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Abstract

Inclusion in relation to special educational needs (SEN) has become an imperative in the educational policies of many countries. However, the implementation of inclusive practice is not straightforward and has been the focus of many studies. In Physical Education (PE), Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles is an integral component of many educational systems but has not been studied in relation to teachers’ understanding of inclusion and inclusive practice. Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching styles has been promoted in Greece since 2006 and this study investigates the relationship between the beliefs and practices of specialist primary PE teachers in Greece in relation to inclusion and Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles.

The study has a single-case research design with embedded units and was conducted in mainstream primary schools with 15 participant PE teachers. Data was collected using semi-structured observations of participants’ PE lessons followed by semi-structured interviews focusing on their understanding of inclusion, of inclusive practices and their knowledge and use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles.

The findings suggest that some of the teachers’ beliefs about inclusion resonate with current understandings as reported in the literature whereas other teachers refer to older understandings of inclusion and disability. Very few teachers had a detailed knowledge of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles but were found to use them to some extent during their lessons. While not commonly associated with inclusion, the teaching styles from Mosston’s Spectrum that were used did not prevent the use of inclusive practices by the teachers. This study relates Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles to a single dimension of inclusion and challenges the value it is accorded in Physical Education policy in Greece where inclusive practice is promoted by particular educational policies. The findings lead to suggestions for enhancement of both policy and practice in the context of Physical Education in Greece and more widely.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATIPDPE</td>
<td>Attitudes toward Teaching Individuals with Physical Disabilities in Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERA</td>
<td>British Educational Research Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cLD</td>
<td>complex Learning Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuous Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>Department for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfEE</td>
<td>Department for Education and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD</td>
<td>Emotional and Behavioural disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAS</td>
<td>Flanders Interaction Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ITLB</td>
<td>Instrument for Identifying Teaching and Learning Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFITS</td>
<td>Instrument for Identifying Teaching Styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPAA</td>
<td>Inclusive Pedagogical Approach in Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDAY</td>
<td>Diagnostic Assessment and Support Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDDY</td>
<td>Differential Diagnosis, Diagnosis and Support of Special Educational Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPOPECQ</td>
<td>Learning and Performance Orientations in Physical Education Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRBs</td>
<td>Language Resource Bases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMMI</td>
<td>Mild-moderate Mental Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSMI</td>
<td>Moderate-severe Mental Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPE</td>
<td>National Curriculum for Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEATID</td>
<td>Physical Education Attitudes Toward Individuals with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>Task, authority, recognition, grouping evaluation and time structures software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This study investigates Greek Physical Education (PE) teachers' understandings of the inclusion of students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) in the PE provision in primary schools. In particular, it focuses on their use of the ‘Spectrum of Teaching Styles’ devised by Mosston (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002) when planning and teaching. This was an exploratory study in the Greek primary education context conducted in one local authority. After observing the PE lessons taught by 15 specialist primary PE teachers, semi-structured interviews focusing on the inclusion of students with special needs into their lessons were conducted.

This chapter sets out the origin of my personal interest in the fields of inclusion and Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles in physical education and continues with a clarification of the basic terms used in this study. Following this, the rationale of this study is presented. This is followed by an account of the purposes of the study and its outline.

1.2 Personal journey

During the last year of my bachelor (four year) studies in PE in Athens, I chose to undertake the speciality of ‘Adapted Physical Education’. It was a yearlong speciality, one of the many alternatives offered by the department. During this year, I learnt about a large variety of special educational needs. I also entered in special education classes for the first time as a trainee PE teacher. I distinctly remember being lectured about the fact that the students with special educational needs had to be separated into ‘educable’ and ‘non educable’ students (this was during the academic year of 2003/4), which at the time sounded very reasonable. As a result, I did not give it second a thought. I was also educated in ways to conduct the PE lesson in Special Education settings, since the speciality modules focused on how to address and conduct lessons with students whom had individual special educational needs.

After I graduated, my aim was to work as a PE teacher in schools. The educational system in Greece, however, is centralised, which means that PE
teachers are not hired by schools or even the local authorities. On the contrary, teachers are hired directly by the Ministry of Education, Research and Religious affairs. The Ministry of Education, therefore, has the difficult task of choosing among thousands of graduate teachers in order to staff schools. For decades, teachers were being selected through the use of long lists and usually after a long wait. In these lists, the year and grade of graduation determined the order of teachers. In 1998, the waiting lists had become so long that the majority of candidates would not have been able to work in schools until they were close to their retirement age. Consequently, the Ministry of Education changed its practice and decided that teachers should be hired after successfully undertaking national exams for teachers, which was to be done every three to four years. These exams are widely known as ASEP exams for educators (ASEP comes from the Greek abbreviation ΑΣΕΠ which means High Council for Staff Selection – In Greek: Ανώτατο Συμβούλιο Επιλογής Προσωπικού). The contents of these exams included a very large variety of subjects that were included in university books, regardless of whether they were taught to student teachers or not. During my studying for these exams, I discovered Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles, which I did not remember being taught in the university. I remember finding Mosston’s Spectrum challenging to understand but intriguing, since it offered a variety of different and practical ways of teaching Physical Education lessons. Eventually, through the ASEP exams, I managed to start working in primary education as a part-time PE teacher.

After a few years in teaching, I decided to undertake a Masters in Special Educational Needs, since it related to my bachelor studies. I was very happily surprised by the knowledge I gained during my Masters. I expected to learn more about special educational needs but I did not expect to learn so much and gain a completely new understanding of inclusion. In reflecting on my understanding of inclusion before my Masters studies, I can now safely state that it related to special education provisions and it had nothing to do with mainstream school environments. My excitement about this newly found understanding of the concept of inclusion made me wonder about other Greek PE teachers’ understandings of it. It also made me wonder about its compatibility with what I knew about Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles. As a result, I initially approached these matters by investigating them through
my Masters dissertation (Karageorgopoulou, 2011). My interest in these areas urged me to continue my studies and further my investigation in what Greek PE teachers understand as inclusion, how they use the Spectrum of Teaching Styles and the possible connection between these two factors in the PE lesson.

This illustrates how I came to be interested in conducting this study. I discuss now briefly the basic terms that appear in this study, as well as the research purposes and rationale.

1.3 Clarifications of the basic terms of the study

In this section, the basic terms that are used in the study are briefly presented. These terms are inclusion, inclusive education, special educational needs (SEN), physical education (PE) and Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles.

a) Inclusion

According to Grossman (2008), “inclusion has become a central strand (or at least a point of debate) in both political and educational policy and, in some cases, a legal and/or moral imperative” (p. 36). It emerged in Europe in the 1980s in the form of social inclusion as a political concept, due to growing inequalities in society (Grossman, 2008). It became an imperative in education in 1994 through the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009), which stated: “Inclusion and participation are essential to human dignity and to the enjoyment and exercise of human rights. Within the field of education, this is reflected in the development of strategies that seek to bring about genuine equalization and opportunity” (UNESCO, 1994, p. 11). Inclusion, therefore, has been seen as a concept that concerns society and consequently education as part of its processes. It has also been seen as having two main features: theory/concept and practice; the latter being inclusive education (Dialektaki, 2014). In the 21st century the international inclusion agenda was reinforced with the adoption of the Dakar Statement (World Education Forum, 2000) which urged governments internationally to expand and improve early childhood education for vulnerable and disadvantaged children. This statement resulted in new legislation regarding Special Educational Needs and Disability in the UK - one of the leading countries in inclusive education (Vickerman and Maher, 2016). Legislation in Greece
relating to inclusion has been slow in comparison to its European counterparts. Legislation regarding the education of people with ‘divergent’ needs was introduced in 1981 (Greek Government, 1981) with more inclusive policies being introduced in 2000 (Greek Government, 2000) (see section 2.1.2). Legislation and practice regarding inclusion in Greece have been criticised by practitioners and academics and a clear and official definition of the term inclusion is still to be produced (see section 2.1.3). This is not unique to Greece and the concept of inclusion internationally has been interpreted in many ways (Grossman, 2008; Hyde and Power, 2006; Topping and Maloney, 2005).

