) argue that in order for teachers to successfully include pupils with additional needs they need to achieve three key skills. Firstly, inclusive instruction; “in order to successfully teach in inclusive
classrooms, teachers need to have skills in designing classrooms where the needs of all students can be met. Secondly, collaboration; having “the competence to work with adults such as parents and allied health professionals.” And thirdly managing disruptive behaviours; ensuring “all students feel safe and do not display any disruptive behaviour.”

**What factors influence teacher efficacy for inclusive teaching?**

The following factors will be explored in the sections below:

- Demographic factors and attitudes towards inclusion
- School climate
- Teacher resilience and risk of burnout

*Figure 1: Showing factors to be explored in relation to teacher self-efficacy for inclusive teaching*
2.4 Demographic factors

Romi and Leyser (2006) explored variables associated with attitudes towards inclusion and teacher self-efficacy beliefs. In their comprehensive review of the literature they were able to identify several variables that influenced the attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs of teachers towards SEN and inclusion.

The following variables were identified by Romi and Leyser: age, correlated with years of teaching experience; gender; type of disability/SEN; area of certification/specialisation; experience in inclusive settings and work with pupils with SEN; and coursework/training in SEN and inclusion. Savage and Wienke (1989) also suggested that the age of pupils taught was an important factor in teacher attitudes to inclusion, with more positive attitudes found for younger pupils.

With regard to experience and training, Romi and Leyser’s research would suggest that number of years of teaching (correlated with age) influences attitudes. Older, more experienced teachers are found to hold more negative attitudes. However, teachers who have had experience in inclusive settings or work with SEN pupils, coursework and/or training in SEN and inclusion or have specialised in SEN are reported to have more positive attitudes. Female teachers are found to have more positive attitudes towards inclusion than their male counterparts. Romi and Leyser’s research also suggests that teachers find pupils with more severe SEN, and in particular those with social, mental and emotional health difficulties, more challenging to include.

Romi and Leyser’s (2006) research into teacher self-efficacy and teacher attitudes identifies the following 12 variables:
1. Age
2. Gender
3. Years of teaching experience
4. Area of certification
5. Area of specialisation
6. Experience with pupils with SEN
7. Coursework/training in SEN and inclusion
8. Year group taught
9. Class size
10. Number of pupils at SA/SA+/Statement
11. Number of support staff in class
12. Stated view of inclusion

In addition to these demographic factors, there is also a measure of attitudes to inclusion which functions as a baseline of a teacher’s attitudes towards inclusion. This measure; Mahat (2008)’s Multidimensional Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education Scale (MATIES) addresses Cognitive, Affective and Behavioural components of attitudes. According to de Boer et al. (2012) this “three-component” theory is based on a “well considered, conceptual framework.” The cognitive component measures beliefs and knowledge, the affective component measures feelings and the behaviour component measures behavioural intentions.

2.5 School climate

Self-efficacy as a construct does not stand alone. Research has shown that teacher self-efficacy is influenced by a cooperative environment (Soodak et al. 1998). Guo and Higgins-D’Alessandro (2001) and Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) suggest that teacher self-efficacy can be increased with a positive school

School climate is defined as “the sum of the perceptions, opinions and attitudes of the school personnel toward the school.” (Weisel and Dror, 2006 p. 159). Zak and Hurowitz (1985) defined six aspects of school climate: supportive leadership; autonomy; prestige; adoption of new ideas and renovations; relations between teachers; and workload. Research since then has identified supportive leadership and relations between teachers as the two most important factors in fostering a positive school climate (Fritz and Miller, 1995; Schanin, 1990; Ainscow, 2000).

Boyle et al. (2011) also identify peer support as key in supporting teachers to successfully implement the principles of inclusion. They suggested that peer support could mediate a school climate where there was not support from leadership and/or management. Kallestad (2010) suggests that leadership, teacher collaboration and teacher support affect student outcomes.

Kallestad (2010) assessed relationships between teachers and relationships between the teachers and the leadership group. This measure fits in with previous research which suggests the support of the leadership team and relationships between teachers are of key importance. The scale also assesses teachers’ orientation to change and teacher influence on classroom work, which might be hypothesised to align with Zak and Hurowitz’s adoption of new ideas, renovations and autonomy respectively.

However, Kallestad discounts these additional two scales, orientation to change and teacher influence on classroom work, as showing low internal consistency.
and “suggest that only three of the original five school climate instruments should be considered for describing school climate”. The three remaining scales - teacher-leader collaboration, teacher-teacher collaboration and communication - all show substantial stability over time and so Kallestad’s measure will be used in this study.

2.6 Teacher resilience and burnout

Teacher resilience describes a teacher’s response to challenging circumstances and is constructed as a result of a combination of risk and protective factors within each individual teacher. Where risk factors outweigh protective factors, teachers may experience burnout. Burnout is made up of three factors; depersonalisation, emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1982). Teacher burnout is highly costly to schools resulting in ill-health and absent teachers as well as high staff turnover and reduced teaching quality. Fernet (2003) and Houfort and Sauve (2010) report that between 12% and 20% of all teachers report burnout symptoms at least once a week. Fernet, Guay, Senécal, and Austin (2012) suggest that it is the relational nature of teaching that puts teachers at risk of emotional drainage. Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) attributed the stress of teaching to the job demands and resources needed. Research by Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2007) suggested that self-efficacy could mediate the stress caused by the job demands and resources needed. This is important because the impact of teacher burnout on students can include an increase in pupils referred to special education settings and a “lack of persistence in working with a child with difficulties.” (Egyed and Short, 2006).

The idea that self-efficacy could mediate the stress involved in teaching and therefore reduce feelings of teacher burnout and lead to increased feelings of
resilience is supported by self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985; 2002). They suggest that autonomous motivation is key for teachers to perform optimally; it is also related to a greater sense of well-being. They also suggest that perceived confidence is also key. Their concept of perceived confidence maps onto the concept of self-efficacy and research has found it both to be a key variable in predicting burnout and to be negatively correlated with burnout (Brouwers and Tonic, 2000; Salanova, Peiro and Schaufeli, 2002). More recently Fernet et al. (2012) have found that positive self-efficacy can be a mediating factor in teacher burnout.

2.7 Conclusion

As has been documented by this literature review there has been a great deal of research published on SEN and inclusion, some of it going back over one hundred years. Conversely whilst self-efficacy is not a new concept it is a relatively new area of research in terms of teaching and inclusive practice.

This literature highlights the vast amount of research that has taken place with regard to the measurement of self-efficacy in particular. It suggests that self-efficacy is a potentially difficult concept to measure, and this poses potential problems for extrapolating a general measure to a more specific area.

Nevertheless, research has been published that specifically looks at self-efficacy for inclusive practice, and measures have been developed to measure this concept separately to general self-efficacy and general teaching self-efficacy.

Thinking about school climate and teacher resilience, both have literature dating back to the 1980s which continues to be investigated further up to the current day.
Self-efficacy, teacher specific factors, school climate and teacher resilience, as concepts together, have only recently been researched in relation to one another, and I did not find, in my literature search, any literature that includes all four factors in one research paper.

In addition to exploring the factors discussed above (demographic factors, school climate and teacher burnout), this research project will also aim to investigate teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practice and teacher self-efficacy for general teaching. These two factors are additionally included to address research questions one and two.
Chapter 3 – Aims, design and methodology

3.1 Research aims

Within my reading and knowledge base, and as explored in the literature review, I have come across no research investigating what the characteristics and features are of a teacher with high self-efficacy beliefs towards inclusive teaching. The current study aims to investigate what the features and characteristics are of teachers with high teaching self-efficacy beliefs about teaching and including children with SEN.

3.1.1 Phase one

1. Which, if any, factors (attitude to inclusion; school climate; burnout and self-efficacy for general teaching) influence or predict self-efficacy for inclusive teaching?

2. To what extent is self-efficacy for inclusive teaching distinct from self-efficacy for general teaching?

3.1.2 Phase two

3. To consider what teachers, who have high self-efficacy for inclusion scores, feel are important and relevant to their inclusive practice within their schools and classrooms.

3.2 Mixed methodological design

A mixed methods approach (Teddlie and Tashkori 1998) was chosen for this research project in order to counteract the criticism of either quantitative (scientific) or qualitative (interpretative) approach in isolation. A mixed methods approach was appropriate for this research project as it enabled a broad understanding of the factors affecting teacher self-efficacy in the first phase through the use of questionnaires. In the second phase it was
possible, through interviews, to understand in more depth how high self-efficacy related to the inclusive practice of teachers.

Gage (1989) referred to ‘paradigm wars’ between qualitative and quantitative approaches to research. There have been camps that are in dispute about methodological approaches and what counts as rigour. For example, from a scientific-quantitative perspective, qualitative data collection in education tends to be seen to miss out the bigger picture of research (Cohen, Manion, Morrison; 2011). However, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) made reference to mixed methods as a new research ‘paradigm’ which did not take a black and white view of existing research paradigms. Supporters of mixed methods as a research approach claim that it provides the research with a rich set of data and flexibility in the way in which the data are collected and analysed. One such example is Denscombe (2006) who claims mixed methods give a bigger picture than one or other approach. This research approach is therefore consistent with using a survey questionnaire as a screener for case study interviews.

Cohen et al. (2011) argue that mixed methods fit within a pragmatist philosophical approach. It posits that the purposes of the research and the kinds of knowledge sought are the important aspect of research, not the kinds of methodological assumptions and data used. Pragmatism assumes that knowledge and truth are best understood in terms of it is useful and therefore, according to the philosophers James and Mead, enables the researcher to select appropriate methodological approaches based on specific research questions. Seale et al. (2007) suggest that this requires researchers to be “cautious” about the methods chosen, but also means that researchers are not required to stay within one approach or another.
This study is designed in two phases with research questions relevant to each phase. The first two questions, within phase one, aim to examine the relationships between factors. These research questions lend themselves to a positivist stance and enquiry by scientific methods.

Within this the first phase the aims are to produce generalised knowledge about teachers’ self-efficacy for inclusive teaching and the relationship between this and other variables; attitude to include; school climate; burnout and general teaching self-efficacy.

The third research question is more nuanced and aims to investigate the experiences and opinions of participants. This, therefore, fits within an interpretivist stance and the use of interviews enables the participants’ own perspectives to be better understood.

This second phase aims to produce a detailed and rich account of the perspectives and experiences of individual teacher selected, from phase one for having high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. This method has been chosen so as to allow the quantitative data to be illuminated through engagement with participants on a one to one interview basis and so that both phases can be integrated at the end.

As discussed above, there are criticisms of using purely quantitative or qualitative methods. In this research a mixed methods approach is taken assuming, in phase one, that self-efficacy and other phenomena exist and are there to be represented and measured. The criticism focuses of purely quantitative methods focus on the “dehumanisation” (Ions, 1977) of this approach in that it fails to consider the human experience behind the data. Phase two, therefore, assumes a negotiated reality based on perspectives, experiences and negotiations. In including a second phase of qualitative data
collection, it is hoped that these criticisms will be responded to by ensuring the interviews capture the lived experiences of the participants.

There are also criticisms of the mixed methods approach to research. It is a relative new approach and therefore is not well defined. There are many combinations in which qualitative and quantitative data collection can be used in conjunction with one another, yet there is no indication that one combination might be better than another. There is also the criticism that by using mixed methods, each individual method - the qualitative and the quantitative - become diluted and therefore less strong than if they were used independently.

Reams and Twale (2008) counteract these criticisms by claiming that a mixed methods approach means that one data collection method can be used to support the other and to validate the findings. They also suggest that conclusions are less likely to be biased and may be easier to justify because of the triangulation of data collected.
PHASE ONE

Chapter 4 – Phase one methods

4.1 Research questions

1. Which, if any, factors (attitude to inclusion; school climate; burnout and self-efficacy for general teaching) influence or predict self-efficacy for inclusive teaching?

2. To what extent is self-efficacy for inclusive teaching distinct from self-efficacy for general teaching?

4.2 Sampling

This research took place within mainstream primary schools in a local authority (LA) in the South of England. There were two criteria for schools to meet: to have a teaching staff of seven or more; and to have a linked EP within the LA. This gave a total of 47 possible schools. Advice was taken from the EPs within the service concerning which schools would be suitable to approach. This included the knowledge the EPs held about how open the school were likely to be to engage in a research project, as well as schools that were large enough to provide a range of attitudes amongst the staff body. Consideration was also taken to how busy the schools were in terms of engagement in other work and preparation for Ofsted or other inspections. Of the total of 47 schools, 11 were identified as appropriate to invite to take part in the research.

The SENCo of each of the schools was contacted first by their link EP with an information sheet about the research (see Appendix A1 – Information Sheet). This was then followed up with an e-mail to the SENCo inviting the school to take part.
Of the 11 schools approached seven agreed to take part. This was a response rate of 63.6%. All teaching staff and SENCos in each of the seven schools were invited to take part. Table 2 below shows the demographic details of each school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of pupils (n)</th>
<th>Number of pupils on SEN register (%)</th>
<th>Number of pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) (%) (Local Authority average = 9.2)</th>
<th>Number of class teachers + SENCo (n)</th>
<th>Responses (n)</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Demographics of each participating school (The data were gathered from the Ofsted School Data Dashboard)

4.3 Participants

There were 66 returned questionnaires from seven schools. A total of 13.6% (n=9) of the participants were male and 84.8% (n=84.8) were female. Table 3, below, shows the participants’ ages.
The participants had different levels of teaching experience. 10.6% (n=7) were in training, 40.9% (n=27) had been teaching for 2-9 years and 47% (n=31) had 10 or more years of teaching experience.

Of the 66 participants, 10.6% (n=7) were members of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) within their schools and 89.4% (n=59) were class teachers.

4.4 Methods

This section will consider the methods used in phase one.

4.4.1 Data collection

Participants filled out a battery of six questionnaires.

1. Demographic questions:

1. Age.

2. Gender.

3. Number of years of teaching experience.

4. Area of specialisation at qualification.

5. Area of specialisation now.

6. Experience with pupils with SEN, personally and professionally.

7. Training on SEN and inclusion.
8. Year group taught.
9. Class size.
11. Number of support staff in class, in the morning and afternoon.

2. School climate measure Kallestad (2010).
4. Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) for Educators Maslach et al. (2001).
5. Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (Sharma et al., 2012).

For examples of each of the questionnaires see Appendix A2 – Demographics Questionnaire.

4.4.1.1 Demographics

The demographic questionnaire was based on previous research which indicated that the 11 variables chosen were relevant and related to inclusion attitudes and inclusive teaching methods. Questions one to three, and six were multiple choice, question four, five and seven were yes/no with a chance to specify yes. Question six was a yes/no response. Questions eight, nine, ten and 11 were open questions requiring numeric responses.

4.4.1.2 School climate

The school climate measure, Kallestad (2010), was designed and has been previously used in Norway as a measure of school climate. It is made up of 22 statements which load onto three variables: teacher-leader collaboration; teacher-teacher collaboration; and communication. Responses were made using a Likert Scale where 1 = seldom or never and 6 = applies exactly/very often. These three variables have a Cronbach’s alpha score of above .80 (.93,
.81 and .80 respectively). The scale has been assessed over time (Kallestad, 1998; 2010) to measure interval validity and has been modified from five aspects of school climate to three aspects which hold high test-retest stability.

4.4.1.3 Attitudes to Inclusion

The attitudes towards inclusion measure, Mahat (2008)’s Multidimensional Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education Scale (MATIES). It was designed and has been previously used in Victoria, Australia as a measure of attitudes towards inclusion in both primary and secondary schools. It is made up of 18 statements which load onto three variables: cognitive; affective; and behavioural. Responses were made using a Likert Scale where 1 = strongly agree and 6 = strongly disagree. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for each of the three variables is between .77 and .91 which Mahat reports to be “substantial”. The scale has been shown to provide “substantial evidence of construct and criterion validity and reliability.” (Mahat, 2008)

4.4.1.4 Burnout

The MBI for Educators scale (Maslach, 1982) is made up of 22 statements which load onto three variables: emotional exhaustion; depersonalisation; and personal accomplishment. Responses were made using a Likert Scale where 0 = never and 6 = always. The MBI for Educators scale is an adaptation of the original Maslach Burnout Inventory. It was developed and has been used in America. The original scale has been assessed for internal validity and factors chosen for “factor loading greater than .40 on only one of the factors, a large range of subject responses, a relatively low percentage of subjects checking the “never” response, and a high item-total correlation.” The three-variable scale for educators has the word ‘recipient’ replaced with ‘student’ and has Cronbach
alpha estimates of .90 for emotional exhaustion, .76 for depersonalisation and .76 for personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1997).