 Efforts to define the term have emerged in the literature. Soulis (2008) defined the Greek term for inclusion - ‘ένταξη’ – as the arrangements made and the methods used in order for students with SEN to participate in education. A similar definition is coming from academics in the UK where, according to Farrell et al. (2007, p. 174), “inclusion is concerned with processes of participation and learning as well as with placement” while being relevant to “many groups of potentially marginalized children and young people”. The similarities in these definitions are that both emphasise student participation as a major element of inclusion and in the processes to accommodate them. The range of students to be accommodated though, seems to be wider in the UK definition.

 Throughout the literature, social inclusion has also been connected with a series of social dimensions:

- “Spatial: social inclusion relates to both proximity and to the closing of social and economic distances;
- relational: social inclusion is defined in terms of a sense of belonging and acceptance;
- functional: social inclusion relates to the enhancement of knowledge, skills and understanding; and
- power: social inclusion assumes a change in the locus of control” (Bailey, 2005, p. 76).

These social dimensions touch on almost every aspect of social life and have framed the form and consequent debates surrounding inclusion. These debates are explored further in the literature review chapter (section 2.1). All of these
dimensions find their application in education and the term ‘inclusive education’ (the practice of inclusion) is discussed below.

b) Inclusive education

According to Florian (2005), “the term inclusive education has come to refer to a philosophy of education that promotes education of all pupils in mainstream schools” (p. 29). Initially, and in particular in the UK, the term inclusive education was introduced around 1990, following attempts to refine the then established ideas of integration (Florian, 2005).

It is worth noting here that the term integration preceded the term inclusion. Integration has been seen as a physical placement of students with SEN in mainstream schools “without any regard to the quality of that placement” (Florian, 2005, p. 30) and as a process of ‘normalisation’ (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002; Florian, 2005). Critique around the term integration, therefore, was mostly focused on issues regarding a denial of difference, which involved students having to adjust in their educational environment and not the opposite (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002; Florian, 2005). Since the term inclusion was introduced, however, there has been a tendency for both the term ‘inclusion’ and the term ‘integration’ to often be used interchangeably in the literature as two concepts representing similar or the same meaning (Frederickson and Cline, 2009). The meaning of the term ‘inclusion’ is also a matter under debate in Greece, which is discussed in detail in the review of the literature (section 2.1).

The term ‘inclusive education’, therefore, is based on the newer concept of ‘inclusion’. There have been many definitions of ‘inclusive education’ over time (Florian, 2005). Issues and views of inclusive education are discussed in detail in the literature review of this thesis (section 2.1). According to Florian (2005), however, the one definition that transcended the notion of ‘normalisation’ came from Inclusion International (1996):

“Inclusion refers to the opportunity for persons with a disability to participate fully in all of the educational, employment, consumer, recreational, community, and domestic activities that typify everyday society”.
It becomes obvious from this definition that the terms ‘inclusive education’ and ‘inclusion’ in education are often subject to the same or similar definitions. Although inclusion can be seen as a notion involving all societal institutions and not just education, the issues around the concept of ‘inclusive education’ are often discussed internationally as issues around ‘inclusion’ in education, which explains the aforementioned definition. After all, as Florian (2008) suggests, “inclusive practice is about the things staff in schools do which give meaning to the concept of inclusion” (p. 205). This meaning, however, has been debated and criticised in Greece, since difficulties relating to the understanding of the term and its translation in Greek are constricting the notion of inclusive education and its consequent practice. As discussed in detail in section 2.1.1.2, the implementation of inclusive education in the Greek educational context has been met with misunderstandings over the meaning of the term deriving from language barriers. In addition, lack of clarity in the legislation creates contradictions in practice, since although promoting inclusion in theory, the suggested practices may lead to segregation and stigmatisation (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005) (see section 2.1.3).

c) Special Educational Needs

The term Special Educational Needs has historically followed the term Special Needs. As Norwich (2010) suggests “the term is specifically an educational one that relates directly to teaching and learning” (p. 13). In Europe, and particularly in the UK, it was introduced by the Education Act 1981 (DES, 1981) following the publication a few years earlier of the Warnock Report (DES, 1978). In Greece, the term SEN was introduced in 2000 (Greek Government, 2000) following European trends on inclusive education.

The term itself is associated with its focus on ‘individual needs’ which, as Norwich suggests, are identified by “assessing individual functioning by reference to the person’s particular context and circumstances (Norwich, 2010, p. 13). However, the term has also been associated with its use as a ‘super-ordinate category’ which replaced special needs categorisation of students (Norwich, 2010). This replacement, although it introduced more positive terms to describe students with SEN, has also been criticised. As Norwich (2010) suggests criticism of the term has focused on stigmatisation and negative
labelling of students with SEN, on the wide range of ‘needs’ it includes which make it vague and on the ‘separatist industry’ which focuses on the expansion of the SEN field for professional and possibly financial interests (Norwich, 2010). Although criticisms have resulted in the creation of ‘dilemmas of difference’ in European countries and the USA over the identification of students with SEN, their curriculum and placement (Norwich, 2009) the value of the term SEN as it is used today cannot be overlooked. Parents have located the value of the term in the positive social identity that it contributes to their child along with a better access to resources and educational provision (Norwich, 2010 & 2008a).

In Greece discussion regarding the term SEN itself was not generated by the Law 2817 which introduced it since its introduction was sudden and without explanation (Greek Government, 2000; Dialektaki, 2014). It has been characterised, however, by academics as ‘highly problematic’ as “it has been used to refer to children who have or may not have an impairment” (Zoniou-Sideri and Vlachou, 2006, p. 383) relating to the use of SEN as a ‘superordinate category’ mentioned earlier. At present, the term Special Educational Needs in Greece is very broad and can refer to children with mental disability, severe visual and hearing impairment, physical impairment, severe health issues, speech and communication difficulties, special learning difficulties such as dyslexia, dyscalculia and dysgraphia, attention deficit with or without hyperactivity disorder, autistic spectrum and developmental disorders and mental or multiple disorders (Greek Government, 2008, p. 3500). In mainstream education, the provision for children with SEN might include simply attending mainstream classes if they have mild learning difficulties, co-teaching in the general class from special education teachers or attending properly staffed ‘inclusive classes’ (Greek Government, 2008). A detailed account of Greek legislation and educational provision is provided in section 2.1.2.

d) Physical Education (PE)

In Greece, although the term Physical Education (Φυσική Αγωγή in Greek) is officially used to refer to the PE lesson, it is relatively new since it was introduced in the Greek context to follow (initially) the international trends (Mpournelli et al., 2006a). For this reason, teachers and students still refer to
the PE lesson as ‘Γυμναστική’ (Gymnastiki). This term has been used to refer to the PE lesson but originates from ancient Greece; as Mpournelli et al. (2006a) suggest the term ‘Γυμναστική’ used to refer to “all human kinetic activities, body exercises and sport, as means to all-round education” (p. 27). However, the restriction of the term to only express concepts related to human movement and health was another reason which led to its official replacement (Mpournelli et al., 2006a).

Although in Greece the term Physical Education has been used to overcome restrictions which limit it to matters of the body, a widely accepted definition for Physical Education has also preoccupied philosophers, academics and occasionally practitioners internationally since the 1970s (Green, 2008). Finding itself between theoretical and practical knowledge, PE has had to defend its usefulness and even existence in the national curriculum of some countries (Kirk and Tinning, 1990; Green, 2008).

In Greece PE is understood as

a concept and practice [which] includes all kinds of physical exercise which contribute to a balanced mental and physical development of the individual (Mpournelli et al., 2006a, p. 28).

In England, the purpose of studying PE is expressed as follows:

A high-quality physical education curriculum inspires all pupils to succeed and excel in competitive sport and other physically-demanding activities. It should provide opportunities for pupils to become physically confident in a way which supports their health and fitness. Opportunities to compete in sport and other activities build character and help to embed values such as fairness and respect (DfE, 2014, p. 260)

An understanding of the mind being informed by the body is implied in both definitions which relates to debates over the theoretical and/or practical value of the PE lesson. These debates are discussed in detail in section 2.2.1. Although teachers and academics debate the definitions of physical education, students define it in terms of recreation and sport without recognising its practical and educational value (Green, 2008). Students’ understandings of PE, however, do not deter PE teachers from finding and implementing innovative ways of
teaching PE. Different approaches to teaching PE are referred to below and explained in detail in the literature review chapter.

e) Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles

Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles for teaching PE became relevant to the Greek educational system in 2006 when a reform in the national curriculum for PE introduced it to the Greek PE lesson. This reform was supported by the publication of four guide books for PE teachers, which are described further in the literature review (section 2.2.1) (Mpournelli et al. 2006a, Mpournelli et al., 2006b, Diggelidis et al., 2006; Goudas et al., 2006).

Before, discussing Mosston’s Spectrum it is worth noting that before its creation other models of teaching physical education were used. ‘Direct’ teaching methods were considered to be those which gave the teacher “greater control over the teaching environment” (Capel, 2005, p. 113) and that is why they were also described as teacher-centred and reproductive (Capel, 2005; Emmanouil, 2002). In contrast, ‘indirect or creative or child-centred’ methods were identified those which allowed children to be more creative during lesson (Emmanouil, 2002; Rich, 2000; Byra, 2006). Both approaches with their advantages and disadvantages are discussed further in the review of the literature (section 2.3.1).

Following the same general structure, Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles was initially formulated by Muska Mosston, and later developed by him in conjunction with Sara Ashworth. The ‘Spectrum’, as they call it, was created after its creator examined “the act of teaching and learning from a structural approach” (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 4). This approach eventually led Mosston to “the discovery that teacher behaviour is a chain of decision making” (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 4). Based on this discovery, Mosston identified the primary decisions that teachers and students usually make during the lesson. The relative degree of decision making between teachers and students establishes the structure of eleven different landmark teaching styles (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002). As a result, at one end of the Spectrum, the teacher makes all the decisions while the students comply with instructions and creates the Command teaching style (style A), while at the other end, students decide on their own what and how they will learn, which creates the Self-
Teaching style (style K) (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002). In between these two teaching styles lie several other teaching styles in the Spectrum, all of which involve different sets of decisions for before, during and after teaching (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002). After the reform of the PE curriculum in Greece more emphasis was placed on teaching styles which enabled students to take more decisions (Syrmpas et al, 2016; Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011). The Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles is described in detail in the literature review chapter (section 2.3.2).

1.4 Research rationale and purposes of the study

Since policies regarding inclusion have been introduced in education, teachers’ and education practitioners’ beliefs and attitudes towards inclusion are critical, as “teachers’ acceptance of the policy of inclusion is likely to affect their commitment to implementing it” (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002, p. 130). This well-established assumption has generated a large amount of international research which reviews possible factors affecting teachers’ perceptions and understandings (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002). Until 2002, however, the understandings and attitudes towards inclusion have been largely measured mostly by quantitative methods (i.e. questionaires) which investigated “‘individualistic’ experiences of inclusion” (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002, p. 144). Additionally, many of these studies were conducted under the assumption that teachers’ attitudes and beliefs “will be expressed in behaviour” (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002, p. 143). It was suggested, for these reasons, that research on the field would benefit from taking into consideration not just individuals’ interactions with their environment and its effects on them, but also from the use of alternative, more qualitative methods, such as observations. (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002). A similar suggestion was also made by Block and Obrusnikova (2007), who suggested:

“More naturalistic observations and discussion with GPE [General Physical Education] teacher about issues related to inclusion would perhaps yield richer data that would translate more directly to practice” (p.120).

Additionally, Qi and Ha (2012), in their review of studies regarding inclusion in PE, which were conducted between 1990 and 2009, found that only 28% of
these studies used qualitative approaches. They suggest that reporting on the ‘actual behaviours’ of teachers would provide better understandings of teachers’ perceptions regarding inclusion and that it would eventually help the promotion of inclusion implementation in PE (Qi and Ha, 2012).

As far as the Spectrum of Teaching Styles is concerned, as noted previously this became relevant to the Greek educational system only in 2006 through the introduction of the latest version of the national curriculum for PE. Given that Greek PE teachers are required, as a result of the curriculum reform, to implement teaching styles from the Mosston Spectrum through their teaching, it is worthwhile to investigate the extent to which they use them during their lessons.

At this point, it is also worth noting that inclusion is also promoted in education by Greek legislation, with the most recent law introduced in 2008 (Law 3699, Greek Government, 2008). The implications of this law are discussed in detail in section 2.1.2. As a result, it is thus clear that the PE lesson is expected, both by legislation and by curriculum changes, to incorporate both ‘inclusion’ and ‘Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles’ implementations.

For this reason, the current study explores PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion of students with SEN in the PE lesson, along with these teachers’ inclusive practices during the lesson. At the same time, teachers’ knowledge and use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles is investigated in an effort to explore possible connections between inclusion understandings/practices and the use of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles. In order to achieve this, qualitative methodology and methods have been employed to be able to investigate the ‘voices’ of the teachers in great depth.

1.5 Outline of the study

This section provides an outline of the thesis structure. The introductory chapter introduces the basic terms used in this study. It also provides the rationale and purposes that guide it.

The literature review chapter sets out the background and theoretical base of the study. The first section explores the notion of inclusion and inclusive education through the perspectives of disability studies, in their international
and political/cultural contexts. It also provides a historical perspective of inclusion in the Greek context, as well as presenting the tensions and debates around it on an international and Greek level. The second section explores the nature and purpose of physical education as well as the notion of inclusion in the PE lesson through a teacher centred perspective. Finally, the third part presents a variety of approaches to teaching Physical Education and explains Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles in detail. It also provides a critical review of literature on the Spectrum. At the end of this chapter, the gaps in knowledge that the literature review has revealed are highlighted and the research questions are presented.

The *methodology chapter* discusses the philosophical and methodological approach used to frame this study and details of how the study was designed and conducted. Following this, the rationale for the chosen methodological design - a single case study with embedded units - which inherently informed the choice of the research methods, is presented. Trustworthiness and ethical consideration issues are also discussed at the end of this chapter.

The study’s empirical findings are presented in the *findings chapter* in three parts. The first part presents combined data at the level of each PE teacher. In this way, a first level of analysis is provided enhancing the depth of understanding of the rest of the findings that follow. A detailed account of the empirical findings is thus presented in the second and third part of the findings chapter according to themes emerging from i) the interviews and ii) the observations.

The *discussion chapter* begins with a presentation of the major discussion points according to research questions. It then continues to discuss these points under the light of each research question in connection with theoretical ideas and relevant literature. As an introduction of each section summaries of the findings that generate these discussions are presented.

Finally the *conclusion* of this study provides a summary of the research journey and highlights its unique theoretical and practical contribution. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW CHAPTER

This chapter will present literature that sheds light on the purpose of the study. As shown in Figure 1, the literature review covers three different areas of educational theory and research and how these relate to practice. The chapter is presented in three main sections: Inclusive education; Physical Education; Teaching Physical Education.

Figure 1: Areas of investigation in the literature

In the final section gaps in the literature are identified and the main research questions which ultimately drive this study are presented.

2.1 Inclusive education

The literature regarding inclusive education is presented in three parts. The first part discusses the context and emergence of inclusion. This is done through a historical outline of understandings of disability and of language issues with relation to inclusion. The remaining two parts present contemporary inclusive education issues and debates both in Greece and internationally.