4.4.1.5 Self-efficacy for inclusive practice
The Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practice scale, Sharma et al. (2012) is made up of 18 statements which loaded onto three variables: inclusive instruction; collaboration; and managing disruptive behaviour. The scale was developed in Canada, Australia, Hong Kong and India. Responses were made using a Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 6 = strongly agree. Sharma et al. claim that “the three factors obtained in the scale have practical relevance” and “strong validity and reliability.” The alpha coefficient for the total scale is .89, with each scale ranging from .85 to .93. Sharma et al. report that “reliability analysis for the total scale as well as factors for each country suggest that the scale provides a reliable measure.”

4.4.1.6 Self-efficacy for general teaching
The Teachers’ sense of efficacy scale (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001) is made up of 24 statements which load onto three variables: instruction; behaviour management; and engagement. Responses were made using a Likert Scale where 1 = nothing and 9 = a great deal. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy claim that the scale has “a unified and stable factor structure”. The Chronbach alpha coefficients for each of the three variables is .86, .86 and, 81 respectively. The overall alpha coefficient is .90. The scale was developed at the Ohio State University and has been tested on over 800 participants in three studies for test-retest validity. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy conclude that “the results of these analyses indicate that the scale could be considered reasonably valid and reliable.”
4.5 Materials

The questionnaires were typed into Excel documents to provide the opportunity for a scaled response for each question. Initially these were e-mailed to participants to highlight their selected response.

The questionnaires which were taken into staff meetings were printed onto A4 plain paper and stapled together to keep the battery together.

Participants filled the questionnaires out by hand using pen, circling their selected response.

4.6 Procedures

All the questionnaires were piloted on a suitable potential participant. This was to ensure the questionnaires were accessible to members of the teaching profession. No changes were made, but the feedback was used to indicate to schools how long the questionnaires would take to fill out.

Initially, questionnaires were sent electronically to the SENCo of school 1 to be then disseminated to the members of teaching staff within the school. The low response rate from this school (33%) over a period of several weeks indicated that e-mail contact was not sufficient to ensure that enough questionnaires were returned. Reminder e-mails were sent to the SENCo to encourage the remaining staff to return their questionnaires.

Following this experience, arrangements were made to collect the data during pre-scheduled after-school staff meetings. A 15-minute slot, as indicated by the piloted questionnaire, was requested and given at the after-school meetings of the six remaining schools. The first school was unable to fit the research project into one of their staff meetings due to prior training and time commitments.
In the staff meetings, participants were given an overview of the research and asked if they would be happy to be involved in the research. There was one member of staff who was present at a staff meeting but who chose not to be part of the research project.

Any questions arising from the questionnaires were answered within the staff meeting and participants were invited to indicate their interest in taking part in the second phase of this research by writing their name on their questionnaire pack. 19 members of staff indicated interest in being interviewed.

Any staff members absent from staff meetings were left copies of the questionnaires which they were invited to voluntarily fill in at a convenient time to them. E-mail support was offered to these individuals, but none took it up. Completed questionnaires were collected at a later date. Not all members of staff who were eligible completed questionnaires (see Table 2).

4.7 Data analysis procedure

Each questionnaire was allocated a participant number (e.g. participant 1) and a school number (e.g. school 1) in order that the data could be organised by schools. A list was made of the participants who had indicated interest in being interviewed so that they could be contacted at a later date.

Raw data from the questionnaires was then entered into the SPSS programme. Descriptive statistics were run for each of the individual questionnaires as well as correlational and regression analyses to examine the predictive relationship between variables and inclusive teaching efficacy measure.
4.8 Ethics

4.8.1 Ethical approval and considerations

Ethics approval was sought from The University of Exeter prior to conducting any research (See Appendix A8 – Ethics Form). In seeking ethical approval, professional codes of conduct were taken into consideration. These included the BPS and HCPC.

4.8.1.1 Informed consent:

Informed consent was ensured for all participants by giving them information about the study, their role within the project, the purpose of their involvement and how their data would be used. Consent was implicit by filling in and submitting the questionnaire battery. Contact details were provided to the participants in order that they could ask any questions at any stage in the research project.

Participants were made aware of their right to withdraw their data at any time and were given contact details in order to do so.

4.8.1.2 Anonymity and confidentiality:

Participants were also made aware that their data would be stored anonymously and not linked back to them individually or their school. The exception to this is where they gave permission for their data to be considered for the second stage of the research.

Participants who were interested in the second stage of the research gave their name on their questionnaire battery in order that they could be contacted at a later date and to ensure that their answers could be linked back to them if they were involved in the second stage of the research.
The completed questionnaires were coded to show which school they were from (e.g. School1) and this information was kept separately from the completed questionnaires at all times.

The questionnaires were only accessible to the researcher and no personal or individually traceable details were recorded on the data set. Personal information was not shared or made public and the Local Authority in which the research took place retains anonymity.

4.8.2 Ethical procedures

As mentioned above, clear ethical procedures were taken in order to ensure informed consent, right to withdraw, anonymity and confidentiality were in place.

As per the ethical approval requirements care was taken to ensure that any participant who found any part of the research harmful, detrimental or unreasonably stressful was supported to discontinue and offered a debrief session. No participants required this support.

The questionnaires were worded in such a way as to be value free as possible to allow participants to feel confident in sharing their genuine views. This was important as it could have been possible that some members of teaching staff would not believe inclusion was positive.

Consideration was given to participants who may have special needs; however there was an expectation that the participants in this particular cohort would be able to respond to the questionnaires without the need for special arrangements due to the nature of their job. Additionally, questionnaires were completed in the participants’ place of work and therefore any special arrangements would have been in place without the need for additional arrangements. To my knowledge, no participant was unfairly disadvantaged from engaging in the research.
Data analysis was carried out in SPSS and in such a way that the raw data file could not be linked back to any individual participant or school. All electronic data were stored on a password protected computer and all hard copies in a locked cabinet unless being worked on.
Chapter 5 – Findings

This chapter will present the findings from the first phase of the research. It will begin with an overview of the data collated from the demographics questionnaire and the five additional questionnaires. It will then describe and display the analysis that was performed on the raw data set.

5.1 General findings

5.1.1 Demographics

Of the 66 participants over 80% were female and nearly 50% had over 10 years’ teaching experience. Nearly half were aged between 25 and 34, with a further third aged between 35 and 44. The participants therefore represent an experienced cohort of teachers who had been trained and qualified whilst inclusion has been an active education policy. The participants taught in reception to Year six and there were a roughly equal number of teachers in each year group.

In terms of specialisms and training (Table 4, below), well over half of the participants held specialisms within their post. These ranged from being a Key Stage leader to supporting Humanities or Literacy across the school. 85% of the participants had attended training on SEN and inclusion, in addition to their initial teacher training. This represents a large proportion of the participants who have additional training on SEN and inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialism on qualifying</th>
<th>Yes n (%)</th>
<th>No n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialism now</td>
<td>39 (62.9)</td>
<td>22 (35.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/Inclusion training</td>
<td>52 (85.2)</td>
<td>9 (14.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Participants’ specialisms on qualifying as a teacher, specialisms at the current time and SEN/Inclusion training (in addition to initial teacher training)
Over half of the participants didn’t have any personal or professional experience with SEN and around a third had some personal experience (Table 5, below). A little more than a third had professional experience. Only 6.8% had no professional experience of SEN indicating that well over 90% of the participants had experience of teaching or supporting a child with SEN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None at all n (%)</th>
<th>To some extent n (%)</th>
<th>Very much n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal experience with SEN</strong></td>
<td>37 (59.7)</td>
<td>21 (33.9)</td>
<td>4 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional experience with SEN</strong></td>
<td>32 (54.2)</td>
<td>23 (39.0)</td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Participants’ personal and professional experiences with children with SEN prior to teaching*

The numbers of pupils who came under the four areas of the SEN Code of Practice (2014) was also varied (Table 6, below). Nearly 60% of classes had at least one child at SEN Support for cognition and learning compared to around 55% for communication and interaction, 48% for social, emotional and mental health and 35% for physical and sensory needs.

Numbers of pupils with EHCPs (Table 6, below) were slightly higher than the national average of 2.8% (Office for national statistics, 2015), at 3.3% with nearly 25% of classes having at least one child with an EHCP for communication and interaction needs, over 10% for cognition and learning, social, emotional and mental health, and physical and sensory needs.
Classes appeared to be well supported by teaching assistants (Table 7, below) with only 5% of classes having no TA in the morning. In all, 6.5% of classes had three TAs each morning. Most classes had one TA in both the morning and the afternoon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of TAs per class (n)</th>
<th>Number of classes with a TA in the morning n (%)</th>
<th>Number of classes with a TA in the afternoon n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
<td>15 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42 (67.7)</td>
<td>38 (61.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 (21)</td>
<td>7 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (6.5)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Numbers of TA each class employs
5.1.2 Questionnaire data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mid point of scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean +/- 1 SD</th>
<th>Difference mean and mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to Inclusion</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>35.8 / 44.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>104.2 / 128.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18.2 / 26.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy for general teaching</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>97.6 / 136.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy for inclusive teaching</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>77.3 / 94.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Results from the questionnaire data

Table 8 shows that the means for each of the five scales lie close to the mid-point of each scale. The differences between the mean and the mid-point range from 0.8 for self-efficacy for inclusive teaching and self-efficacy for general teaching and 2.5 for burnout.

5.2 Research question one

RQ1: Which, if any, factors (attitude to inclusion; school climate; burnout and self-efficacy for general teaching) influence or predict self-efficacy for inclusive teaching?

Firstly, correlational analysis was conducted on the data set to see if any demographic descriptor was related to self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. Only one of the demographic descriptors was significantly predictive of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching; number of years teaching experience. This suggests that the more years’ teaching experience a teacher had, the higher their self-efficacy for inclusive teaching score (see Table 9).
Table 9: Correlations between the demographic variables and self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Self-efficacy for inclusive teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience with SEN</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional experience with SEN</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years teaching experience</td>
<td>.330*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05

Correlational analysis using Pearson correlation coefficients was then conducted to assess whether any of the variables from the remaining questionnaires (15 variables in total) were related to self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SC1</th>
<th>SC2</th>
<th>SC3</th>
<th>AI1</th>
<th>AI2</th>
<th>AI3</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>SEI1</th>
<th>SEI2</th>
<th>SEI3</th>
<th>SEG1</th>
<th>SEG2</th>
<th>SEG3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.761**</td>
<td>0.743**</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.355*</td>
<td>0.406*</td>
<td>0.344**</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.759**</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.372*</td>
<td>0.313*</td>
<td>0.292*</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.287*</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.491**</td>
<td>0.452**</td>
<td>0.359*</td>
<td>0.288*</td>
<td>0.324*</td>
<td>0.315*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.676**</td>
<td>-0.340*</td>
<td>-0.288*</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.328*</td>
<td>0.462**</td>
<td>0.308*</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.298*</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.358**</td>
<td>-0.330*</td>
<td>-0.338*</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.643**</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.207</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.454**</td>
<td>-0.341**</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>-0.310*</td>
<td>-0.305*</td>
<td>-0.291*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.410**</td>
<td>0.450**</td>
<td>0.474**</td>
<td>0.349**</td>
<td>0.445**</td>
<td>0.417**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.814**</td>
<td>0.716**</td>
<td>0.691**</td>
<td>0.746**</td>
<td>0.783**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.706**</td>
<td>0.577**</td>
<td>0.652**</td>
<td>0.714**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.557**</td>
<td>0.756**</td>
<td>0.663**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.814**</td>
<td>0.834**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.803**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.803**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ** p<0.01;  * p<0.05

Table 10: Significant correlation coefficient for subscales of self-efficacy (inclusive teaching and general teaching), inclusion attitude, burnout and school climate variables (grey highlights are internal relationships between sub-scales) n = 47 - 66
Table 10 shows that the 3 subscales for 3 of the constructs (self-efficacy – inclusive and general teaching and school climate) have high relationships, while for 2 of the constructs (inclusion attitudes and burnout); only two of these are related: emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation aspects of burnout; and affective and behavioural aspects of inclusion attitudes.

The next step was to use those subscales which related significantly at p<0.05 to inclusive teaching self-efficacy in a regression analysis; to identify their joint predictive relationship when all independent variables were used together. Based on this analysis the subscales for the former 3 constructs were formed into a single scale by adding the scores to give an aggregate construct core (self-efficacy; inclusive and general teaching, and school climate) as well as number of years teaching experience. These subscales were aggregated because they were inter-correlated so forming a coherent aggregated scale as designed originally. The two related subscales for inclusion behaviour and affective attitude were aggregated to form a total inclusion attitude scale (the cognitive scale was left out because it did not correlate significantly with self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. The Burnout subscales were then considered independently; burnout (emotional exhaustion) was not related to self-efficacy so it was not used. Burnout accomplishment was statistically related to self-efficacy, but it is conceptually linked to self-efficacy and so was not used in this analysis. Considering the items used in each measure, the two constructs are conceptually similar, though not overlapping, explaining the moderate, as opposed to strong, correlations found between the two constructs. This left the depersonalisation burnout subscale as the only burnout measure to be used in the regression analysis.
Table 11 shows the inter-correlations between the aggregated scales where these were calculated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEinc</th>
<th>SEgen</th>
<th>Bdp</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>Years teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEinc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.81*</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEgen</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bdp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEinc: self-efficacy inclusive teaching (instruction, collaboration, behaviour management)
SEgen: self-efficacy general teaching (instruction, behaviour management, engagement)
Bdp: burnout (depersonalisation)
SC: school climate
AI: attitude to inclusion (behavioural and affective scales)
Years teaching: number of years of teaching experience

* p<0.01; * p<0.05

Table 11: Correlation coefficients between composite scales

Figure 2 below shows the significant correlations of variables related to inclusive teaching self-efficacy. The burnout variable did not correlate significantly with inclusive teaching self-efficacy.
Figure 2: Significant correlations between independent variable and inclusive teaching self-efficacy

As the above different variable correlated with inclusive teaching self-efficacy might themselves be correlated, a stepwise regression analysis was done to identify the independent contribution of each of these variables to predicting inclusive teaching self-efficacy. Table 11 shows that independent contribution of each of the independent variables to predicting inclusive teaching self-efficacy.

A regression analysis for predicting inclusive teaching self-efficacy from general teaching self-efficacy, general self-efficacy and inclusion attitudes, general self-efficacy, inclusion attitudes and school climate and finally with all 4 variables was conducted. Though this showed that general teaching self-efficacy predicted the most variance in inclusive teaching, self-efficacy, attitude, school climate and years teaching experience also make significant contributions to the
overall prediction of inclusive teaching self-efficacy. However, the burnout (depersonalisation) variable did not predict self-efficacy independently, and so dropped out of the analysis. Table 12 below shows the relative contributions of the four independent variables in predicting inclusive teaching self-efficacy. It shows that self-efficacy for general teaching and school climate independently predict self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

Table 12: Relative contributions of 3 independent variables to predicting inclusive teaching self-efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.737</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGen</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>6.956</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 below shows the regression model for predicting inclusive teaching self-efficacy using the four independent variables discussed above.

Table 13: Regression model for predicting inclusive teaching self-efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R squared</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>4/35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Research question two

**RQ2:** To what extent is self-efficacy for inclusive teaching distinct from self-efficacy for general teaching?

and show that general teaching self-efficacy is the strongest predictor of inclusive teaching self-efficacy. But the regression analysis also shows that the other 2 variables make independent significant contributions to inclusive teaching self-efficacy. This suggests that inclusive teaching self-efficacy, though
similar to general teaching self-efficacy also has contributions from teachers’ inclusion attitudes and their perceptions of the quality of the school climate.

Correlations were conducted on the overall values of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching; self-efficacy for general teaching, burnout (depersonalisation and emotional exhaustion) and school climate ascertain which variables predicted self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

The correlation between self-efficacy for inclusive teaching and self-efficacy for general teaching was $r = 0.809$, ($p < 0.01$).

The correlation between self-efficacy for inclusive teaching and school climate was $r = 0.506$, ($p < 0.01$).

The key findings from this phase of the research indicate that years teaching experience does influence self-efficacy for inclusive teaching in that the more years’ experience a teacher has, the higher the self-efficacy for inclusive teaching score.