2.1.1 The context and emergence of inclusion and consequent educational provision

In an effort to explain how inclusion is perceived nowadays and to reach a better understanding of how educationalists came to embrace this particular term there will be a description and analysis of ‘the context and emergence of inclusion’ (Vickerman, 2007a, p.18) in this section, as well as the consequent
educational provision. In order to address the reasons that led to the emergence of the term ‘inclusion’ in educational settings, this section provides a description of the so called ‘models of disability’. It continues by discussing issues related to the use of language referring to disability and provides a clarification between the terms inclusion and integration.

2.1.1.1 Models of disability: a brief review

Altman (2001) suggests that it is often observed that “there is no neutral language with which to discuss disability” (p. 97) because disability is considered a complicated, multidimensional and contested concept (WHO, 2011; Altman, 2001). As such, disability is understood “as a dynamic interaction between health conditions and contextual factors, both personal and environmental” (WHO, 2011, p. 4). Historically, however, disability has been approached through different lenses and expressed in different terms. These approaches have been named ‘models of disability’ and are known as the ‘medical model of disability’, the ‘social model of disability’ and the ‘bio-psycho-social model of disability’.

The first approach is connected with the historical link of the word support with the provision of people with SEN. The ‘medical model of disability’ maintained that a disability, or a deficit, was directly and exclusively focalised to a disabled person whose life and quality of life were affected negatively. As such, the care provided to these people focused on medical treatment and intervention as part of a general effort for normalisation (Brisenden, 1986; Koch, 2001). As Brisenden stresses, ‘the problem comes when they [carers] determine not only the form of treatment…but also the form of life for the person who happens to be disabled’ (Brisenden, 1986, p.173). As a result, it was decided that many children should attend special schools with special treatment and ‘special techniques’ due to their difficulty in following the curriculum in ‘normal’ classes (Clough and Lindsay, 1991). Segregated education was the response to students with disabilities from the late nineteenth century until almost the mid-1960s (Vickerman, 2007a). Even in the 21st century, it has been suggested that lack of knowledge and exposure to different kinds of special education needs … often forces many educators to function under the traditional
medical paradigm that treats impairment as a disease and difference as a social deviance (Paliokostas and Blandford, 2010, p. 184).

As a result, as Paliokostas and Blandford (2010) mention “although people use the term ‘inclusion’, they still function in the context of the medical model and see the deficit within the child” (p. 184).

Barton (1998) was one of the first to insist that disability was not just about the disabled person but also about the ‘disablist’ society around them. This approach represents the ‘social model of disability’. According to this model, it is society that creates all the problems that people with disabilities – people that have extra needs – must face (WHO, 2007). Most importantly, and in opposition to the ‘medical model’,

authors arguing a social definition of disability insist the importance of a physical difference lies solely in discriminatory social reaction to or ignorance of the effects of that difference (Koch, 2001, p.370).

Consequently, it is argued that society should be responsible for removing the barriers affecting the wellbeing and inclusion of disabled people.

Since the ‘social model of disability’ was introduced, there have been many changes to both the academic and the general way of thinking about inclusion (Oliver and Barnes, 2010). The Salamanca statement and framework for action (UNESCO, 1994, p. 5) suggested that “a change in social perspective is imperative” and Oliver and Barnes (2010) suggested that ‘an inclusive education system is a necessary prerequisite for an inclusive society’ (p. 556) following the writings of Barton and other authors. These suggestions, though aiming to achieve the same result – which is inclusion – describe a diametrically different way of doing so. The first one suggests that society needs to be improved in order for education to be more inclusive. The second one suggests the exact opposite. Explaining and trying to understand which one of these statements is a priority is like trying to answer one of Coleridge’s (2009) questions: ‘Who controls the educational process and what scope is there for influencing it?’ (p. 30). If someone uses Socrates’ dialectic method of ‘maieutics’ in order to answer this question, they will probably come to the understanding that it is very difficult to arrive at one single answer. The answer to this question
is, in fact, circular in the sense that it leads to society, then to its leaders and then back to the same society who votes for its leaders and so on. It is almost impossible, therefore, to give a single answer concerning the best way to handle change. However, through this way of thinking – the social model of disability - a more inclusive perspective seems to have been established in education (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009). As Oliver and Barnes (2010) state, it is because of the “social model of disability” that people have a better universal understanding about the “the economic, political and social barriers encountered by disabled people” (p. 552). This is significant for education in particular, since the implementation of the social model of disability advocates for schools to:

- review their curriculum approaches, classroom management and organisations, as well as the expectations of teachers, assistants and their general ethos, in order to ensure the stereotypical and discriminating attitudes that society holds in relation to disability and people with impairments would be broken down (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009, p. 25).

Finally, the ‘bio-psycho-social model’ of disability – provided by International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) (WHO, 2007) - combines elements from both medical and social models in a way that both health conditions (diseases, disorders and injuries) and contextual factors (external environmental and internal personal) can be considered as factors of disability and functioning in general (WHO, 2007). The ‘bio-psycho-social model’ of disability adopts a more practical approach to a vision of inclusion. It also seems to tackle the so-called ‘disability paradox’ successfully. This refers to a paradoxical denial of the ‘social model’ advocates of the individual factors and the ‘medical model’ advocates of the social factors affecting disability (Albrecht and Devlieger, 1999; Koch, 2001). As Norwich (2010) puts it, the ‘bio-psycho-social model’ of disability provides “a useful way of going beyond the unnecessary polarisation between medical (individual) and social models, sometimes promoted by some advocates of inclusion” (p. 13). By doing so, this model “draws on biological, psychological and social perspectives” of disability (Farrell, 2009, p. 30) introducing a different set of possible implications for the
educational provision and even the possibility of special education for students with disabilities.

At this point, it is worth clarifying that the implementation of the medical model of disability in education led to segregated educational provision of students with SEN, whereas the social - and the current bio-psycho-social - model of disability led to integration, and then to inclusion, in education. The terms ‘integration’ and ‘inclusion’ are deliberately mentioned here, in order to be clarified. In the current literature, the two terms are often used as having the same or similar meaning (Frederickson and Cline, 2009). The term ‘integration’, however, preceded the term ‘inclusion’. As Avramidis and Norwich (2002) state “inclusion has recently superseded integration in the vocabulary of special educators as a more radical term located within a human rights discourse” (p. 131). Vislie (2003) also argues that “the two notions have different foci, and … they should not be mixed” (p. 19). In that respect, he explains that the term inclusion focuses more to the “quality of the integrated provision” — integrated provision being the provision provided to students with SEN in mainstream schools — whereas integration focuses more on non-segregation options for students with SEN (Vislie, 2003, p. 20). As a result, in many Western countries, the terms ‘integration’ and ‘inclusion’ are frequently considered to have distinct meanings and implications. Integration is considered to be the placement of children with SEN “in a mainstream educational environment … [where they are] expected to adapt to their new surroundings” (Morley et al., 2005, p. 85). According to Lindsay (2007), the term ‘integration’ ‘may be seen as a child adapting to a host setting (typically a school) while ‘inclusion’ may refer to the host adapting in order to meet the needs of actual (and potential) pupils’ (p. 3). When educational settings adapt to meet the needs of their students or when they try to ‘give meaning to the concept of inclusion’, as Florian (2008, p. 205) suggests, these settings may be called ‘inclusive education’ settings.

2.1.1.2 Inclusion and language

Being aware and understanding the language and its connotations in regard to both inclusion and disability is important since ‘the language used and the situation in which it is expressed will determine the message that goes out to those listening’ (Brisenden, 1986, p. 174). In an era where knowledge and
information is being shared amongst nations at a speed that was unknown and unimaginable in previous centuries, clarifying the language used to share the information is vital.