The regression analysis suggests that school climate and self-efficacy for general teaching are significantly correlated and are predictive of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. The two aspects of burnout (depersonalisation and emotional exhaustion) drop out of the analysis indicating they are not uniquely related to self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

The stepwise analysis indicates that whilst self-efficacy for general teaching is most predictive of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching; attitude and school climate make significant contributions to the overall prediction of inclusive teaching self-efficacy.
Chapter 6 – Discussion

This chapter will summarise and discuss the key findings from the first phase of the research.

Research Questions:

1. Which, if any, factors (attitude to inclusion; school climate; burnout and self-efficacy for general teaching) influence or predict self-efficacy for inclusive teaching?
2. To what extent is self-efficacy for inclusive teaching distinct from self-efficacy for general teaching?

6.1. Demographics

When analysed, only one of the demographic factors was significantly predictive of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. Number of years’ teaching experience was correlated significantly with self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores suggesting that teachers who had been working for longer were more confident in their abilities to teach and include children with SEN. This is in keeping with Romi and Leyser’s (2006) research. The reason for a lack of significant correlations between the other demographics variables might have been due to a relatively homogenous group of teachers who were likely to have trained and qualified at similar times.

6.2 School climate

The measure of school climate taken for this study assessed individual teachers’ ‘perceptions of school climate. This means that the scores represented each individual’s perception of the climate within their school.
The data would suggest that if an individual perceives the climate within their school to be positive in terms of teacher-leader collaboration, teacher-teacher collaboration and communication, then they will also report higher self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores.

This is consistent with research, as detailed below, which indicates that the social environment is influential on teacher self-efficacy. What is interesting is that the findings here appear to take this influence one step further than general teacher self-efficacy and suggest that the environment is also influential on teacher self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. In terms of the regression analysis this relationship between school climate and inclusive teaching self-efficacy persisted even when other factors related to self-efficacy were taken into account.

Research by Soodak et al. (1998), Guo and Higgins-D’Allesandro (2001), Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) and Fritz and Miller (1995) indicates that teacher self-efficacy is correlated with school environment and more specifically that a more positive school environment will increase teacher self-efficacy. The research findings here indicate that this particular aspect of a perceived positive school environment is predictive of higher self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

In practical terms, this would suggest that a teacher who is feeling positively about the environment in the school in which they work is more likely to feel confident about teaching and including children with SEN.

6.3 Attitude to inclusion

The measure of attitudes to inclusion for this study measured three elements of personal attitudes towards inclusion: cognitive; affective; and behaviour.
The findings of this research indicate that teachers who feel and act positively towards inclusive teaching are more likely to be confident in their ability to teach and include children with SEN. It is interesting that the cognitive component of attitudes did not correlate significantly. The cognitive statements on the scale asked about participants’ beliefs around inclusion and asked questions such as “I believe that inclusion facilitates socially appropriate behaviour amongst all students.” And “I believe that an inclusive school is one that permits academic progression of all students regardless of their ability.” This suggests that teachers do not necessarily have to believe that inclusion is always a good thing in order to have confidence in their abilities to teach and include children with SEN. This would support Engstrand and Roll-Pettersson’s (2014) research which indicates that positive attitude towards inclusion is not significantly correlated with high self-efficacy. In terms of the regression analysis this relationship between inclusion attitudes and inclusive teaching self-efficacy persisted even when other factors related to self-efficacy were taken into account.

In practice this is likely to indicate that teachers who feel positively towards inclusion will feel more confident in their abilities to put inclusion into practice. Likewise, those teachers for whom this translates into inclusive behaviour are more likely to have high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

6.4 Burnout

The measure of Burnout used in this research was Maslach’s burnout inventory for educators. There were two significant correlations between self-efficacy for inclusive teaching and the burnout subscale scores. The first was a negative correlation with the depersonalisation measure of the inventory. This would indicate that the more teachers depersonalise the children with whom they
work, the less confident they feel about teaching and including children with SEN. It is also possible that less confident teachers are more likely to respond to children they perceive as challenging in a more depersonalised way.

The second significant correlation was with the personal accomplishments aspect of the burnout inventory. Higher feelings of personal accomplishment were significantly correlated with higher self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores. This would suggest that those teachers who feel they are accomplishing more in their work will feel more confident about teaching and including children with SEN. Interestingly, emotional exhaustion did not significantly correlate with self-efficacy scores. This would indicate that teachers are able to maintain their confidence in teaching and including children with SEN despite the considerable stresses of the job.

Xanthoupolou et al. (2007) would suggest that high self-efficacy mediates the stress caused by the job demands of teaching, which may be partially supported by the results above. Depersonalisation and personal accomplishment are both significantly correlated with self-efficacy scores. Xanthoupolou et al. did not provide a breakdown of the individual constructs in their research. Other research by Brouwers and Tonic (2000), Salanover et al. (2002) and Fernet et al. (2012) have also indicated that low self-efficacy can result in teacher burnout which is supported by the results above.

Only the burnout depersonalisation scale was used in the regression analysis, as the personal accomplishment was considered to be too similar to the self-efficacy variable for this analysis. However, in the regression analysis depersonalisation no longer predicted inclusive teaching self-efficacy independently.
6.5 Self-efficacy for general teaching

All three of the sub-factors for self-efficacy for general teaching were significantly correlated with the three sub-factors for self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. Overall the general teaching self-efficacy had the strongest correlation with inclusive teaching self-efficacy. When other variables were taken into account in the regression analysis, this variable was still the strongest predictor of inclusive teaching self-efficacy. This would suggest that a teacher who reports feeling confident in their general teaching ability is also a teacher who feels confident in teaching and including children with SEN. The stepwise analysis would suggest that despite self-efficacy for general teaching being the best predictor; attitude to inclusion and perceived school climate are independent predictors of self-efficacy for inclusion.

Considering the research on teacher self-efficacy, it is not surprising that the two constructs (general teacher self-efficacy and self-efficacy for inclusive teaching) are linked. However, research (e.g. Bandura, 1997; Engstrand and Roll-Pettersson, 2014) would suggest that self-efficacy is situation specific. The results of this study would suggest there is some generalisability that can be made between having a high self-efficacy score across aspects of teaching (general teaching) and specific aspects of teaching (inclusive teaching).

Bandura (1989) stated that those teachers who have had more “performance mastery experiences” would have higher self-efficacy scores. It is therefore possible that the teachers’ general teaching experiences have impacted on their inclusive teaching self-efficacy.

Within the two self-efficacy questionnaires, there are two variables that overlap; instruction and behaviour management. The questions for these two variables
are similar and this may go some way to explain the high correlation between the two constructs. The variables that do not overlap; collaboration (self-efficacy for inclusive teaching) and engagement (self-efficacy for general teaching) are still correlated with self-efficacy for inclusive teaching variables. Engagement in correlated with all three self-efficacy for inclusive teaching variables.

6.6 Predicting self-efficacy for inclusive teaching

The regression analysis indicated that self-efficacy for general teaching was the best predictor of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. In addition to this there were also two other factors that was one other significant predictors; school climate. In other words, this additional variable is itself an independent predictor of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. The regression analysis shows that school climate independently predicts self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

In practice this is likely to mean that teachers who perceive their school climate to be positive and supportive are more likely to also report high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores.

Therefore, a teacher working in a school with a supportive environment and who is confident about their general teaching ability is likely to be a more competent teacher of children with SEN.

6.7 Concluding thoughts on the questionnaire data

As mentioned previously, the participants who took part in this phase were made up predominantly of teachers with significant experience behind them. Having said that, there was a wide range of self-efficacy scores for both teaching in general and inclusive teaching suggesting that number of years’ experience didn’t necessarily translate into increase self-efficacy, and therefore competence, in the participants’ jobs.
6.8 Strengths and limitations of phase one

One of the biggest limitations of this study is the small sample size. According to the DfE ‘School workforce in England, November 2014’ there are 215,500 full-time equivalent teachers in England. The actual number of teachers is likely to be higher as the survey also identifies that 26% of primary school teachers work part time. This study therefore draws on the opinions of 0.031% of teachers in England and is highly unlikely to be generalisable to the full teaching population across England.

That said, the response rate from the initial approach to schools was strong - at 63.6%. The response rates from within the individual schools were also strong. These ranged from 33.3% to 100%, with the average response rate being 68.4%. Additionally, large amounts of data were collected from each school, with 155 variables collated per participant, representing a rich set of data for each participant.

Despite the relatively small sample size, the schools which took part in the study were relatively non-homogenous. Numbers of pupils on the SEN register ranged from 2.9% to 12.6%, numbers of pupils eligible for free school meals ranged from 3.4% to 48.6% and the size of the schools ranged from under 200 pupils to over 450 pupils. This represents a mixture of one and two form entry schools.

Other limitations of the study include the potential for participants to have responded to the items on the questionnaires with socially desirable responses. In order to combat this, participants completed the questionnaires anonymously. I am also aware of there being some items that teachers opted not to answer because they chose not to or didn’t feel able to answer them. One example is ‘I
believe that students with a disability should be taught in special education schools' which was not answered by 16.7% of the participants. Whilst it might be expected that some questions might be missed inadvertently I would suggest that this question was not answered intentionally by some participants.

There is a potential for researcher bias to influence the selections of the questionnaire battery, and certainly the battery of questionnaires as was put together for this study had not been researched together before. The selection of the questionnaires was carefully led by research into which variables were likely to have influence on self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. The results indicate that the battery of questionnaires was relevant and appropriate. It is not possible to know what the results might have been had there have been questionnaires measuring different variables, or alternative questionnaires seeking to measure the same variables.

The final limitation of this stage of the research is that quantitative data such as that collected through the battery of questionnaires misses the nuances of individual experience. Teaching is known to be a stressful and emotionally involved job and therefore trying to reduce experiences to a set of numbers on Likert scales will inevitably miss the subjectivity with which the participant answered the questions. There is some hint that the questions were answered in an individual way with the high opt-out rate of the question discussed above. Each of the 66 participants will have brought with them their own experiences, opinions, views etc. which will have impacted their responses. This participant subjectivity may have been greatest on topics which were of debate in the wider teaching community or field of education in general.
6.9 Future directions

The clearest future direction of this stage of the research is to expand the study to far greater number of teachers. This would increase the generalisability of the research findings and add weight to the results. In addition to this, it would be helpful to have all members of staff from each school so that school climate, in particular, but also other variables, can be measured more accurately within and between schools. The strong response rates from schools would suggest that a study with greater numbers of schools and teachers has the potential to be successful.

It would be interesting to expand the study across schools with different numbers of pupils with SEN and within different school settings, e.g. those with specialist units, to see if teachers who have more exposure to including children with SEN respond with high rates of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. Additionally, this study focused on primary school staff and so another potential future direction is to focus on secondary school staff who tend to have lower levels of pupils on their SEN registers.

Another potential future direction is to increase, or change, the numbers of variables being measured for each teacher. This would give a different set of results which may be correlated with, or predictive of, self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

From the data collected, it would be interesting to investigate positive and negative teaching events. Bandura (1989) would suggest that high general self-efficacy for teaching scores is linked to a greater number of positive teaching events. This would therefore be an interesting area to explore.
One of the limitations mentioned above was the limits that quantitative data collection places on recording the nuances of individual experience. It would therefore be interesting to expand this study to explore in more depth the individual experiences of the participants. The quantitative data collected from this stage of the research is broad, but it lacks depth. A qualitative follow-up to this data would allow a deeper understanding of the importance of the individual experience.

Therefore, the second stage of this research will look in more depth at the individual experience of the participants using interviews to better understand the features and characteristics of those who have high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.
PHASE TWO

Chapter 7 – Phase two methods

7.1 Research question

RQ3: What are the factors that teachers who have high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores see as important and relevant to the inclusion of children with SEN?

7.2 Sampling (recruitment)

Participants in this phase of the research were invited to interview on the basis of their self-efficacy for inclusion scores falling in the top third of all scores.

There was also an additional requirement of having indicated interest in being contacted for interview during the first phase of the research. 19 of the 66 participants indicated interest in being interviewed, though one did not complete the self-efficacy for inclusion questionnaire and so was discounted. Of these remaining 18, eight had scores above the mean (85.8) and 10 had scores below the mean. Of the 18 valid responses the top third were invited to be interviewed: a total of six participants. Of the six participants who were invited to interview, five accepted the invitation.

7.3 Participants

The five participants came from three schools. Three were full time class teachers, one was a part-time class teacher (three days) and part-time SENCo (two days) and the final participant was a full time SENCo. Table 14 below shows the demographics of each participant as well as their scores on the battery of questionnaires from the first stage of the research.
Using the quantitative results above as well as the demographic information on each of the participants confirmed for the second stage of research, a concept map was drawn up aiming to draw on themes that were similar and different between the five members of staff (see below).

This concept map was arrived at through visual analysis of the similarities and differences in the responses to the questionnaires by the five members of staff who were selected for interview. The questions (in purple) served to provide a base from which to develop the semi-structured interview schedule.
The questions from this concept map were used to develop a semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix A9 – Teacher Semi-Structured Interviews) which was checked for consistency by the research project supervisor. Two versions of the semi-structured interview were compiled to allow for the slight differences in role between the three class teachers and two SENCos. The two versions remained based on the concept map above and asked the same questions, reworded for each job role.
The interview schedule was used throughout the interviews to ensure the interviewees had answered each of the questions posed in the schedule. For the majority of the interviews this was a natural process, with interviewees adequately touching on each of the topics without being directly asked. At times it was used as a prompt to continue conversation and to ensure each question was covered.

7.4.1 Data collection

Participants were offered a number of interview slots and selected a time that would be most convenient to them. The interviews took place in each participant’s school. Each participant was able to provide a quiet space in which the interviews were conducted. Three interviews were conducted in school meeting rooms and the remaining two in classrooms. The interviews lasted around one hour each.

The interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder and were then transcribed into Microsoft Word. The final transcriptions were sent to each participant in order for them to raise any concerns - which none did.

7.5 Materials

The interview schedule was used to make sure the interview remained focused on the preselected topics. In addition to this, a digital voice recorder was used to record each interview.

Participants signed two copies of the consent form, one of which was kept by the participant and another by the researcher (see Appendix A11 – Interview Consent Form).
7.6 Procedure

Participants were given an overview of the research project and it was confirmed that they were still interested in being interviewed. The consent forms were signed and it was made clear to each participant that their interview would be recorded and transcribed.

At the beginning of each interview the participants were given feedback on their questionnaire scores and there was some discussion as to the context around each of the scores.

The interview schedule was then initiated, with participants free to respond to each question as they wished. The schedule was referred to in order to ensure each topic had been covered by the end of the interview. Notes were taken in addition to the recording so that particularly pertinent comments could be referenced in the analysis.

7.7 Data analysis procedure

The recordings from the interviews were transcribed into Microsoft Word using intelligent verbatim (see Appendix A12 – Example Transcript for an example). This meant that any unintelligent utterances (e.g. “er”, “um”) were omitted from the transcription.

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) model for thematic analysis was employed in order to analyse the transcriptions. This model has six phases which were repeated for each of the two rounds of analysis.

1. Familiarising yourself with your data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining and naming themes

6. Producing the report

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) model was chosen because it provided a structure and a method which enabled the raw interview data to be analysed whilst employing the researcher’s familiarity with the data. Braun and Clarke argue that their model of thematic analysis allows flexibility in the analysis of the data in a way that other methods, such as IPA or conversation analysis, do not. They argue that this is because thematic analysis is “essentially independent of theory and epistemology, and can be applied across a range of theoretical and epistemological approaches.” This approach, therefore, was consistent with the mixed methods methodology used in this research.

Before any analysis was done on the transcription data, the Word documents were read through and any additional notes taken during the interviews were considered alongside the transcription data. This familiarisation was useful in preparing for the initial generation of codes during the second phase.

The transcription data were then loaded into NVivo to be thematically analysed using the second phase of Braun and Clarke’s model.

From the initial transcription data, 29 nodes were identified which were reduced to 27 as two nodes (Assessment and Ofsted) only had one reference in them (see Appendix A13 – Initial Node Structure Report and Appendix A14 – Final Node Structure Report for raw data codes). These 27 nodes were then taken individually, and internally analysed using the third, fourth and fifth phases of Braun and Clark’s model.
These references identified in the second phase of the analysis were imported into Microsoft Word to identify the themes within the initial codes. Braun and Clarke’s model was employed a second time to identify these themes.