The Salamanca Statement of the United Nations (UNESCO, 1994) was a great milestone in the education of children with SEN. It proclaimed that ‘every child has a fundamental right to education, and must be given the opportunity to achieve and maintain an acceptable level of learning’ (UNESCO, 1994, p. viii). The terms ‘inclusion’ and ‘education for all’ have emerged from this statement and they have since affected the educational provision of children with SEN. A brief definition of what the term ‘inclusion’ entails in educational settings has been provided already, along with its perceived difference from the term ‘integration’, which preceded it. The distinction between the two terms is, however, not always clear in practice (Lindsay, 2007). In some countries, such as Greece or Sweden, a distinction in terminology can be even more difficult, if it even exists at all. Berhanu (2011) mentions that the terms inclusion and integration have been used interchangeably in Sweden's educational discourses. The reason for this is that ‘the term inclusion has been difficult to translate into Swedish … In the first translations into Swedish of UNESCO’s Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action, inclusion was translated as integration’ (Berhanu, 2011, p. 7). Currently, this terminology gap in Sweden has been addressed by experts who differentiated between the terms ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’ in the Swedish language (Berhanu, 2011). Polichronopoulou (2003) mentions that in Greece, although the two terms ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’ have been linked in the literature with different conceptual frameworks, they are often used interchangeably without being attached to a particular ideology. Practice shows that in Greece the use of the term inclusion is used in a context which refers more to the understanding of the term integration according to the definition provided earlier (section 2.1.1.1) by Vislie (2003). As a result, the part-time withdrawal system of the ‘inclusive classes’ is the main inclusive ‘tool’ of the Greek educational system and its core reflects integrationist practices. Additionally, the part-time withdrawal system defies the meaning of the word inclusion the way that it is translated in Greek. Inclusion is, in fact, translated as ‘ένταξη’ in Greek. This is defined as the action, or the result, of including someone in an organised situation or ensemble. Its use in
the educational context consequently corrupts the meaning of the word itself, increases confusion and decreases its understanding. To add to the confusion, Zoniou-Sideri et al. (2006) mention that:

From 1985 onwards the main special education policy in Greece is this of ‘inclusion’. However, inclusion in this context is seen as the accommodation of children with special needs or disabilities in an educational system that is characterized by uniformity at a structural, organization and curriculum level (p. 285).

The issues surrounding the understandings of the terms inclusion and integration are not the only issues regarding inclusion in education which are connected to language. The term special educational needs, heavily associated with inclusion and consequently inclusive education, has also been criticised. Norwich (2010) suggests:

‘This criticism is about SEN as a super-category with its continued focus on children’s ‘difficulties’. As a super-category, the use of the SEN term continues to label children negatively and its use is devaluing of them’ (p. 85).

This could also be related to the term ‘special needs’ and its interpretations. The word ‘special’ can contain either a positive or a negative value judgment. In special education, however, ‘special’ “usually refers to an individual’s undesirable characteristics or way of functioning in relation to an end considered as crucial” (Vehmas, 2010, p. 91). Mittler (2012) voices his concerns about the term ‘special needs’ by compartmentalising it and explaining his view. Since the term ‘special’ refers to children, he suggests that “the children concerned are ‘special’ only because so far the educational system has not been able to meet their needs” (Mittler, 2012, p. 9). He continues by explaining his concerns regarding the term: “the use of needs sends out signals of dependency, inadequacy and unworthiness” (Mittler, 2012, p. 9). On the other hand, in an effort to soften the edges of the same word, Vehmas (2010) suggests that “needs do not exist without aims; if I have no aims, I have no needs either” (p. 89). Since all people have needs in their lives the word ‘special’ on its own is not strong enough to deprive any person of their “rights, wellbeing and good life” (Vehmas, 2010, p. 94). Finally, as far as people’s
needs are concerned “it is not clear whether naming and categorising differences...is automatically in conflict with social inclusion’ which is a crucial aspect of ‘genuine inclusion” (Vehmas, 2010, p. 95). The concerns regarding the term ‘Special educational needs’ are reflected in issues regarding the terms inclusion and inclusive education. These are further analysed in section 2.1.3.

Patrick McDonnell (2000) voices his concerns in regard to the use of the word ‘normal’ in education. He suggests:

Firstly, there is the problem of how ‘normal’ is understood or determined in society. There is the assumption, for example, that what happens in mainstream schooling is ‘normal’ and therefore unproblematic. Secondly, there is the assumption that the ‘normal’ is a given rather that a social product (McDonnell, 2000, p. 22).

The links between the language used and its perceived meaning within society, as well as society’s reactions have clearly affected the advocates of the ‘social model of disability’. As previously discussed (section 2.1.1.1), a more complete model of disability has emerged nowadays (the ‘bio-psycho-social model’). However, the concerns of the aforementioned authors (McDonnell, 2000; Vehmas, 2010) and of the advocates of the social model of disability regarding the use of language touch a human rights discourse. Regarding the use of the term ‘special need’, Runswick-Cole and Hodge (2009) suggest that “the language of ‘need’ and the term ‘special’ be rejected in favour of the term ‘educational rights’” (p. 201). The term ‘special educational needs’ has been the base “to sustain and construct exclusionary practices within education” on many occasions, according to them (Runswick-Cole and Hodge, 2009, p. 201). Because of that, an “educational rights discourse could enhance the provision and practice of education” (Runswick-Cole and Hodge, 2009, pp. 201–202).

In conclusion, this section has highlighted issues relating both to language understandings and its linked understandings of educational provisions, as well as societal understandings regarding students with SEN. These issues initiate discussions and debates in the literature that are further explored in section 2.1.3. The next section, will explore inclusion and special educational provision in the context of Greece.
2.1.2 Inclusion and special education in Greece: legislation and educational provision

The table below provides an overview of the main features of the Greek Laws regarding Special Education that are presented and analysed in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Year of Issue</th>
<th>Main features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1143   | 1981          | • First law issued regarding solely 'special education'.  
              • First law to introduce 'special classes' in mainstream settings.  
              • Used the term 'divergent' to describe individuals with SEN.  
              • Stated that 'diagnostic tests' are necessary to identify 'special needs'. |
| 1566   | 1985          | • The only law regarding general education to include a separate chapter regarding 'special education'.  
              • Introduced the term 'special needs' to describe students with SEN. |
| 2817   | 2000          | • This law was (once again) issued separately for 'special education' instead for education in general.  
              • The term 'special needs' was changed to 'special educational needs'.  
              • 'Special classes' were renamed to 'inclusive classes'.  
              • The function of KDAYs (Diagnostic Assessment and Support Centre) was established.  
              • The Individual Educational Plan (IEP) was introduced once a student was identified as having SEN. |
| 3699   | 2008          | • This law was mainly based on the Law 2817.  
              • It divides students in two categories: Disabled students and students with SEN.  
              • It renamed KDAYs to KEDDYs (Centre of Differential Diagnosis, Diagnosis and Support of Special Educational Needs). |

Table 1: Greek legislation regarding Special Education

The first law in Greece regarding special education was Law 1143 issued in 1981 (Greek Government, 1981). It was titled “Regarding Special Education, special vocational education, occupation and social care of individuals divergent from the normal” (translation from Greek: ‘Περί Ειδικής Αγωγής, Ειδικής Επαγγελματικής Εκπαίδευσης, Απασχολήσεως και Κοινωνικής Μερίμνης των αποκλινόντων εκ του φυσιολογικού ατόμων) (Greek Government, 1981, p.787). This law stated that “special education be provided from schools or other
special education units”, some of them located inside “normal schools” (Greek Government, 1981, article 3.3, p. 787) and that “special education…is provided after diagnostic tests which will determine the type and level of impairment of the divergent individuals” (Greek Government, 1981, article 7.1). The law specified where and from whom these diagnostic tests could take place. It did not, however, specify the exact way that this would happen (Vomva, 2012). Consequently, a doctor, a psychologist, a social worker and a special educator would form the team performing the diagnostic tests in locations and centres provided by the Greek state (Greek Government, 1981, article 7.2). This was criticised for its use of language (i.e. “divergent from the normal”) as outdated and offensive (Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000). It became, however, the first law to establish and legitimise the education of students with SEN inside mainstream schools. However, it eventually failed to be fully implemented due to a change of government the same year (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006).