In order to address issues of trustworthiness and validity of the data analysis, the initial codes have been provided in the appendices. This shows the process of analysis from raw data to themes. In addition, the themes have been supported by extracts from each of the interviews so that it is clear throughout the presentation of the data where each extract originated from.

7.8 Ethics

7.8.1 Ethical approval and considerations

Ethics approval was sought from The University of Exeter prior to conducting this phase of the research. In seeking ethical approval, professional codes of conduct were taken into consideration including the BPS and HCPC.

7.8.1.1 Informed consent

Informed consent was ensured for all participants by giving them information about the study, the purpose of their involvement and how their data would be used. Consent was gained by way of a signed consent form (see Appendix A11 – Interview Consent Form). Participants were made aware of their right to withdraw their data at any time and were given contact details in order to do so.

7.8.1.2 Anonymity and confidentiality

Participants were also made aware that their data would be confidential, stored anonymously and not linked back to them individually or their school. Each participant’s number and school number was used to store the interviews so that the participant could be sent their transcript. This information was kept separately from the interview recordings and transcripts at all times.
No personal or individually traceable details were recorded on the transcriptions (see Appendix A12 – Example Transcript). Personal information was not shared or made public and the Local Authority in which the research took place retains anonymity.

### 7.8.2 Ethical procedures

As mentioned above, clear ethical procedures were taken in order to ensure informed consent, right to withdraw, anonymity and confidentiality were in place.

As per the ethical approval requirements, care was taken to ensure that any participant who found taking part in the interview harmful, detrimental or unreasonably stressful was supported to discontinue and offered a debrief session. None of the participants required this support.

The interviews were conducted in such a way as to be as value free as possible to allow participants to feel confident in sharing their genuine views. Some participants found the lack of feedback difficult to manage and so some gentle encouragement was needed in some cases.

Consideration was given to participants who may have special needs, however there was an expectation that the participants in this particular cohort would be able to respond to the interviews without the need for special arrangements due to the nature of their job. Additionally, interviews were conducted in the participants’ place of work and therefore any special arrangements would have been in place without the need for additional arrangements. To my knowledge, no participant was unfairly disadvantaged from engaging in the research.

Data analyses were carried out in NVivo and in such a way that the interview recordings and transcription files could not be linked back to any individual
participant or school. All electronic data were stored on a password protected computer and all hard copies in a locked cabinet unless being worked on.
Chapter 8 – Findings

8.1 RQ3

**RQ3**: What are the factors that teachers who have high self-efficacy for inclusion scores see as relevant to the inclusion of children with SEN?

Four factors were identified from the 27 nodes. These were teacher factors (seven nodes), school factors (seven nodes), inclusion factors (ten nodes) and external factors (three nodes). Any theme with fewer than 5 references was removed (See Appendix A15 – Secondary Data Analysis for theme and factor development.

8.1.2 Teacher factors

Seven sub-factors were related to teacher factors. These can be seen in the diagram below. From the top circle, feelings of being overwhelmed, in a clockwise direction the factors are organised in order of reference frequency. Teacher factors included themes that were related to the teacher, or teaching. In this sense, these themes were relevant to the individual. For example, the experiences of each participant before coming to teaching and what their individual teacher strategies for teaching children with SEN were.
Feelings of being overwhelmed:

Participants spoke of feeling overwhelmed in terms of feeling that there was an ever increasing amount of work to do that did not fit into the working day. They also spoke about the difficulty of maintaining a work/life balance and in fitting the job into the school day.

“You could happily give every hour of the day to working the job and you would still not even be nearly finished with it, so there’s no point.” (Participant 1)

“I can see more and more expectation being placed on us as time goes on.” (Participant 3)
“I think there is huge pressure on teachers to do an increasing amount and expect children to make increasing progress”. (Participant 4)

“Working in the evenings, working weekends and I’ve got two small children. It was just sort of chaos.” (Participant 4)

Impact of experience on current role:

The five participants brought to their role a wealth of experience. In total there was 72 years of teaching experience between the five participants ranging from three years to 23 years.

Two of the participants had not come straight into teaching and one had worked in education before completing a teaching qualification. This gave the participants a range of unique perspectives on teaching and including children with SEN. One participant had previously been an archaeologist, and another had worked in finance. The three others had worked in schools or education in various guises.

“Before I became a teacher I worked in a school with children with learning difficulties.” (Participant 3)

“I actually qualified as a secondary geography teacher.” (Participant 4)

Four of the participants had additional qualifications or roles within their school, these were also the most experienced teachers.

“Two years ago I did a Master’s in Education.” (Participant 3)

“I’ve been doing the SENCo role for seven years.” (Participant 4)

“I became a SENCo before the requirement for this qualification.” (Participant 2)

“I coordinate Autism across the school.” (Participant 1)
Participants were able to reflect on their experience and acknowledge what they brought to the role.

“I do have masses of experience.” (Participant 2)

“That was probably the most formative part of my career when I had to go into people’s homes and work with them. That was absolutely fascinating.”

(Participant 1)

“In the corporate world it’s all about how you communicate, how you get things done and how you work around somebody and say ‘that’s your strength, how am I going to use it to make it work?’” (Participant 5)

Teaching Strategies:

Participants identified specific methods and interventions including visual timetables, work stations, precision teaching and TEACCH method. They also identified the importance of ensuring the strategies chosen were the right ones.

Two participants identified the importance of planning, and matching the task to the child to ensure success.

“It’s your planning, it shows that you’ve thought about them.” (Participant 5)

“Really looking at really breaking down the tasks that he’s doing and making sure they’re achievable.” (Participant 4)

One teacher identified the importance of involving others in the teaching strategies they were using and the importance of the environment.

“Making sure all the NQTs are up to speed on things.” (Participant 1)

“It’s taken me years to get this room exactly as I want it.” (Participant 1)
Going beyond the role:

Two participants spoke of having to do things that were not the role of the teacher, or would not have been considered the teacher’s job “years ago”.

“You find yourself buying shoes and you find yourself providing breakfast.” (Participant 1)

“I’ve had a child in nappies this year and we’ve managed to toilet train him…. Toilet training a child, you know, but now all of a sudden it seems to be something that we’re having to take on.” (Participant 3)

“As it is every day I have to do OT [Occupational Therapy] with the whole class because I have so many children who need it but they don’t have access to it so I’m having to try and do some exercises with the whole class which wouldn’t have even been thought about years ago.” (Participant 3)

Motivation for working with children with SEN:

The biggest motivating factor for the participants was working with children with SEN. Participants offered different reasons why they came to the profession, but all were clear as to their particular interest in SEN.

“You have to understand children and what motivates them really, that’s what motivated my interest in Special Needs.” (Participant 1)

“It’s everything I do, really. It’s what drives me and it’s been my mission, really, from the word go. I had a statemented child in the very first class I taught and at that time it was quite unusual. That was 1993 so it was a bit unusual then.” (Participant 2)

“I love my job and I love that it’s different every day and that I do get to support these children.” (Participant 4)
“I think I made a very conscious choice when I moved into teaching and moved to teaching for a great number of reasons but a lot of it’s to do with children and my own personal experience with children.” (Participant 5)

Two of the participants identified a need to make a difference as motivating to them in their role.

“I’m very passionate about special needs. I'd like everybody to get it right, really. That's why. I just think our kids are getting a good deal but I still think there’s more that we can do. And I never think you should stop. Never rest on your laurels because there is more we can do, definitely. But, like I said, knowing it and acting on it are the things to do next. I'm proud of what we do. I am.” (Participant 2)

“I've gone in to teaching with a very different hat. With a very different vision of why I want to do teaching. When I applied for teacher training I had one goal in my mind and when I to my interview I had one goal and mine was inclusion.” (Participant 5)

**Doing things differently:**

Participants spoke about comparisons with other schools and a feeling of their school managing things differently, or better.

“I feel if other schools I'm dealing with might fall short of the mark I come away just thinking, 'Well, you know what, we do that at my school. I would make sure that happened. I'd make sure that a parent was in the loop. I'd make sure they were included.'” (Participant 2)

Another participant discussed the role she expected her TAs to take on and acknowledged that this may be different to how other teachers used their TAs.
“Obviously some of them when I first started were very experienced, they had to learn a different style, I think it’s hard for people when you come into the role and you’ve been in their job and you think ‘actually I wouldn’t do it that way’ so I’ve had to work around that.” (Participant 5)

This participant also commented on feeling that children might get differing levels of support throughout their time at school depending on who their next teacher was, or where they moved on to after primary school.

8.1.3 School factors

Six factors were related to school factors. These can be seen in the diagram below. From the top circle, support - receiving, in a clockwise direction the factors are organised in order of reference frequency. School factors were characterised by the participants’ experience of working within a school and the different elements of school communities. Topics such as teaching assistants, other children and the support networks that were available to them were discussed.
Working collaboratively with others:

Two Participants spoke of the wider team around them and working together. They discussed the importance of having others to work with and to share ideas with.

“I'll share it with them and see what they think about it,' because three or four heads are probably better than one.” (Participant 2)

Two of the participants identified that they felt they missed this aspect of support:

“I don’t really have a team of people where we sit around and talk about stuff and I think at a bigger school you do have that support.” (Participant 4)
“I think when you’re such an all-inclusive person in the classroom it’s hard to have that communication and that sort of discussion with somebody else who may have a different point of view.” (Participant 5)

This second quote captures the feelings of once participant who felt that they stood out from other teachers in terms of attitudes to inclusion and inclusive teaching. It was felt that there were peers around this participant, but that they held a different viewpoint and were therefore unavailable as points of support.

Having someone to talk, and acknowledging that talking to others was an acceptable and useful thing to do was another important aspect for two participants in particular.

“Every child is different and I don’t think I’ve ever come to a solution myself, ever, for all these children. It’s always been through conversations with people – ‘Have you tried...?’ ‘What about....?’” (Participant 1)

“I’ll come down to the staff room and will openly say, 'It's been a really difficult morning. X and Y have banged off. It’s been really difficult.' And that's when people just sit down and empathise, find humour in it, go back and start again, really.” (Participant 2)

The next quote identifies a participant who works closely with nurseries to support children transition into reception. The participant indicates that this is something that is initiated independently and adds to their own knowledge about the child and situation.

“Talking to nurseries helps you kind of prepare for everything.” (Participant 3)

The role of Teaching Assistants:
Four out of five of the participants identified the challenges of putting, often, the least qualified adults with the highest need children. One even questioned it.

“Is it all right to put your least qualified people with your most complex children?” (Participant 2)

The other comments also identified the dilemma, for example.

“You hire Teaching Assistants to come in and work with some really difficult children and the ones you end up hiring tend to be quite young and inexperienced actually, which always seems a bit like... actually, that’s sort of the flip way round because obviously, the most challenging child gets the most inexperienced TA.” (Participant 1)

Two of the participants, from the same school, identified the positives in their team of TAs.

“My perception of them is that they’re quite a high-performing bunch of people.” (Participant 2)

“They’re normally very educated and very motivated people who want to go on and be teachers.” (Participant 1)

Participants gave examples of what their TAs would be doing in the classroom environment. Two participants used the word “busy” to describe their TAs. TAs roles ranged from helping the class to “get their coats sorted” to specific interventions which included “phonics”, “social skills” and “precision teaching” as well as 1:1 support for individual children.

“She would take [child], my SD [Sensory Difficulties] girl, to the Sensory Room whilst [other TA] got the things ready for the next session.” (Participant 1)
Participants discussed what the purpose of TAs was and all agreed it was to support the children and make a difference to their attainment.

“Every minute you've got a TA in your room they're gainfully employed making a difference to a child across the board.” (Participant 2)

“They're there to educate the children and support them in whatever way they can to access the curriculum.” (Participant 3)

One participant commented on the financial aspect of employing TAs and how this needed to be justified in outcomes.

“We spend a lot of money on TAs. It's a big part of the budget that goes on it. They have to make a difference. And it's not just putting up a display they need to make a difference with. They need to make a difference with the children.” (Participant 2)

One participant also commented on the issue of dependency and how they manage to encourage independent in their children. This is a national issue and has been highlighted in research by Blatchford et al. (2007).

“We've always been careful about Velcro-ing a teaching assistant to a child because of that dependency that it creates.” (Participant 2)

We've recruited somebody and we've worked with her about gauging when she can step away. And actually that child in particular is saying, 'I'm starting to do a lot more stuff on my own. That's good, isn't it?' 'Yeah, yeah.' But he knows where she is as a bit of a safety net.” (Participant 2)

Participants made reference to “menial tasks” or “admin” and how this wasn't the role of the Teaching Assistant.
Two participants spoke about the relationship between the class teacher and the TAs. This was both in terms of the different roles undertaken in the class and how they worked together.

“I mean it’s not just me, it came down to the whole team that I worked with, and we all had a shared vision.” (Participant 5)

“Throughout the day working with different groups and different activities and we swap over the activities so one day I’ll do a writing task and she’ll do a maths task or guided reading and then we swap so I see it very much as an equal kind of thing.” (Participant 3)

**Offering support for SEN:**

Support was discussed in terms of who the support needed to be offered to. Participants identified various recipients, including parents, other teachers and the children themselves.

Participants talked about giving support to the parents of the children with SEN.

“I think those parents probably get a little bit more from me. I tend to be on first name terms with those parents because actually, they’re going to have to have a friend and they need a friend who they can ring up and talk to and have a chat with.” Participant 1

They also spoke of the support some of the children needed.

“I think it’s about working, in a school like this, where there is an awful lot of social need and you can be the only point of stability in these children’s lives.” (Participant 1)

The two SENCos and one of the teachers discussed the role they played in supporting other members of staff within the school.
“I will help you. I will help you at every stage, be it in the written stuff behind the scenes, target setting, paperwork that goes to parents. I’ll help you with all of that but I can also help you to implement programmes in the classroom.”

(Participant 2)

**The positive role of school senior management:**

Participants spoke of the management role the leadership played within their schools.

“We’ve got a very, very clear direction from the Leadership.” (Participant 1)

“I feel very confident that the leadership team absolutely is on board with the inclusion agenda.” (Participant 2)

They also discussed the support the leadership team were able to offer them.

“I feel like if it needs solving and something needs putting in place, if the money’s needs spending, if the training needs to happen, it happens and they’ll be no question about that. I have to justify it obviously but there would not be a problem with that at all.” (Participant 1)

“It makes a big difference in your job because if we don’t have that support we just feel really demoralised really you know it affects you, it knocks you.”

(Participant 3)

**Identification of SEN:**

Participants spoke of the importance of “identifying early need”. Two of the participants, who worked in reception and year one, commented on the role they played in the identification of children with SEN and how that fitted into their role within the school.
“We do tend to kind of spot a lot quite early on in here.” [in reception]  
(Participant 3)

“What are you doing? Why aren’t you raising this?’ because actually, he’s going to go to the next class and somebody’s going to spot this and then they’re going to turn round to me and go, ‘Hold on a minute. Did you not notice this one?’” (Participant 1)

These two participants also commented on the sorts of signs they might be looking for if they were worried about a child.

“Behaviour is communication.” (Participant 1)

“I’ve got concerns over a child with dyslexia right now but you pick things up as you go.” (Participant 3)

The role of the other children in the class:

Two participants commented on the role the other children took in their classrooms when there was a child with SEN. They spoke about acceptance and tolerance from the other children.

“There are different expectations on some children and behaviourally as well but we’re very open with the other children. It’s like, ‘Actually sometimes, so and so is learning how to X and we need to help’ and the children are great at that. They want to help.” (Participant 1)

“It’s been about educating the rest of the children about being tolerant.”  
(Participant 2)
8.1.4 Inclusion factors

Ten factors were related to inclusion factors. These can be seen in the diagram below. From the top circle, action, in a clockwise direction the factors are organised in order of frequency. Inclusion factors consider aspects that impact inclusion within schools and also those factors that are pertinent to the inclusion of pupils with SEN. For example, many participants had examples of children with SEN who they had previously taught who they were able to talk about in detail. These children seemed to personalise the process of inclusion for them and gave them case-studies to return to with their current class of children. Participants also offered definitions of inclusion and discussed both positive and negative outcomes.

Figure 6: Inclusion factors
Actions that support inclusive classrooms:

The participants talked about the importance of the physical element of inclusion and the importance of children with SEN being present in the classroom. They discussed their feelings on withdrawing pupils from lessons versus including them within the classroom.

“We desperately try to get her to be in this classroom as much as possible, just to be around her peers because what I don’t want for her is to be different and to feel she’s different.” (Participant 1)

“I’m not a big fan of withdrawing children from class, it depends what you’re withdrawing them for, if it’s a child that can’t cope or a child’s behaviour or it depends really. I’m not a big fan because you’re not really handling them, if you take them out of the classroom you’re not teaching them skills that they need to kind of access.” (Participant 3)

“I try to always have the group in my class, where luckily I’ve got a little corner, and it’s still within the same lesson.” (Participant 5)

One participant acknowledged that withdrawal from class was sometimes the most appropriate thing to do for some children.

“I’ve got a little girl at the moment who gets very distracted very easily because of the noise levels in the classroom and I know she’s got a lot of potential to do well but she’s not showing it to me in the classroom. So if I want her to show me something she can do we will take her out and work on a one to one basis with her outside the classroom. So I think in that kind of situation to give her the opportunity to kind of show what she’s capable of and take her away from the distractions that are in here I don’t think that’s such a problem.” (Participant 3)
They also spoke about differentiation in various guises. This quote refers to a child who required work to be differentiated. The participant spoke of the work not being the same because that would be unfair, and setting the child up to fail. The participant speaks of differentiation as sometimes being ‘different’ and that being OK.

“It’s not necessarily the same because that wouldn’t be fair on her. It wouldn’t be fair to ask her to do the same. Actually, that is completely the opposite of inclusive; that is just highlighting her to be different, in my mind, and she’s being set up to fail and that’s not fair.” (Participant 1)

“I don’t see any reason why, even if you’re working at a Year 2 and Year 3 level – that is not a bar to them being in that classroom. That’s not an issue. That’s just an academic thing and we’re all skilled enough here to put something in place for them to do which will bring them on in their targets.” (Participant 1)

“I think if a child is in school and in your classroom then you have a responsibility to as much as possible make sure that you have differentiated the work effectively.” (Participant 4)

Participants also talked about how they engaged other people in their actions to support the inclusion of children with SEN.

“It was about educating everybody else as well to understand disability, whether it be physical disability or whether it be something to do with your learning or your emotional state. It’s about getting everybody else to understand.” (Participant 2)
“We do quite a bit of transition and so if we know that we’ve got a child we do extra transition meetings with the nursery and any other agencies involved if we know we’ve got a child that’s already been flagged up.” (Participant 3)

One of the SENCos noted that there was always room for improvement.

“We’re looking at an action plan in order to monitor it in a better way because I don’t think we’ve got it nailed yet.” (Participant 2)

The limitations of inclusion:

Participants spoke of limits to the inclusion of children with SEN. One teacher commented.

“Sometimes there are things that cannot be done in this classroom.” (Participant 1)

Participants also talked about the limits of inclusions in terms of children with SEN being more appropriately placed in alternative provision. This was always in terms of the mainstream school having done as much as it possibly could, and alternative provision being the last option.

“There’s been some where we have had to admit that actually this child’s needs exceed our expertise. So with the best will in the world there are some mainstream children whose learning needs and their emotional needs can just exceed your abilities.” (Participant 2)

“If, after you’re throwing a one-to-one, you’re throwing the best differentiation, alternative curriculum, providing a new space, lunch time clubs, working with parents and it’s still not working, then it’s not right and it’s just not. That’s the time to say, ‘Right, we need to find somewhere else where you can be successful and move on’.” (Participant 1)
It was suggested that an immediate barrier to inclusion would be violent or dangerous behaviour.

“I guess the one thing which can never allow inclusion... which would automatically stop being in my room, is if you were a danger to other children. That would always stop it and it has to.” (Participant 1)

“It was clear that we can’t have people threatened and I think that’s the biggest one for me really.” (Participant 1)

Two of the participants also spoke about weighing up the impact on the remaining children in the class.

“I can’t spend all my time working with those two children and I’m not going to because that wouldn’t be fair.” (Participant 1)

“Understanding where the critical point is and about the other children’s entitlement as well.” (Participant 2)

**Measuring the success of including children with SEN:**

Participants discussed what the features might be of a successful outcome might be. One participant spoke of the aspects of achieving that were not academically focused.

“Because you don’t always have to achieve academically first, you do, but you have to build other skills as well.” (Participant 5)

Another commented on how it was difficult to assess how successful a child had been because of the long-term aspect of success.

“It’s quite hard to say, ‘It was successful’ because actually, you’re looking way into the future.” (Participant 1)
One of the participants explained her “ultimate aim” for the inclusive practice in the school.

“I hope if you wandered round I hope that you would not spot those children in each of the rooms. That’s my ultimate aim is that they’re not obvious to the naked eye the children who struggle, because they should blend in with everybody else. Their needs should be being met so well that they look like any other child.” (Participant 2)

However, there was still an acceptance that one outcome of inclusion might be a move to a special school.

“There’s definitely a place in mainstream for a lot of children but I think it depends on the child, I think there’s definitely a need for special schools as well.” (Participant 3)

**Vignettes of past/current pupils with SEN who have impacted practice:**

In total there were 25 individual descriptions of children with SEN that the participants had taught previously or currently. The descriptions highlighted how well participants knew their pupils. Some were descriptions of the pupils themselves, and others of situations which the participants recalled.

“I’ve got a little girl – she’s a little pickle – she’s tricky. She’s almost profoundly deaf, she’s got a whole load of syndromes, mobility issues and she has also got a little bit of Avoidance Disorder going on there as well.” (Participant 1)

“We had a little girl, profoundly deaf, cerebral palsy so using a walker. She had difficulty swallowing because of the cerebral palsy. And one of the requirements was that for her lunch she needed her food with some sort of sauce, be it a gravy or a ketchup or something like that. And I remember staff
coming to me saying, 'The kitchen aren't prepared to give her a bottle of ketchup or put gravy with her food.' I was like, 'Right, we'll see about that.' And it was unusual because it was so different from the rest of the culture. It was dealt with and it was changed overnight but it was about working with those people and just saying, 'It's such a little thing to do just to buy a bottle of ketchup. And if it's a problem we'll get it out of our budget. Don't worry about the funding of it. It's the principal of it.” (Participant 2)

“I've got a child this year who just got diagnosed with Autism who couldn't sit down straight away he was just all over the place, he's also slightly sensory in that he seeks a lot of movement.” (Participant 3)

“Another child we had there were huge issues at school around his sibling and behaviour and Dad was dyslexic and Mum had struggles with Dad's dyslexia and therefore her son's dyslexia and what that meant in terms of job prospects for him and aspirations for her son and that definitely he felt that so it wasn't just the dyslexia for him.” (Participant 4)

“We've got a very good example now of a child in year two who although she's very bright, is hugely struggling with attachment from Mum and socially she's struggling and I would put my money on it that it stems from poor communication skills back in Year R and her self-esteem and her ability to communicate well with her peers and it's had a knock on effect.” (Participant 4)

The challenges of inclusion:

Participants commented on what the biggest challenges were to including children with SEN. Several comments focused on the challenges that the children themselves brought to teaching.
“Actually they are the people that colleagues find more difficult to teach.”

(Participant 2)

“Well I suppose in year four, some of the needs where you think it’s so embedded in the child so what can you do to really move that child on?”

(Participant 5)

Participants also spoke of the budget constraints within schools.

“I don't have money to do that, I don't have funding to do that, I don't have the time to do that.” (Participant 4)

“Firstly it’s obviously financial support because obviously you can’t do it all and you don’t have enough people to do the things that you want to do.” (Participant 5)

Support agencies were also mentioned as challenges in including children with SEN, particularly around waiting lists.

“There’s a huge waiting list for OT, there’s a huge waiting list for speech and language.” (Participant 3)

“When you refer someone and you’re cross that you’ve got to wait a long time.”

(Participant 5)

**Getting to know the child:**

There was a strong theme of participants recognising that they needed to take the time to get to know a child before they could tailor support towards their needs. The following quotes illustrate how each participant would go about getting to know the children in their class with SEN.
“It’s looking at them individually, kind of keeping on top of where they are in their learning so it’s observations, you know making sure that you know those children really well so you know where to take them next and what they need…. Especially with children with SEN if you really know that child and you can see any changes in behaviour or anything you can kind of accommodate, yeah I think it’s just really knowing the children.” (Participant 3)

“It’s knowing your job and knowing the children. I think a good teacher knows the children. When you know your children then you can include them. If you’ve spent the time to know them then you know what the needs are so then your teaching becomes better because everybody’s included.” (Participant 5)

Participants also commented on the individual teaching a child with SEN would need in order to make progress.

“I think every child is so individual and at this school and most schools I think, there’s no blanket approach. It has to be tailored to that child, how we deal with that particular child.” (Participant 1) “Every child should be individually taught, basically every child should be taught for their own personal style.” (Participant 4)

“So it’s about catering for the needs of an individual within the whole class so that - you can teach one way and you hope that children learn but if there are some children that are not learning in the way that you're teaching you need to work hard to find the way that they learn and you need to make adaptations in order for them to be able to access what you're teaching and you have to work very hard to do that.” (Participant 2)

Inclusion is good for everyone:
Participants commented that often supporting children with SEN did not require doing anything special or additional.

“It always seems quite straightforward to me and people sort of say, ‘That’s really good’ but actually, it just seems like really common sense to me…. It’s like a little tapestry of all the obvious things.” (Participant 1)

“And we do the same with the SEN children and all children when they first come to school…. “We’re accountable for every child that we teach in this class.” (Participant 3)

It was also noted that approaches used for supporting the inclusion of children with SEN wouldn’t harm the learning of others.

“It doesn’t hurt any child to use those approaches, so they’re good approaches to have.” (Participant 1)

There was also a feeling that supporting children with SEN was “part of the job”.

“I think the best teachers are the teachers who do understand SEN.” (Participant 2)

“Every teacher is a teacher of SEN.” (Participant 4)

**What does inclusion mean?**

Participants were asked directly what inclusion meant to them. Their answers fell broadly into three themes.

Two of the participants felt that inclusion had to be within the same mainstream class.

“Trying to provide the best possible education in a school setting in the same classroom.” (Participant 1)
“I think they owe it to the child to be able to educate that child in a mainstream class in the right way.” (Participant 2)

Participants discussed the importance of ensuring the curriculum was accessible to everyone in their class.

“For me it’s trying to make the environment and the learning process as accessible and as equal to everybody right across the board. That’s your job as a teacher to try and make it more accessible to that child, regardless of need.” (Participant 2)

“It means helping all children to access the curriculum and kind of like your teaching and learning kind of fits in with what that child needs so it’s kind of adapting the environment or the learning to help support that child to access the learning curriculum.” (Participant 3)

“It’s that fair access that every child matters. And even if it’s going to be difficult, if you’ve got to plan ten ways, plan ten ways, if you’ve got to print a picture for one child and do something else for another, you’ve got to do it, you’ve got to give them a fair go.” (Participant 5) They also commented on creating a level playing field for children with SEN in their class.

“It’s how to include that child so that they are blissfully unaware of the things that they find difficult so they don’t have a hang-up about it.” (Participant 2)

“That every child, no matter what their difficulty is, is able to engage in every activity that’s going on and by engage I suppose I mean actually understand what’s going on for it to be appropriate level for them to be able to achieve the activity. It might be achieving the activity with support, it might be a challenge for them, but that’s inclusion.” (Participant 4) “That every child is given a fair go
in the classroom, regardless of if the child has an SEN need or not an SEN need or if a child’s vulnerable.” (Participant 5)

Experience of exclusion:

Participants offered examples of when they felt inclusion had been unsuccessful or when they had experience exclusion of children with SEN. This was identified as being due to the culture of the school or individuals within schools.

“They don’t really come into our school. They should probably go somewhere else.” [As said by a previous manager.] (Participant 1)

“She used to describe some of our children who were living in impoverished circumstances, she used to come and say, ‘They’re just dirty and horrible,’ and it was the most abhorrent thing she could have said, really.” (Participant 2)

One participant commented on a parent’s concern of her child’s SEN needs within the wide context of society.

“The thing is, if he has a diagnosis of autism, how will he ever become an American Air Force pilot?” (Participant 1)

The responsibilities associated with inclusion:

Participants identified how responsible they felt for including children with SEN. There was one comment about it being “my responsibility”, and another which spoke about it being “everyone’s responsibility”.

“Yeah, it is my responsibility to get it right.” (Participant 2)

“It’s everyone that works with the child in school, if it’s the class teacher or even the playground supervisor or the dinner ladies.” (Participant 5)
There were also comments on the enormity of the task, and being realistic about the limits of responsibility.

“It is a big responsibility, it’s a big responsibility to have any child but I think well even more so with a child with SEN because you’ve got to help them access the curriculum but you’ve also got to support them in lots of other ways and support their parents usually as well and I think that’s a big responsibility.” (Participant 3)

“I can’t do it all. I’ve also got to be realistic about what can be done.” (Participant 5)

8.1.5 External factors

Three factors were related to external factors. These can be seen in the diagram below. From the top circle, parents/parenting, in a clockwise direction the factors are organised in order of frequency. External factors were considered to be anything outside of the teacher or school’s control. Parents, outside agencies and the impact of training (as often offered by outside agencies e.g. Educational Psychologists, the Local Authority or private training companies).
Parents/Parenting:

Parents were mentioned throughout the interviews. A lack of support from parents was cited as making things “difficult”.

“How the parents support you often has a huge impact on then how they get on, how they respond to the support, with some parents, some children we’ve found we’ve put support in place, parents have not been supportive, it just doesn’t work so then the situation doesn’t get better and then you're left with a situation where a child isn't making progress but it all has a slightly, if it's around behaviour particularly that it's affecting their progress and you feel that everything you put in place on the day actually is having little impact because it's lost when they go home.” (Participant 4)
“My doubts have come from the fact that there’s not much support at home so whatever I do in school is almost disbanded at home because there’s lots of family problems.” (Participant 5)

This sat alongside participants who discussed the nature of the relationship with parents.

“I think it’s really important that the parents are involved as well and that we communicate with them but they need to be helping us too, there needs to be a two way, we need to be on the same page really because it’s very difficult when you don’t have that.” (Participant 3)

“It is a job where it’s very emotive for parents, you get often people getting very upset with you understandably, sometimes getting cross with you about what provision you can’t give or haven’t given and very seldom do you get someone coming and saying thank you.” (Participant 4)

Participants also commented on the difficulty some parents had in accepting that their child had SEN.

“The parents came in and they absolutely refused to accept that anything was different about this child, which is completely their right but what I always felt was really sad was we got completely railroaded by parents.” (Participant 1)

“You’ve got to] “understand what the parent might be going through and how they might perceive that, whether it's that they haven't spotted it or that they’ve spotted it and they’re struck with grief about it, because that can happen, particularly with our deaf pupils. That’s not what the parent thought they were getting when they were expecting their little baby and they’ve got a deafness
that will be lifelong. And so there is that trying to work with parents on all of that.” (Participant 2)

There were also comments about taking care not to blur the lines between parenting and teaching.

“You can’t be their parent. You can’t. I’m not their parent and I’m not.” (Participant 1)

“I have to be just really objective and not get emotionally drawn in to it because I’m not mum or dad. I’ve just got to protect him in a way where I can’t take over their role. It’s the danger of once you become like mum, they all look up to you that way but then it’s hard to move on to the next teacher.” (Participant 5)

There were also positive and negative comments about the impact parents could have on the inclusion of their children who had SEN.

“Mum was really on board which had a huge effect.” (Participant 3)

“His son has got Spina Bifida and he’s at state school but because his mum is highly supportive of the system and she works very closely with the school and that’s how it’s managed.” (Participant 5)

“Sometimes, people don’t talk to their children.” (Participant 1)

“So it could turn bad if the parents don’t turn things around.” [Participant 2 discussing a family where the children could be taken into care.]

**External Agencies:**

There was a sense of frustration from some of the participants around difficulties with external agencies.
[We] “Refer them to Speech and Language and they’ve not met the criteria.” (Participant 4)

“There’s a huge waiting list for OT, there’s a huge waiting list for speech and language.” (Participant 3)

“Local authority! Local authority and government and particularly at the moment. I think, particularly at the moment, the current climate is a really difficult one to work in. So government changes a system, which I know had some glitches in it but, for the most part, it was all right. And they changed it to a system, which I think they intended for it to be more transparent for parents and more child centred and those are very, very laudable principles to start from. I get that. But then in the hands of differently local authorities and different groups working on it it’s turned into a system which is sort of like the statementing process only a little bit worse.” (Participant 2)

There was also a sense of support that came from the external agencies.