In 1985, another law (Law 1566, Greek Government) that used the term ‘Special Needs’ to describe students with SEN was introduced. Although the second law regarding special education it was the first law to be incorporated as a separate chapter in general education legislation (Zoniou-Sideri et al, 2006). From this point of view this law “was an innovation for the Greek reality that kept children with SEN on the fringe of society even at legislative level” (Dialektaki, 2014, p. 41). In addition, Law 1566 (Greek Government, 1985) concerning primary and secondary special education also introduced the term ‘inclusion’. ‘Inclusion’ was used to describe one of the goals of special education as follows:

[special education aims to:]

a) the all-round and effective development and utilisation of the potentials [of individuals with SEN],

b) their inclusion in the production process and c) their mutual acceptance by the community (Greek Government, 1985, article 32.1).

As a result, it was determined that special education was to be provided not only in special schools and other types of special education units but also in
“special classes…that function inside normal schools” (Greek Government, 1985, article 32.4.b). These classes were used to accommodate children with learning difficulties, as well as children who faced “short term or persistent problems in one or more areas of literacy, numeracy and learning skills” (Avramidis and Kalyva, 2007, p. 369). Students with SEN were being withdrawn from general class on an occasional basis in order to attend lessons with a specialised teacher in the special class (Avramidis and Kalyva, 2007). ‘Special classes’ became the dominant type of provision for children with SEN in Greek mainstream schools “without any assessment and research of their effectiveness” (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005). Law 1566 also determined that the diagnostic tests for the detection of the special needs of the students would be conducted from the relevant services of the then Ministry of Health, Provision and Social Security (Greek Government, 1985, article 33). These diagnostic tests later became the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, but their initial allocation of this responsibility to the Ministry of Health is indicative of the ‘medical model’ understandings that permeated Special Education in 1985 in Greece.

Greece was one of the 92 countries that signed the Salamanca Statement in 1994 (UNESCO, 1994) and made a serious effort to embrace inclusion by issuing another law in 2000. Law 2817 was specifically titled “Education of people with special educational needs and other provisions” (translation from Greek: Εκπαίδευση των ατόμων με ειδικές εκπαιδευτικές ανάγκες και άλλες διατάξεις) and it referred analytically to the issues of provision (Greek Government, 2000). It was issued exclusively for special educational practice instead of being part of the general education legislation which Law 1566 had been (Greek Government, 1985). The term ‘Special Educational Needs’ made its appearance for the first time in this law and thus replaced the outdated terms ‘Special education’ and ‘Special Needs’. As Clough and Lindsay (1991) suggest, the use of this term reveals an effort to correlate the disability or the learning difficulty of the child not only with the child, but, also, with the child’s school/learning environment. As such, this understanding relates to the social model of disability which involves societal factors in the view of disability. In the light of this term, the cause of school failure moves from within the child, an understanding which is derived from the medical model of disability, to the
ability of the school to meet the child’s needs. The first chapter of this law also explained the meaning and purpose of special needs education in an analytical way that was absent in the previous laws. In addition, ‘special classes’ were renamed as ‘inclusive classes’ without further explanation or justification (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005). It also introduced in-class support and, subsequently, established the presence of a special educator/teacher in mainstream classes for the support of the child/children who may have needed them (Greek Government, 2000). These teachers either co-teach alongside the general education teacher or offer their personalised support to one or more students in the classroom (Greek Government, 2000). As a result of the latter change, the presence of special educators in general schools was increased. Zoniou-Sideri et al. (2005) mention, when denouncing the 2000 law concerning Special Needs Education, that the changes suggested by the Greek government did not “affect the overall structure of the schools and [did] not require schools to change their practices”. They also claim that, by itself, the simple renaming of the ‘special classes’ to ‘inclusive classes’ was thoughtless and turned inclusion to a “bureaucratic trick...instead of being an important issue for educational debate” (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005).

The 2817 law also pronounced that the diagnosis and assessment of the students with special needs would be determined by the local Diagnostic Assessment and Support Centre (KDAY) (translation from Greek: Κέντρα Διάγνωσης, Αξιολόγησης και Υποστήριξης, (ΚΔΑΥ) (Greek Government, 2000). Most importantly it also established that one of KDAYs’ responsibilities would be to provide individual educational plans for the assessed students. Two curricula were thus established; the general curriculum and the special or personalised curriculum (Greek Government, 2000). In the past, the curriculum was common to all the schools in Greece. As such, students with SEN had to follow the mainstream curriculum irrespective of how useful this curriculum was for them. The state seemed to take into consideration understandings of inclusion with this alternative curriculum. These understandings relate to the school environment adapting to students’ needs. Other responsibilities involved the assessment and diagnosis of the type and level of difficulty of children of preschool and school age, the recommendation of a suitable educational unit, the support and advice of the teaching staff during the educational process of
students with SEN diagnosis, the provision of suitable resources according to recommended teaching, the replacement of written with oral exams for the diagnosed students and finally the suggestion of early intervention programmes for students with SEN (Greek Government, 2000).

The most recent law concerning special education in Greece was issued in 2008 (Law 3699). Law 3699 (Greek Government, 2008) was mainly based on Law 2817 (Greek Government, 2000). This law stated that the Greek state is devoted to the establishment of “equal opportunities for the full participation and contribution to society…with full establishment of their rights in education, social and vocational inclusion” of people with SEN (Greek Government, 2008, article 1.1, p. 3499). With this law, students with SEN can attend the classes of a mainstream school as long as they have mild learning difficulties. If the students need co-teaching from special education teachers, that can be provided (Greek Government, 2008). They can also attend appropriately staffed ‘inclusive classes’ with suitable group-oriented or personalised curricula but for no more than 15 school hours per week. After that students must return to their regular classes (Greek Government, 2008). Lastly, students with severe learning difficulties can attend either mainstream schools or ‘special education units’ while having access to the appropriate support staff regardless of their environment (Greek Government, 2008). Law 3699 divided students falling under the special education clause in students with SEN and disabled students, instead of just students with SEN as in the previous law (Greek Government, 2008). As Dialektaki (2014) comments there was no explanation or justification for this decision in the document. In addition, this categorisation seemed to have derived from an understanding that physical disabilities need to be differentiated from disabilities relating to human intellect. However, as Vickerman and Maher (2016) suggest “rigid classification systems” deprive people with SEN “the varying degrees of support and autonomy required and desired”. Although the purpose of special needs education does not seem to have changed from the previous law (Law 2816, Greek Government, 2000), an attempt was made to improve the function of the ‘inclusive classes’. More specifically, students with mild learning difficulties could attend lessons of the general curriculum and/or of a special curriculum according to their needs. However, the law does not give details on additional types of provision to be
implemented in order for all types of SEN to be accommodated according to their needs.

Regarding the assessment of the students with SEN, Law 3699 renamed the previously mentioned KDAY (Diagnostic Assessment and Support Centre) to Centre of Differential Diagnosis, Diagnosis and Support of Special Educational Needs, or KEDDY (translation from Greek: Κέντρα Διαφοροδιάγνωσης, Διάγνωσης και Υποστήριξης Ειδικών Εκπαιδευτικών Αναγκών (ΚΕΔΔΥ), (Greek Government, 2008). This change was not explained by the law, but the word ‘differential’ relates to medical diagnoses. The diagnosis, however, was set to be conducted by five members of a team consisting of a SEN educator, a child psychiatrist, a social worker, a psychologist and a speech therapist (Greek Government, 2008). KEDDYs’ role and therefore of the five member team is mostly the same as in the previous law (Law 2817, Greek Government, 2000) but there are some additional responsibilities. These responsibilities involve KEDDYs submitting annual reports regarding their overall operation, writing individual reports for all the students under their authority and writing reports regarding possible insufficiencies and interventions in schools’ infrastructure. However, the Law 3699 has not appointed additional staff to help with the increased responsibilities. Given that severe shortages in personnel were observed even before 2008 it is doubtful whether the new responsibilities can be met by the existing staff in KEDDYs (Dialektaki, 2014). In her study Dialektaki (2014) found that teachers of ‘inclusive classes’ complained about a lack of a set and planned curriculum, which puts the effectiveness of the latest legislation on this matter into doubt. Nevertheless, Law 3699 describes in detail the process of diagnosis (Greek Government, 2008). The assessment as described is made by the group of five professionals mentioned earlier. The parents’ or guardians’ role is firstly to apply for their child’s diagnostic process. At the beginning of the assessment parents/guardians are also required to submit their child’s medical history along with any possible diagnoses made by independent bodies. Parents’ opinions can play an important role in the assessment process but they are not binding according to the law. Children undertaking this process are required to attend a few meetings until the process is complete. In these meetings, they are administered a number of tests including an IQ (intelligence quotient) test. The IQ test in particular has been
criticised for its unquestioned use in the diagnostic process in Greece since its effectiveness and the underlying meaning of ‘intelligence’ it represents have caused controversy in many countries (Dialektaki, 2014). Once the diagnostic process is completed the team of five professionals write their report regarding the type and level of special educational needs of the students which includes their IEPs. Parents’ opinions can also factor in the creation of IEPs, however these opinions do not necessarily play a conclusive role. Schools are then required to implement the IEPs. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the law does not clarify what happens when parents/guardians do not want to apply for the diagnostic process of their child.

The journey towards inclusion in Greece has been a long one but it did not start and hopefully will not finish with the aforementioned legislation. As mentioned earlier the initial laws (Law 1143, Law 1566 and Law 2817) regarding special education in Greece reflected to a larger or smaller degree a stance originating from the ‘medical model of disability’ (Greek Government, 1981, 1985, 2000). As a result, they did not create fruitful conditions for a new “inclusive educational policy covering all aspects of education” (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005). It comes as no surprise therefore that the latest law (Law 3699, Greek Government, 2008) was based on the previous Law 2817 (Greek Government, 2000) bringing with it outdated notions. Some of the reasons why this might have happened are discussed in the next section (2.1.3). However, by 2011 and regardless of the many contradictions surrounding legislation regarding inclusive education a significant change was observed. According to data from the Pedagogical Institute in Greece, the ‘inclusive classes’ increased in number by over 120% (Pedagogical Institute, 2004 & 2011). Such a phenomenal increase can be attributed to the popularity of the ‘inclusive class’ as a tool of implementing inclusion but also to a change in the public discourse regarding disability. Instead of disability being something to be ashamed of or being regarded and defined as “personal tragedy” (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006) society and parents in particular seem to have started overcoming notions of stigmatisation and accessing resources and tools provided to them by legislation – i.e. the right for their child to attend the local school, unless otherwise suggested by the local KEDDY.
As mentioned earlier in this section inclusion in Greece was the outcome of legislation influenced by ‘trends’ in other western European countries. In some of these other countries inclusion was “the outcome of the ‘battles’ of the voluntary organisations and parents contesting the rights of children with special educational needs” (Dialektaki, 2014, p. 39). In the UK in particular, one of the leading countries towards inclusive education, the journey from segregated to special and inclusive education has and continues to be a long one. It is well known in the UK that the Warnock Report first introduced the term special educational needs in the UK in 1978 (DES). However, decades before then, the Butler Education Act issued in post-war Britain in 1944 (DoE), stipulated, although never fully implemented, that education should meet the needs of children with special educational needs (Jones, 2016; Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009). The equivalent legislation in Greece could be considered the Law 1143 (Greek Government, 1981) which, as mentioned earlier, although introduced ‘mainstreaming’ it gravitated more towards the locational integration of students with SEN. In the UK context, the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) was the result of pressure put on the government by “educational professionals and parents” in the 1970s to rethink issues of educational provision of students with SEN (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009, p. 67). The Warnock Report conclusions and suggestions informed the Educational Act of 1981 (DES) which in turn defined the educational provision of students with SEN for over three decades (Warnock and Norwich, 2010). This is not to say that the 1981 Educational Act (DES, 1981) did not face criticism – on the contrary, it did - but to highlight that it was an Act that was informed by public dialogue and by changes in the special needs discourse of the time. The Education Act of 1988 (DfE, 1993) and 1996 (DfEE) were issued a few years later and addressed some issues raised previously. These led to the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (DfES, 2001) which strengthened the legitimate right of students with SEN to study in mainstream education (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009) and to other government initiatives such as ‘Removing Barriers to Achievement’ (DfES, 2004b) and Every Child Matters (DfES, 2005). Definitions of what was being considered ‘special needs’, ‘special educational needs’ and ‘inclusion’ have been given over time in these documents. Most importantly though, definitions and their implementation in schools have been and continue being discussed thoroughly by academics, researchers, practitioners, disability
activists and families/ family associations. These discussions seem to have an impact on policies over time, creating a fertile and productive two-way communication which fosters continuously improving inclusive practice. In Greece, in contrast, such discussions usually happen after the legislative framework is implemented in the educational settings. In addition, core terms used in the laws are not given official definitions, resulting in collective confusion, on behalf of practitioners, over their meaning. More issues regarding Greek legislation are discussed in the next section (2.1.3). The UK example mentioned in this paragraph, however, provides useful information about how discourse surrounding special education and inclusion affects one of the leading western countries on the field.

This section, in conclusion, provides an outline of the legislation regarding Special Educational Needs and the educational provision in Greece. Starting from 1981 until 2008, the implementation of special education is shown in a way that describes how Greek legislation moved away from a clearly ‘medical’ approach to disability to an educational provision which resembles integration and possibly even inclusion. However, clear definitions of these approaches have not been given in the aforementioned legislation. Rather, they are expressed through their implementation in education. At the end of this section the example of how special and inclusive education have evolved in the UK is presented briefly for comparative reasons. The next section will explore debates regarding the issues around inclusive education and it will aim to shed light onto the issues that relate to the special education provision in Greece.

2.1.3 Inclusive education debate: an international and Greek account

This section presents the issues surrounding the definition and conceptualisation of inclusive education. It starts by providing a number of inclusive education definitions which reveal approaches to inclusion. The section continues by presenting a variety of inclusive practices in different contexts and concludes by presenting the issues and interpretations surrounding inclusive education in the Greek context.

The fundamental principle of the inclusive school is that all children should learn together, wherever possible, regardless of any differences they may have. Inclusive schools must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of their students, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning and ensuring quality education to all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnerships with their communities. There should be a continuum of support and services to match the continuum of special needs encountered in every school (UNESCO, 1994, p.11).

Inclusive education, in the way it is defined by the Salamanca statement, therefore expresses an understanding which puts schools at the frontline of both inclusion and inclusive practise, by essentially interpreting inclusion not only as students’ common placement but also as a responsibility for change on behalf of the school in order to support the needs of all students, done equally and with respect. Inclusive education is met, however, with confusion and contextual interpretations, which make its definition a difficult task. A generalised tension in inclusive education is also phrased by Florian (2014), who suggests that “it is not surprising that reviews of inclusive education conclude that it lacks clear definition” (p. 288). Florian (2014) also identifies “a lack of clarity and conceptual difficulties in defining inclusion” (p. 288).