[EP] “Was lovely because she came and sometimes we just had a chat about stuff.” (Participant 4)

“That was when [EP] was involved and I think that really made me think that actually I do know a lot of things that I could do to help this child.” (Participant 5)

“Quite often the speech language therapist and I strongly agree.” (Participant 3)

“The local authority SEN conference they have every year, we’ve got one coming up in February, is great, really good. We rave about that because the speakers that they get there are very, very good. Very inspirational and it’s not about top tips for teachers. It’s about the theory behind these things and that’s what you need.” (Participant 2)
Training:

Participants discussed the practical applications of training that they had attended.

“The theory’s great but actually getting it into the practical aspects in the classroom is the main thing.” (Participant 1)

“The biggest impact are the ones where you can actually see how it would impact on your practice so it’s relevant to your kind of situation. It’s all very well giving the theory but what it’s how it’s going to work and the most effective is how they show that, providing ideas and support that way I think.” (Participant 3)

[Specialist teacher] “Did come and do a whole session with the TAs on using the interventions in the classroom using what they'd learned in the intervention back in the classroom…” (Participant 4)

“I learnt a lot from that and I think it’s just helped me look at how I do things and how I actually think about how people think and how children think.” (Participant 5)

Research and theory was also mentioned when talking about training.

“I go to the conference, that sparks something, I come back, I do lots of reading about it which makes me think. So I tend to pick up on my practice then and then I feedback to people.” (Participant 1)

“Often quite theory-based things, not necessarily the strategies because I think I should be all right on those.” (Participant 2)

Participants also discussed the impact of training, particularly depending on the cohort of children being taught at that time.
“I do think it has an impact, I don’t know sometimes how long the impact is and I think you have to keep revisiting it.” (Participant 4)
Chapter 9 – Discussion

9.1 Summary of findings and links to the literature

**RQ3:** What are the factors that teachers who have high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores see as relevant to the inclusion of children with SEN?

This discussion will consider the qualitative data that have been produced from the five interviews undertaken. It will first consider the data overall, then look at the four identified broad factors. It will then consider how the responses by the individual participants fit into the bigger picture of the data and how these link to wider literature. It will conclude with a discussion of some of the strengths and limitations of this phase of the research and consider what future directions might be taken in this line of research.

9.1.1 Overall data

The initial interpretation of the data analyses following the methods of Braun and Clarke (2006), who suggested a six stage model of thematic analysis starting with familiarising yourself with the data, was the high level of knowledge and interest the participants had in the children they were talking about. As a construct this was been hard to capture, and although vignettes of current/past pupils with SEN who had impacted inclusive practice came up as one of the higher frequency nodes, it was not as high as some of the other factors.

Participants were able to give in-depth, historical accounts of children they had taught or supported many years ago. They also displayed an ongoing knowledge of these children, even after they had left their class or the school. One participant spoke of a child who she had taught in her first year of teaching, over twenty years ago, as the inspiration for her current role. Another discussed
a child who had been in their year one class six years ago, who was now finishing their time in primary school. There was a clear narrative from this participant as to how this child had progressed through the school and the successes and challenges they had faced along the way. Another participant recalled a child she had taught who was now competing at Olympic standard. Again, this participant had kept up to date with the events that had unfolded in this young person’s life and was clearly proud of their achievements. These stories have been hard to capture as a concrete themes within the findings, but they form an important basis to the thematic analysis and further discussion below.

Another interpretation from this stage was the extent to which these five participants went beyond their role. All but one of the participants had an additional role within school. These included being the lead for Autism or the school SENCo and therefore they weren’t just doing the basic teaching role. This came out strongly within the thematic analysis; that these participants took on additional roles, jobs and duties and that this contributed positively to their inclusive teaching practice. There was one participant (participant 5) who did not have an additional role within their school and this was the one participant for whom there was a strong sense that they went above and beyond in their role, to the point that they made comments throughout the interview about being told not to do so much.

It is therefore fair to conclude that these five participants were busy, active members of their schools and fully committed to all the children they taught. This is further evidenced in their engagement in this research. There is also strong support for this from their initial questionnaire data which identified these participants as having high self-efficacy scores for inclusive teaching. As was
shown in phase one, these self-efficacy scores for inclusive teaching are highly correlated with self-efficacy for general teaching which would suggest that the five participants were confident, competent teachers who took challenges in their stride rather than seeing them as hurdles they were unable to overcome.

9.1.2 Teacher factors

The high response rate of five out of the six participants who were re-contacted to be interviewed is a testament to the enthusiasm of the participants who took part in this study. There was no requirement to volunteer at the initial questionnaire data collection phase or to continue to agree to be interviewed when invited. This is particularly pertinent given that ‘feelings of being overwhelmed’, one of the teacher factors, was one of the highest frequency themes.

It would therefore be fair to say that these teachers engaged in an additional, non-compulsory interview despite identifying feelings of being overwhelmed because of their work load.

The participants also spoke of their experience and motivation for entering the profession and there was a sense of reflection on what they were able to bring to the role. This fed into the teaching strategies that they drew on; identifying that their experience enabled them to have a selection of strategies to use with pupils who needed additional support. All but one of the participants held a specialism within their school and this was spoken about in terms of what they were able to bring to teaching and including pupils with SEN. There was also a sense of the participants going above and beyond their role, and of doing things differently to other teachers or other schools.
Feelings of being overwhelmed are discussed below in greater detail as it was a key topic on which the participants spoke.

9.1.2.1 Feelings of being overwhelmed

Teacher stress is a much talked about concept and researchers have discussed teaching in terms of being a highly stressful career (Al-Fudail and Mellar, 2008). There are regularly media articles which discuss the teaching profession, often in a negative light. Research suggests that within five years 50% of newly qualified teachers have left the profession (Haigh, 2015). A recent Guardian article (Lightfoot, 2016) identifies that 43% of teachers are planning to leave the profession within the next five years. This article also reports that 98% of teachers identify as being under “increasing pressure” and 82% feel they have an “unmanageable” workload. It reports that over 75% of teachers “are working between 49 and 65 hours a week” and that this is having a “serious impact on their physical and mental health.”

Within the interview data ‘feelings of being overwhelmed’ was the teacher factor which had the highest number of codes attached to it. The overall feeling from the interview responses was that this was an accepted and inevitable aspect of the job. The participants offered examples of how stress affected them and how they were able to overcome it.

Of the five participants, two participants had high scores on the Burnout scale indicating that they were identifying high emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation and low levels of personal accomplishment. (Maslach, 1997). One of these shared that the stress they encountered in their job had an impact on their physical wellbeing, the other identified that they had completed the questionnaire at a particularly stressful point in the term. A further two of the
participants had low Burnout scores and the responses from these two participants particular felt calmer and more measured. They both shared the importance of social networks in helping them de-stress and this seemed to be an important element for both of these participants. The final participant had a medium burnout score. This was an experienced member of staff within their school and it felt that some of their frustration, and cause of stresses, had come from the more recent changes in SEN legislation which were causing uncertainty not just for their role within the school but within the local authority as well.

The participants offered many ways in which they helped themselves to de-stress including running, exercise classes, wine, socialising and making use of their peer networks. The feeling from the overall data were that participants had a good insight into their current stress levels and that they were taking steps to reduce their stress where they could.

9.1.3 School factors

The factors which came up as important to participants in terms of the schools in which they worked mapped onto the variables from the school climate questionnaire. Participants indicated that peer support was important to them, as was the focus and support from the leadership team. In addition, participants spoke regularly of teaching assistants and how they were utilised within the classroom.

There was an understanding that TAs should not exclusive work with the lowest ability children. This is supported by research by Blatchford, Russell, Bassett, Brown, and Martin (2007) which indicates that TAs do not necessarily increase educational outcomes for children. However, this research does conclude that
having a TA supporting in the classroom increases “pupils’ and teachers’ attention to work.” This research indicated that teachers felt that TAs were a supportive addition to the classroom. Participants spoke of TAs as being educated, motivated and high-performing. They indicated that they were always busy running groups, individual interventions or supporting children in class. The assertion that TAs were educated would give support to the Government’s 2003 School Workforce publication which aimed to improve access to training and support for school support staff. However, Blatchford et. al’s (2007) research suggests that training or experience did not have any impact on the effectiveness of TAs.

9.1.4 Inclusion factors

These codes were concerned with the impact inclusion has on the participants. One of the criticisms from the Ofsted (2010) review of SEND was that there was a difference in support ‘on paper’ and in reality. Research by Lifschiz and Glaubmam (2002), Soodak et al. (1998), Gibsen and Denbo (1984) and Bandura (1997) would suggest that more confident teachers, those with higher self-efficacy, are more competent teachers of children with SEN.

It is therefore plausible to suggest that the five participants, with higher self-efficacy scores, are more competent teachers of SEN and that therefore their inclusive actions may be likely to be more successful in including children with SEN. All participants, as was required by the sampling had above average self-efficacy for inclusion scores. In addition to this, all except one of the participants also held high self-efficacy for general teaching scores. This suggests that there is indeed an overlap in self-efficacy for general teaching and self-efficacy for inclusive teaching within this group of participants.
All but one of the participants’ teaching experience post-dates the Salamanca Statement (1994) and so they all entered teaching when inclusion was to be considered the norm. The one participant who has experience longer than this is likely to have been trained around 1994. In her interview she comments on having a child with a statement in her first class as a teacher and the rarity of this. In fact, she cites this as one of her motivations for being more interested in SEN and inclusion.

All the participants gave examples of how they included children with SEN in their class and these examples included differentiating appropriately for the child’s learning needs, supporting mental health and wellbeing, using visual approaches to supporting learning and providing children with resources such as Theraputty, wobble cushions and raised writing tables. The participants gave numerous positive examples of how they had included children with SEN successfully in the mainstream setting and the long term outcomes for these children.

Research (Ylonen and Norwich, 2013) would suggest that teachers’ concepts of inclusion mirror Ofsted’s definition of an inclusive approach; having a supportive and caring environment. As discussed above, the interviews leave no doubt that the participants in this research were providing a supportive and caring environment to all the children they taught. However, other research (Norwich, 2013) questions the distinction between inclusion as “all children under the same roof” or “including all children in the common education enterprise of learning wherever they learn best” (Warnock, 2005). Certainly the participants’ views in this research would suggest that inclusion did include withdrawal and relocation to specialist settings.
The participants were unanimously agreed that there was a role for withdrawing children from the class to support their learning, and that there was also a limit to how far inclusion could go before a child would benefit from alternative, specialist, provision.

There were largely two reasons offered for why a child would benefit from specialist provision; because they were no longer able to access the mainstream environment, either because their needs become too great or their mental health becomes a concern; or if they are considered a risk or danger to the safety of the other children.

9.1.5 External factors

There were far fewer external factors mentioned throughout the interviews. External factors were coded as anything that was outside the control of the school. Parents were talked about, often with negative connotations, as were external agencies.

Training was also discussed and participants made the assertion that training was often applied to quite specific circumstances and not always generalised. This meant that repeat training on similar topics was requested for a new class or year group. In terms of applications to the role of the educational psychologist this is key and will be discussed later. It perhaps ties in to the importance of teachers who are successful at including children with SEN in their class knowing the individual children well.

One of the themes that came out of the interview data to do with external agencies was the confusion and uncertainty that the new SEN Code of Practice had created. This was referenced as not only being a difficulty within the schools, but that multi-agency professionals and the local authority were also
unclear on policies and procedures. There was a sense of frustration, particularly from the SENCos that they had got used to one way of working that had been pulled out from under their feet.

The comments about parents were interesting in that they were broadly negative in their connotations. There was a suggestion that some parents were not as supportive as the school would like them to be. There also was an understanding of the emotional impact that having a child with SEN had on a family and a narrative created around the importance of being able to engage with parents and having a positive relationship with them.

9.1.5.1 Ofsted

Ofsted was removed from the original 29 codes as it only had one reference in. In over six hours of interview data Ofsted was mentioned by just one of the participants. This is despite ‘feelings of being overwhelmed’ being the most referenced teacher factor. There was no link made between Ofsted the high levels of stress that the teachers were indicating they felt. In other words, Ofsted was not named as the cause of stress.

9.2 Concluding thoughts on the interview data

The concluding thoughts from the overall interview data were that the participants, who were chosen for their high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching, focused on planning, differentiation and individual attention. They also held some specialist knowledge, and knew where to go if they didn’t have the knowledge they needed.

They were also school staff who were either able to manage stress because they felt supported by their school environment, peers and leadership team or they were school staff who were not stressed. This distinction seemed to be
linked to availability of external sources of support (e.g. social networks, stress relieving activities or expert knowledge).

One aspect of teaching that was not discussed was the challenge of catering to a wide range of abilities within one class. Participants spoke of inclusive teaching strategies as being beneficial to all pupils. One reason for this, discussed in more detail below, is the years in which the participants taught. Research by Ashton and Webb (1986) would suggest that teachers with high self-efficacy for inclusive practice have pupils with higher academic performance levels. The discussion around inclusive teaching tactics being beneficial for all pupils is supported by Ashton and Webb’s research. In other words, teachers with high self-efficacy, who are more competent teachers of SEN and who put in place more inclusive teaching strategies, also have pupils who perform higher in terms of academic performance.

In terms of the literature on self-efficacy for inclusive practice; Sharma et al. (2012) identified three factors – inclusive instruction; collaboration; and managing disruptive behaviours. There was a sense from the participants that inclusive teaching strategies often came with experience and that this was the case for collaboration and managing behaviour too. Sharma and Sokal (2015) additionally identified ‘concerns’ as a key predictor of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

9.3 Strengths and limitations of phase two

One of the clearest limitations to this study is the small numbers of participants who were interviewed. Whilst this means that generalisation to a wider cohort of school staff is not possible the results are nevertheless an interesting insight into the teaching practices of five highly confident, and competent, teachers.
Despite the small numbers of participants, of the six participants contacted to be interviewed five responded and were subsequently interviewed. This represents a high response rate and is suggestive of similarly high response rates should the research be conducted on a wider cohort of school staff.

Linked to the small number of participants is the limited number of schools that the participants came from. In total the five participants came from three schools. In some ways it is not surprising that four of the participants who had both the highest self-efficacy scores and indicated interest in interviews came from just two schools. It is possible that schools who embrace engagement in research were more likely to respond positively to being interviewed.

Despite this, the three schools were set in relatively different contexts. One school had over 450 pupils with 43.5% of its student population eligible for FSM and with 12.6% of pupils on the SEN register. Another was similarly sized, but with 9.8% pupils eligible for FSM and 7.9% of pupils on the SEN register. The third much smaller with just over 200 pupils of whom 3.4% were eligible for FSM and 2.9 were on the SEN register. All three were primary schools, as opposed to infant or junior schools, with classes ranging from reception to year six.

One of the additional limitations of this research is that the participants worked largely in KS1, or younger years. This meant that pupils who might require activities to challenge, or stretch, them at the other end of the spectrum were not given such consideration by the participants. Inclusive teaching strategies were seen as positive for all pupils in the class rather than a trade-off for engaging pupils who were extremely bright.

The data collection and analysis used in this phase of the research were intended to provide an illumination of the quantitative data gathered in phase
one. Every effort was taken to reduce researcher bias by supporting the
interviewees to respond openly and honestly. The analysis was based on Braun
and Clarke's (2006) model in order to provide a structure for the analysis. The
codes generate were led by the data, but broadly fitted into the topics that had
been drawn up in the concept map.

The qualitative analysis had its challenges as it was hoped that the voice of the
participants would come out through the research without researcher
subjectivity or bias. There was also a sense of responsibility for writing the
participants’ story as they told it rather than restructured into previously set
factors.
Chapter 10 – Overall Discussion

10.1 Summary of conclusions

10.1.1 Phase one

The data from the first phase of this research was conducted via questionnaires and analysed for the prediction of inclusive teaching self-efficacy. 66 questionnaires were completed by members of staff from a range of primary schools.

The first questionnaire focused on demographics factors which research had indicated could be predictive of self-efficacy scores. The analysis found that just one demographic factor, years teaching experience, was found to be correlated with, or predictive of, self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. This is in contrast to Romi and Leyser (2006) who found that the age and gender of the participants was also predictive of their inclusive attitudes or self-efficacy scores.

The data would suggest that a perceived positive school climate does correlate significantly with self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores which is consistent with Soodak et al. (1998) and Fritz and Muller (1995) who identified that a positive school climate was predictive of general teaching self-efficacy.

The findings also suggest that affective and behavioural aspects of attitudes to inclusion are significantly correlated with self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. This means that participants who felt and acted more positively about inclusion also held higher self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores.

The first phase of the research also investigated the relationship between burnout and self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. Two aspects of burnout (Maslach et al., 2001) were significantly correlated. Depersonalisation was...
negatively correlated suggesting the teachers who have high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching were less likely to depersonalise the children with whom they worked. Personal accomplishment was also significantly correlated, which as a similar measure of efficacy is a relatively predictable result. This would broadly fit with research which suggests that self-efficacy could mediate the stress experienced by teachers (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007) and reduce occurrences of burnout (Fernet et al., 2012). The finding that emotional exhaustion, a key component of stress, was not correlated with self-efficacy is consisted with Ashton et al., (1984) who found that stress and self-efficacy were not related.

Self-efficacy for inclusive teaching was also significantly correlated with self-efficacy for general teaching suggesting there is a significant overlap with confident teaching of all children and confident teaching of children with SEN.

Sharma and Sokal (2015) investigated the link between self-efficacy for inclusive teaching and actual teaching practice and did not find a link between these two constructs. Whilst actual teaching practice in their study was measured using an observation tool, it might be said to be similar in some ways to general teaching efficacy as measured by this research whereby the teaching of all the children in the class is taken in to account. This research took place in a mainstream classroom and took into account the teaching of all the children in the class, whilst observing the inclusive teaching methods. Therefore the findings of this research would go beyond Sharma and Sokal’s research and suggest that general teaching and inclusive teaching are significantly correlated.

In addition, the overall regression analysis in this research considers the predictive variables together and suggests that school climate and attitude to inclusion also significantly predict self-efficacy for inclusive teaching. This also
goes beyond Sharma and Sokal’s research and suggests that there are additional factors at play when considering self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

10.1.2 Phase two

Five interviews were conducted, representing a cross-section of participants from three diverse schools.

Four broad themes were identified from the interviews as being important to the participants for successful inclusive teaching; teacher factors; school factors; inclusion factors and external factors.

The participants were chosen for their high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores and so the analysis from the interview data represents a snapshot of views of highly confident and competent teachers. Data from phase one indicates that participants who had high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching scores also had high scores for self-efficacy for general teaching. This suggests that the participants in this second phase were not only confident and competent at including children with SEN, but were generally confident and competent teachers of all children.

From the four broad themes, it was identified that the participants felt that feelings of being overwhelmed was a big factor within their jobs. It became clear that these participants were, each in different ways, able to manage and cope with this stress. The ‘burnout’ scores for these participants were varied and this would fit with the finding in phase one which identified that emotional exhaustion did not correlate with self-efficacy for inclusive teaching.

Underlying the participants’ responses was an acceptance that there were limits to inclusion as discussed below. Participants spoke of special schools and settings as a necessity or inevitability for some children. They discussed
extreme behaviour or emotional/mental health needs as being the biggest limit to inclusion. This was often referred to in terms of ‘in the best interest of the child’ or of the impact it had on the rest of the class.

10.2 Methodological approach

Using a mixed-method approach in research is not without criticism, as discussed in chapter three. However, using this approach for this research project enabled the numerical data of the first phase to be illuminated in the second phase.

It was particularly important to give the participants the opportunity to contextualise their thinking around their answers to the questionnaires and to reflect on what might have influenced their responses. Participants spoke of the time of year, it was near to the end of the Christmas term, having an impact on how they were feeling as well. They also discussed the changes in the SEN Code of Practice as changing how they were feeling in their job and of their personal situation around the time they completed the questionnaires.

The two phases had their focus on different aims. Phase one aimed to establish which factors, if any, were correlated with, or predictive of, self-efficacy in general terms. Phase two aimed to consider which factors specific teachers with high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching felt were important to their practice. Phase two, therefore, whilst being a continuation of phase one in some aspects, stood alone in terms of its aims and focus.

10.3 Overall discussion

Taking the findings from both phases the data would suggest that inclusive teaching is an expansion and adaptations of general teaching approaches
(Norwich, 2013). This would explain the high correlations between self-efficacy for general teaching and self-efficacy for inclusion.

However, the participants in phase two identified clear limits to inclusion. Research would indicate that teachers consider behavioural exclusions and the transfer of pupils to specialise settings in line with the ethos of an inclusive school (Ylonen and Norwich, 2012). Ofsted’s definition of inclusion focuses on the supportive and caring environment a school provides. As has been evidenced from the interviews, the five participants came across as supportive and caring teachers who were likely to create such an environment within the school and classroom.

The differing definitions of inclusion are perhaps influenced by inclusion in theory and inclusion in practice. Warnock (2005) would suggest that her initial concept of inclusion went too far and that “including all children in the common educational enterprise of learning, wherever they learn best” would fit within the concept of inclusion.

The limits to inclusion are discussed by Hansen (2012). This asserts that because inclusion is a theoretical vision, there are no limits defined within the concept of inclusion itself. It suggests that if this theoretical view is taken, limits of inclusion, or exclusion, are most commonly explained by deficits in teachers or teaching.

Hansen argues that this is not the case and suggests that inclusion should not be viewed as a theoretical vision with indefinite limits, but as a social practice which has inclusion and exclusion processes. This theoretical vs. pedagogical, or practical, inclusion is evident in the availability of special school settings and the exclusion of pupils with SEN from mainstream classes and schools being
seen as compatible with an inclusive school. Hansen talks of the teacher ‘self-concept’ and argues that a teacher who considers that learning best takes place in a calm and quiet space is likely to find disruption difficult to manage. On the other hand, a teacher who considers that learning should be flexible and variable is likely to find rigidity and a need to routing more difficult to include in the classroom.

Throughout the interviews there is an underlying acceptance that not all children would be right for mainstream education. There is a concept of a ‘grey’ area, giving the idea that there are also ‘black’ and ‘white’ areas where children clearly fit into mainstream or special education. The feeling from the interviews were that children within the ‘grey’ area often start off their education in mainstream schools, but are likely to end up in specialist settings before they leave primary school.

Hansen discusses the idea of special education and argues that the purpose of special education is not to ‘exclude’ but to enhance learning opportunities. This could be argued to be a relatively modern concept of special education and is incongruent with a time before inclusion was on the political agenda in the early 1990s, prior to the Salamanca statement of 1994.

There is a concept of inclusive teaching being beneficial to all children (i.e. the children in the class who do not require special education). Sharma and Sokal (2015) would argue that teachers who have more positive attitudes to inclusion and lower concerns about including children with SEN perceive positive effects from their inclusive teaching practice for children who do not have SEN. They argue that “inclusive practices help both students with and without disabilities.” This is something that came through in the interview data; that teachers
perceived inclusion and their inclusive practices, to have positive, or at the very least no negative, implications for all the children in the class.

It is important that the teacher is not seen in isolation, and that the school environment and system is also considered. This research aimed to consider the wider picture through the interviews which picked up on the idea of supportive environments being key to inclusive teaching.

Having said this, the data gathered would suggest that teachers with high self-efficacy for inclusive teaching are competent teachers who take inclusion as part of their role. This is supported by the high correlation between self-efficacy for inclusive teaching and self-efficacy for general teaching. The interview data illuminate that the way the participants cope with a full class of mixed ability children is indicative of more inclusive or flexible styles of teaching.

This would suggest that, within mainstream teaching, teaching SEN is not a specialist role, but more an adaption of general teaching and continuum of an inclusive, flexible pedagogical approach (Lewis and Norwich, 2004)

10.4 Future research

A bigger study, with more schools and participants would be an interesting extension to this exploratory research. This would also allow for comparisons to be made between similar groups of teachers, e.g. KS1 and KS2, and between teachers and SENCos, something this study was not able to consider. It would also be interesting to consider the views of specialist teachers and educational psychologist to include the views of those whose job it is to support inclusion within schools.

Future research might also consider additional factors at the initial phase. Sharma and Sokal (2015) discuss the concept of “concerns” in terms of
concerns around inclusion. This is distinct from attitudes and considers the apprehensions teachers feel about including children with SEN in their classes. This could be included in the initial phase where teachers’ views and opinions around inclusion are sought.

It would also be an interesting extension to utilise the current class of the participants by observing teaching practice or engaging the children in the class. The four aspects of the two self-efficacy measurements used in this research; engagement; behaviour management; collaboration and inclusive instruction could be investigated in practice. An observation schedule would be an interesting addition to this study and would identify the actual teaching practice of staff. It could also measure engagement of children with SEN and consider the progress of these children specifically.

This sort of extension involves placing a value judgement on teaching and learning. It would remain related to a specific class, or group of children. A longitudinal study of different classes over time, with the same teacher, would explore how the differing needs and make-ups of classes impact on the inclusive practices of the teacher.

10.5 Implications for EP role

One of the clearest implications for educational psychologists is the role for supporting teachers to get to know the children with SEN in their class. This could be successfully supported through consultation with the child’s parents to enable the teacher to gain a full understanding of the wider picture for the child. This ties in with Bronfenbrenner (1986) whose ecological systems theory would place the child at the centre with family, school and other immediate influences in the child’s life within the immediate ‘microsystem’ around the child. This
model takes into account the work that educational psychologists do in terms of supporting parents and teachers to consider the big picture and providing a voice for the child at the centre.

The participants touched on the issue that often training was given on a particular issue, e.g. dyslexia or attachment, and this would seem relevant only if there was a child in their class at the time to whom the training applied to. This suggests that a new approach to staff training is needed on a much more regular, and more personalised basis. Staff supervision or staff clinics can be useful to ensure staff feel they are listened and responded to on a more regular basis and gives them an opportunity to discuss children they are currently working with. This also supports staff to understand the child better, which has been discussed previously.

Another implication from the research discussed in this thesis is the opportunity to provide stress management support for teachers and school staff. Mindfulness and positive psychology have become more popular within the mainstream and there are possibilities here to pass on mindfulness and stress management techniques through training to school staff. Stress was identified as a major factor for the five participants in this study, and it is likely that this would be a common theme if the study was explored with a wider group of participants.

10.6 Contribution to knowledge

This study brings together a number of factors that have not been considered in one research paper before. It considers school climate, burnout and attitudes to inclusion alongside two measures of self-efficacy.
School climate and burnout have been shown to be significantly correlated with self-efficacy for inclusive teaching which suggests that teachers benefit from a positive school environment and from being supported to avoid, or manage, major stressors.

In addition to adding to the literature in terms of the different factors that could affect self-efficacy for inclusive teaching, it is also based in the UK. This is not true of any of the other self-efficacy work around inclusive teaching and opens up the possibilities of exploring inclusive teaching within a highly politicised educational system.
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Appendices

Appendix A1 – Information Sheet
Thank you for indicating that you might be interested in taking part in this research project. I have put together some information outlining the research below.

My research is investigating the role teacher self-efficacy, or teacher confidence, plays in the inclusion of children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). I am looking at which factors predict or contribute to teacher efficacy (confidence) in inclusive practice.

The Participants' Role:

My research will take part in two stages. The first stage consists of a number of questionnaires. The first of these asks some basic demographic questions (age, gender, job role etc.) as well as a bit about your personal and professional experience of working with children with SEND. The next few ask for your ratings on a number of statements aimed at measuring attitudes to inclusion, confidence in teaching in general, confidence for teaching children with SEND in particular, school climate and professional resilience. All these questionnaires are well evidenced and standardised. You can complete the questionnaires electronically and e-mail them back to me at arm230@exeter.ac.uk, print them out and I can pick them up or you could post them back to me at the below address:

Anna Maxwell c/o Brahm Norwich,
St. Luke's Campus,
University of Exeter,
Heavitree Road,
Exeter,
EX1 2LU

The second stage will be a follow up of the questionnaires. If you indicate that you are interested in being contacted for the second stage of the research you may be asked take part in a brief interview to discuss in more depth what you think and feel about including children with SEND and how you go about doing this. I am interested in specific examples, general feelings and the methods and resources used to include and teach children with SEND both in your current class and in the past. This interview would be at a time and location convenient to you.

Why should I take part in the research project?

There is no requirement for you to take part in this project. Your time, opinions and feelings are gratefully received. However by taking part in this project you are contributing to a piece of research which will be used to think about the support teachers tell me they need to feel more confident about teaching and including children with SEND. I am interested particularly in listening to teachers’ opinions about what helps them to feel more confident and what they feel would be most supportive for other teachers.

For individual teachers who take part in both stages you will be given a break-down of your individual scores and the full run-through of what this means. These would be yours to keep, and share with you SLT if you wished. It could form a valuable part of your CPD and future targets, as well as giving you some feedback on your current practice.

For whole schools who take part in the first stage, you will receive whole-school feedback at a SLT level. This would give you a measure of your school climate, as reported by the teaching staff, and an overview of the confidence levels and resilience among your staff members as a whole. Individual responses would be kept anonymous.

If you have any further questions please get in touch. My contact details can be found at the top of this letter.

Many thanks,
Anna
Appendix A2 – Demographics Questionnaire
1. Which age category do you fit into?

2. Are you?

   Male  Female

3. How many years have you been teaching?

   I am currently training  I am in my NQT year  2-4  5-9  10-14  15-19  20-24  25-29  30+

4. When you qualified as a teacher, did you have an area of specialisation?

   a. Yes, please specify ______________________
   b. No

5. Do you have an area of specialisation now?

   a. Yes, please specify ______________________
   b. No

6. Before you started teaching, did you have any experience with children with SEN?

   NOT AT ALL  TO SOME EXTENT  VERY MUCH

   PERSONALLY

   PROFESSIONALLY

7. Have you done any training on SEN and/or inclusion?

   a. Yes, please give details: -
      __________________________________________________________________________
      __________________________________________________________________________
      __________________________________________________________________________
      __________________________________________________________________________
   b. No

8. Which year group do you teach? __________________

9. How many pupils are there in your class? __________

10. Please fill out the table to show how many pupils in these areas are in your class.

    LEVEL OF NEED  MAIN AREA OF NEED

    School Action/SEN Support  Communication and Interaction  Cognition and Learning  Social, Mental, Emotional Health  Sensory and/or Physical

    Statement/EHC Plan

11. How many teaching assistants are there in your class?

   a. In the morning? __________
   b. In the afternoon? __________
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The collaboration between the teachers and the leadership group is generally good.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teachers and the leadership group generally agree on how the school should be run.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The leadership group generally supports teachers’ suggestions for changes in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel that I can go to the leadership group with my problems at school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The leadership group is generally positive to the teachers’ suggestions for changes in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The headteacher performs good and efficient school management.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The headteacher sees it as important to be a pedagogical leader for the teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The headteacher is concerned about the teachers’ personal wellbeing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The headteacher is a friendly and open person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I like the collegial atmosphere at this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I like the teachers’ professional attitude at this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teachers at this school are helpful towards each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teachers at this school generally agree on working and teaching methods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New teachers are easily accepted in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I enjoy working at this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The teachers at this school are keen to try out new ways of working and cooperating.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I discuss with the other teachers at my school how I work with my pupils.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I speak openly with the other teachers at school about my relationship with my pupils.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The teachers at school speak openly to each other about their relationship with their pupils.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The teachers at school collaborate with regard to working and teaching methods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Teachers at this school consult each other on professional issues and concerns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>When a teacher has problems in her/his teaching, other teachers offer help and support.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A4 – Attitudes to Inclusion Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitudes to Inclusion</th>
<th>1 - Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 - Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>3 - Agree</th>
<th>4 - Disagree</th>
<th>5 - Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>6 - Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I believe that an inclusive school is one that permits academic progression of all students regardless of their ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I believe that students with a disability should be taught in special education schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I believe that inclusion facilitates socially appropriate behaviour amongst all students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I believe that any student can learn in the regular curriculum of the school if the curriculum is adapted to meet their individual needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I believe that students with a disability should be segregated because it is too expensive to modify the physical environment of the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I believe that students with a disability should be in special education schools so that they do not experience rejection in the regular school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I get frustrated when I have difficulty communicating with students with a disability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I get upset when students with a disability cannot keep up with the day-to-day curriculum in my classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I get irritated when I am unable to understand students with a disability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am uncomfortable including students with a disability in a regular classroom with other students without a disability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am disconcerted that students with a disability are included in the regular classroom, regardless of the severity of the disability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I get frustrated when I have to adapt the curriculum to meet the individual needs of all students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I am willing to encourage students with a disability to participate in all social activities in the regular classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I am willing to adapt the curriculum to meet the individual needs of all students regardless of their ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I am willing to physically include students with a severe disability in the regular classroom with the necessary support.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attitudes to Inclusion

For each question, put a ring around the number that you feel describes your views best:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 - Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>3 - Agree</th>
<th>4 - Disagree</th>
<th>5 - Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>6 - Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am willing to modify the physical environment to include students with a disability in the regular classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am willing to adapt my communication techniques to ensure that all students with an emotional and behavioural disorder can be successfully included in the regular classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I am willing to adapt the assessment of individual students in order for inclusive education to take place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A5 – Teacher Resilience Questionnaire
## Teacher Resilience

For each question, put a ring around the number that you feel describes you the best:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0 - Never</th>
<th>1 - Seldom</th>
<th>2 - Now and then</th>
<th>3 - Regular</th>
<th>4 - Often</th>
<th>5 - Very often</th>
<th>6 - Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained by work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the day.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel fatigued when I have to get up in the morning to face another day on the job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can easily understand how my pupils feel about things.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel I treat some pupils as impersonal 'objects'.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Working with people all day is really a strain for me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I deal very effectively with the problems of my pupils.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I feel 'burned out' from my work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel I'm a positive influence of other people's lives through my work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have become more callous toward people since I took this job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I feel I'm working too hard in my job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I don't really care what happens to some pupils.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my pupils.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel exhilarated after working with my pupils.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>In my work I deal with emotional problems calmly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I feel pupils blame me for some of their problems.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>In my work, people bother me with personal problems that I don't want to be bothered with.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I try to keep away from the personal problems of my pupils.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A6 – Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Teaching

Questionnaire
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can make my expectations clear about pupil behaviour.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am able to calm a pupil who is disruptive or noisy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can accurately gauge pupil comprehension of what I have taught.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable pupils.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behaviour in the classroom before it occurs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I can control disruptive behaviour in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with special educational needs and disabilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of pupils with special educational needs and disabilities are accommodated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., specialist teachers or speech and language therapists) in designing educational plans for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., teaching assistants, other teachers) to teach pupils with special educational needs and disabilities in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get pupils to work together in pairs or in small groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I can use a variety of assessment strategies (e.g., work assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of pupils with special educational needs and disabilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am confident when dealing with pupils who are physically aggressive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when pupils are confused.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Self-efficacy for Inclusive Teaching**

For each question, put a ring around the number that you feel describes you the best:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 - nothing</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 - very little</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 - some influence</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 - quite a bit</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9 - a great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when pupils are confused?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent can you create good questions for your pupils?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your pupils?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the appropriate level for individual pupils?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To what extent can you gauge pupil comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much can you do to control disruptive behaviour in the classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much can you do to calm a pupil who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of pupils?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How well can you keep a few problem pupils from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How well can you respond to defiant pupils?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To what extent can you make your expectation clear about pupil behaviour?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How much can you do to get pupils to believe they can do well in schoolwork?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How much can you do to help your pupils value learning?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How much can you do to motivate pupils who show low interest in schoolwork?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a pupil who is failing?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How much can you do to help your pupil think critically?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How much can you do to foster pupil creativity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult pupils?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A8 – Ethics Form
Certificate of ethical research approval

MSc, PhD, EdD & DEdPsych theses

To activate this certificate you need to first sign it yourself, and then have it signed by your supervisor and finally by the Chair of the School’s Ethics Committee.

For further information on ethical educational research access the guidelines on the BERA website: http://www.bera.ac.uk/publications and view the School’s Policy online.

READ THIS FORM CAREFULLY AND THEN COMPLETE IT ON YOUR COMPUTER (the form will expand to contain the text you enter). DO NOT COMPLETE BY HAND

Your name: Anna Maxwell
Your student no: 560000632
Return address for this certificate:
Degree/Programme of Study: Doctorate in Educational, Child and Community Psychology
Project Supervisor(s): Brahmi Norwich and Margie Tunbridge
Your email address: 
Tel: 07732886433

I hereby certify that I will abide by the details given overleaf and that I undertake in my thesis to respect the dignity and privacy of those participating in this research.

I confirm that if my research should change radically, I will complete a further form.

Signed: An Maxwell date: 20/03/2015

Chair of the School’s Ethics Committee
updated: March 2013
Certificate of ethical research approval

**TITLE OF YOUR PROJECT:** The composition and characteristics of teacher efficacy for inclusive practice.
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   I am investigating the role teacher self-efficacy plays in the inclusion of children with SEN. I am looking at which factors (teacher attitudes to inclusion, school climate, resilience, demographic factors and general teacher efficacy) predict or contribute to teacher efficacy for inclusive practice. I am then interested in what the features and characteristics are of a teacher who has self-reported to be on either ends of the self-efficacy for inclusive practice scale.
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5. Give details of the methods to be used for data collection and analysis and how you would ensure they do not cause any harm, detriment or unreasonable stress:

Study One: Questionnaires (attached). I will be available throughout the data collection time in each school and will answer questions where necessary. I will be aware that some questions around the inclusion of children with SEND can arouse emotional reactions in some people and I will ensure I am available for debrief sessions if any of the members of staff require them.

Analysis will take place on SPSS and will be fully anonymised. Each school will have a different code so I know which school the participants are from.

Study two: Interviews – Again I will be present throughout the interviews and will ensure I am mindful of the possible emotional reactions from participants over this topic. I will offer all participants involved in the 2nd stage of the study a debrief session if they wish.
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8. Give details of any exceptional factors, which may raise ethical issues (e.g. potential political or ideological conflicts which may pose danger or harm to participants):

It may be possible that I encounter some teaching staff who do not believe inclusion to be positive. My questionnaires and interview schedule will be as value free as possible to allow participants to feel confident in sharing their genuine views. All participants interviewed will be offered a full debrief where I will be happy to share the indicative results and transcripts with them.
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Appendix A9 – Teacher Semi-Structured Interviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been a teacher for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What year groups do you have experience of teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about including children with SEN. Have you found any year groups/age groups where it has been easier or harder to include children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your experience of teaching and including children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you found it easier or harder to include some children?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your concept of inclusive teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does it mean to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does this impact your day-to-day role as a class teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do you think children with SEN should be educated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you ensure all pupils feel a member of the class community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are you expected to do this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about withdrawal from class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are you able to do this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you adapt your teaching to be relevant to all individual needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you able to give a specific example where you have successfully included a child with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you able to give an example where you have had doubts about including a child with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How responsible do you feel for the inclusive teaching of children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there limits to your responsibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinking about including children with SEN. What would you identify as the challenges of your role as class teacher?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What helps you to overcome these challenges?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Why?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who else is responsible?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Support</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How challenging is inclusive teaching?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In what ways?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Why?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What difference does the school context make to you?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Why?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What support has been useful from the senior leadership team around including children with SEN?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What other forms of support have been useful around including children with SEN?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you see the role of the TA/LSA as being?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How do you utilise TAs/LSAs?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Training</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have you had any training on including children with SEN?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What has been the most useful form of training?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Why?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What impact has your training had on how you include children with SEN?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A10 – SENCo Semi-Structured Interviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you held the role of SENCo (in this school and/or others)?</td>
<td>Did you teach beforehand? Which year groups did you teach? Thinking about including children with SEN. Do you think there are year groups where it is easier or harder to include children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your concept of inclusion?</td>
<td>What does it mean to you? How does this impact your day-to-day role as SENCo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do you think children with SEN should be educated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you ensure children with SEN are included?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you ensure all pupils feel a member of the class community?</td>
<td>To what extent are you expected to do this? To what extent are you able to do this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about withdrawal from class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you support teachers to adapt their teaching to be relevant to all individual needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you able to give a specific example where you have successfully supported the inclusion of a child with SEN?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you able to give an example where you have had doubts about the inclusion of child with SEN?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How responsible do you feel for the inclusion of children with SEN?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there limits to your responsibility?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who else is responsible?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about including children with SEN. What would you identify as the challenges of your role as SENCo?</td>
<td>What helps you to overcome these challenges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How challenging is inclusive teaching?</td>
<td>In what ways? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What difference does the school context make to you?</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What support has been useful from other SENCOs around including children with SEN?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What support has been useful from the senior leadership team around including children with SEN?</td>
<td>What other forms of support have been useful around including children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see the role of the teacher as being in terms of including children with SEN?</td>
<td>How do you support teachers to include children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see the role of the TA/LSA as being in terms of including children with SEN?</td>
<td>How do you support TAs or LSAs to include children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had any training on including children with SEN or supporting teachers to include children with SEN?</td>
<td>What has been the most useful form of training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What impact has your training had on how you support teachers to include children with SEN?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A11 – Interview Consent Form
GUIDE INFORMATION/CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEWS

Title of Research Project
The composition and characteristics of teacher efficacy for inclusive practice.

Details of Project
I am interested in the role teacher confidence plays in the inclusion of children with SEND. Your participation in this second stage of my research allows me to find out in more detail what teachers think and feel about including children with SEND and how they go about doing this.
I am interested in specific examples, general feelings and the methods and resources you use to include and teach children with SEND in your current class and in the past.

Contact Details
For further information about the research or your interview data, please contact:
Anna Maxwell, Department of Education, Exeter University, Devon UK.
Tel 00 44 (0) 1392 263240, arm230@ex.ac.uk

If you have concerns/questions about the research you would like to discuss with someone else at the University, please contact:
Brahm Norwich, Department of Education, Exeter University, Devon UK.
Tel 00 44 (0) 1392 724 805, b.norwich@ex.ac.uk

Confidentiality
Interview tapes and transcripts will be held in confidence. They will not be used other than for the purposes described above and third parties will not be allowed access to them (except as may be required by the law). However, if you request it, you will be supplied with a copy of your interview transcript so that you can comment on and edit it as you see fit (please give your email below). Your data will be held in accordance with the Data Protection for five years and then destroyed.

Anonymity
Interview data will be held and used on an anonymous basis, with no mention of your name, but I will refer, anonymously, to the school of which you are a member (e.g. Teacher1 from School2)

Consent
I voluntarily agree to participate and to the use of my data for the purposes specified above. I can withdraw consent at any time by contacting the interviewers.

TICK HERE: □ DATE………………………………

Note: Your contact details are kept separately from your interview data

Name of interviewee:............................................................................
Signature: ........................................................................................
Email/phone:........................................................................................

Signature of researcher........................................................................

2 copies to be signed by both interviewee and researcher, one kept by each
Appendix A12 – Example Transcript
I: The next question is around Teaching Assistants, so Learning Support Assistants and I just wondered if I came into your class one morning, what sort of things would I see them doing?

IV: If you came in first thing... literally, the start of the day is always quite a good one and you’d see me at the door with the parents there, you’d see one Teaching Assistant sort of in that doorway there, making sure everyone gets their coats sorted and then J, my most experienced Teaching Assistant, she’d be gathering in her first little group, which is her Phonics group and then get ready. You’d see H, who is my newest TA who’s very young and very lovely and she would take E, my SD girl, to the Sensory Room whilst J got the things ready for the next session. So J’s effectively her mentor really; that’s what she is. There are lots of little Speech and Language jobs going on in the room. They completely join in with everything else as well. They’re not exclusively SEN and they don’t work with my lower ability. It’s on a complete carousel; everybody works with everybody because for everybody’s sanity, I want all the adults to know number one, where those children are but also, with my SEN hat on, I want my two autistic children working with a variety of adults as well because I don’t want them getting stuck with one adult. I don’t think that’s healthy because my adults aren’t going with them and they’re not going to enter Year 2 with them and I wouldn’t want them to do that. It’s interesting doing a thing called ‘One Page Profile’ and I was talking to them today and that was one of the key questions I was asking – ‘Who do you like to work with?’ and both R and E said, ‘I don’t mind’ which is lovely because they were quite attached in
Foundation Stage to their adult and that was a thing I really wanted to get away from. The parents actually took some convincing about that. They were a bit like, ‘Well, who’s their adult?’ It’s like, ‘We’re all their adults and we’re going to be watching out for them’. ‘Yeah, but what if...?’ It’s like, ‘Well, just give it a chance’ and they have come round to it now, yeah. So they’re busy; they’re always busy.

I: Good. I think you’ve kind of touched on this a lot actually throughout what you’ve been saying but thinking about the challenges of including children with SEN, what do you think are the biggest barriers to that?

IV: That’s quite a hard question, isn’t it? I guess the one thing which can never allow inclusion... which would automatically stop being in my room, is if you were a danger to other children. That would always stop it and it has to. We’ve had children, a couple of years ago, throwing chairs, tables being turned over, so we used to have the Abandon Room Drill, where the children would happily... they wouldn’t even flick an eye. It was really sad actually; they would just get up and walk out. That’s always my main concern. It is about those children but those key children are no more equal in my eyes than those other children and there has to be a balance there. I can’t spend all my time working with those two children and I’m not going to because that wouldn’t be fair. They will get more adult time because that’s their hours. They’ve got their key adults but I do things like... it’s really sad but I tend to count up, three times a year, and I quantify for one day, how exactly how much time I’m spending with each Special Needs child. I do that because in my first year, when my little girl started, I figured out she was taking 70% of
my time at the start. I thought, ‘That’s not right. That cannot, cannot be right for me to be working 70% of the time with this child, who’s sucking in everything’. So, at that point, we did get another Teaching Assistant to come and work with her and the school were really good about that. I think that the danger thing... sorry, I’ve gone completely off on a tangent, haven’t I? I think, for me, that is the biggest one. It’s the danger and the safety of the other children. It is distress... if somebody’s distressed and they’re kicking off – as we say here ‘if they’re kicking off’ – you’re going to get chairs and scissors and I’ve had that before wanged at me. It’s because the little boy in question was having epileptic fits and that’s what he was doing; he was having mood swings because he was having fits constantly and he couldn’t control it but at the same time, Mum was very understanding about that. It’s like, ‘Well, he can’t be in here at those points because it is just dangerous because he’s either going to hurt himself or somebody else’. Actually, it did resolve itself in the end; he did move on and Mum wanted him to move on. Again, it was quite sad because we’d put a lot of work into what was a transition to Year 2 but at the end of the day, he left. It was clear that we can’t have people threatened and I think that’s the biggest one for me really. I don’t see any reason why, even if you’re working – as I was saying, we’ve got children in Year 5 who are working at a Year 2 and Year 3 level – that is not a bar to them being in that classroom. That’s not an issue. That’s just an academic thing and we’re all skilled enough here to put something in place for them to do which will bring them on in their targets and we’ve got TAs who are clever enough as well to do that. They can put that work together.
Appendix A13 – Initial Node Structure Report
## Node Structure

### Interviews

### Node Structure Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Name</th>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>User Assigned Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Beyond role</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Experience of exclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Good for everyone or common sense</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Identification of SEN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - action</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - barriers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - definition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - outcome</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Individual children</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Interest in SEN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Interest in SEN\Specialism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Leadership</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Other children - positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Parents</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Practical applications of training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Stress</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Support - giving</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Support - receiving</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\TAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Teaching strategies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Uncertainty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Name</th>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>User Assigned Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Node</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Assessment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Beyond role</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Children as individuals</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Doing things differently</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Egs. of individual children</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Experience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Experience of exclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\External agencies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Good for everyone or common sense</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Identification of SEN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - action</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - action\Teaching strategies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - challenges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - definition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Inclusion - overall\Inclusion - outcome</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Interest in SEN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Interest in SEN\Specialism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Leadership</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Motivation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Ofsted</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Other children - positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Parents and parenting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Practical applications of training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Responsibility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Stress</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Support - giving</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Support - receiving</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\TAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Uncertainty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A15 – Secondary Data Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Refs</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>New Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>The responsibility of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>The role of the other children in the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing things differently</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Doing things differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of exclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Experience of exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification of SEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>identification of SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion - definition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>What does inclusion mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>The positive role of school senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Motivation for working with SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - giving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Offering support for SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for everyone/common sense</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Inclusion is good for everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical applications of training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Practical applications of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond role</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Beyond role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Externally agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Impact of experience on current role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Parenting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Parents/Parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children as individuals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Getting to know the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion - challenges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>The challenges of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>The role of TAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eg. Of individual children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Vignettes of past/current pupils with SEN who impacted practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - receiving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Working collaboratively with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion - outcome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Measuring the success of including children with SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion - limits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>The limitations of inclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Feelings of being overwhelmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion - action</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Actions that support inclusive classrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>