Several attempts to provide a definition for inclusive education are presented in the literature. Grenier (2010) suggests that “inclusive education is understood as a philosophy that supports and celebrates diversity through the active participation of all students in the school culture” (p. 388). Black-Hawkins (2014) suggest a philosophical approach, one that offers “a conceptual clarity [to] the meaning of inclusive education”, alternative ways of thinking about policy and practice and stigmatisation in the educational systems (p. 447). It also offers “a fundamental concern with Pring’s notion of the ‘foundations of our moral values’” and an optimistic view of the future of inclusive education (Black-Hawkins, 2014, p. 447). Frederickson and Cline (2009) suggest that “given an inclusive philosophy, pupils with SEN may be a stimulus to development of a richer mainstream experience for all” (p.71). A philosophical point of view in inclusive education is thus suggested, in order to provide conceptual clarity and
a way of rethinking of the purpose of inclusive education through considering issues of social justice and equity in education.

Florian et al. (2010) suggest that “the challenge of inclusive education is to respect and respond to human differences” giving an insight to the challenges affecting inclusive education (p. 712). They also add that, given an inclusive practice, “the teacher works to extend what is ordinarily available to all, as opposed to doing something ‘additional’ or ‘different’ from that which is available to others” (Florian et al, 2010, p. 712). Inclusive practice as suggested here, therefore, reflects an understanding of inclusion which tackles the aforementioned challenge (respect of human difference) and, as such, responds to individual differences with respect.

“Maximising the participation of all learners in the community schools of their choice” is another definition for inclusive education, one given by Thomas and Vaughan (2004, p. 134). In her small-scale study, Corbett (2001) also found that one of the most important factors in order for a school to become “effectively inclusive… [is] a shared vision by the school team” (p. 58). This sense of unity and ‘school wide effort’ as essential for an inclusive education environment permeates the findings of many authors (Corbett, 2001; Grenier, 2010). It is, however, not the only factor that promotes the existence of inclusive schools. An administration which encourages such a vision, ‘experienced…teachers’, resources and “open receptivity to learning new skills and trying out whatever strategies seem to be useful” are, also, important factors in creating an inclusive school (Corbett, 2001, p. 58). It seems that, apart from being an issue that involves student participation and freedom of choice, inclusion is also perceived as a continual process, to which everyone needs to contribute.

In their critical review of research regarding inclusive education Göransson and Nilholm (2014) conclude that “reviews of the field sometimes seem to overlook that the definitional problems indicate differences in beliefs about what schools can and should accomplish” (p. 275). Furthermore, Norwich (2013) explains that the reason inclusive education can be considered an ‘illusion’ is “because of the disparities in what is understood by inclusive education and how it has been practiced internationally” (p. 92). Confusion regarding the definition of inclusive education therefore relates to contextual interpretations of how it is, or should
be, practiced. Indeed, inclusive education practice varies significantly internationally. Miles and Singal (2010, p. 9) mention that “mainstream teachers” in Zambia perceived the term as referring exclusively to the education of students with special educational needs (SEN). Almost the same situation is observed in India. In this case, however, it was the government instead of the teachers that made this specific interpretation of inclusive education (Miles and Singal, 2010). Therefore, Zambian and Indian teachers’ understanding of inclusive education translates in special but not necessarily to inclusive provision. Referring to educational practices, Anastasiou et al. (2015) suggest that “identification and classification of disabilities in Italy follow a medicalised model” (p. 434). Writing about inclusive education in Ireland, McDonnell (2000) concludes that the assumptions and practices in the Irish educational system (such as the reflection of a medical/pathological model of disability in official education documents) do not favour inclusive education, since they contradict its basic principle of equality. Gyimah et al. (2009) reported on a centralised educational system which lacks coordination between mainstream schooling and special education planning in Ghana. The curriculum is both one and for all students and, as such, the assessment of students with SEN often leads them to special schools. As a result, “in spite of a shift towards inclusion, institutionalisation is an entrenched practice” in Ghana (p. 790). In Macau, China, ‘experimental’ inclusive schools materialise the terms inclusion and inclusive school into three models (Forlin, 2011). According to the first model, students with mild hearing, visual or physical impairments are fully included in a regular classroom. The second model refers to students with “slightly more challenging needs”, who receive education based on the regular curricula but in a special class in a mainstream environment (Forlin, 2011, p. 438). Finally, the third model is enacted again in a special class and it involves students with “higher support needs” (Forlin, 2011, p. 438). It does not follow the regular curriculum. As such, Macau’s practice reveals a “flexible interpretation of inclusion” (Forlin, 2011, p. 438), which relates more to segregated provision and not to inclusion.

It comes as no surprise, then, that efforts to pinpoint quality inclusive education have been developed. Wolery et al. in 2000, along with Soukakou in 2012, did this through the “development of observational rating scales which cover
several dimensions of process quality, including the level of children’s engagement” (Fyssa et al., 2014, p. 224; Vlachou and Fyssa, 2016). Another effort involved Florian and Spratt (2013), who tried to “bring conceptual clarity in the field” by creating the Inclusive Pedagogical Approach in Action (IPAA) Framework (p. 293). A revised version of the IPAA Framework suggested that an inclusive practice includes all students by creating suitable learning opportunities for all, by “extending what is ordinarily available for all learners” and by providing sufficient choice to everyone through differentiation (Florian, 2014, p. 290). It also suggested that teachers better focus on the subjects to be taught than “who is to learn it”, reflect and strategise their responses to difficulties, have a good relationship with their students, have a flexible approach to learning, see “difficulties in learning as professional challenges … rather than deficits in learners” and seek opportunities to further their professional development (Florian, 2014, p. 291). However, clear this latest approach makes inclusive education appear, the inconsistencies between theory and practice continue internationally.

Although the Greek constitution and legislation suggest and recognise the right to free education to all Greeks equally, there are issues that indicate that the ‘democratisation’ of the Greek educational system is not complete and that it may be even inadequate (Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000). It is worth noting at this point that the term ‘special education’ is used in Greece (by practitioners and legislators) to refer to all types of educational provision for students with SEN (whether it being provided in segregated special education units or in mainstream settings). Moreover, regarding the latest law concerning Special Education (Law 3699, Greek Government, 2008) “the implementation of this policy is far from straightforward” (Fyssa et al., 2014, p. 224). A variety of organisational settings exist for the enactment of the inclusive manifestation of this law. These consist of ‘inclusive classes’ in mainstream schools, co-teaching with special education teachers and placement in mainstream classrooms without additional support. This manifestation has been heavily criticised, dubbed as ineffective and inadequate (Fyssa et al., 2014; Vlachou, 2006; Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005; Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006). Firstly, as Fyssa et al. (2014) suggest, even on the occasions where “organisational changes” to accommodate inclusion have taken place, schools are still lagging in “the
adaptations needed in curriculum content and pedagogical practices” to achieve inclusive practice (p. 224). The Greek educational system is characterised by its uniformity; schools are required to follow the same organisational structure in terms of school management, the same academically oriented curriculum, have the same timetable and use the same resources, all provided by the Ministry of Education (Vlachou, 2006; Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006; Dialektaki, 2014). As a result, students with SEN have historically been required to follow the same curriculum, regardless of whether their needs are being met. Law 3699 (Greek Government, 2008) and its predecessor (Law 2817, Greek Government, 2000) brought students with SEN a step closer to their ‘liberation’ from this common curriculum requirements (see section 2.1.2). KEDDY, however, the authority responsible for the issuing of personalised curriculums (IEPs) for students with SEN, has been criticised as ineffective due to organisational issues and its IEPs as not always useful to the practitioners (Dialektaki, 2014). In addition, the function of the ‘inclusive classes’ “is much closer to the US resource or pull out programmes, or to what the British describe as part-time withdrawal in a learning support base” (Vlachou, 2006, p. 41). Vlachou (2006), however, made the aforementioned statement when referring to ‘special classes’ as introduced by the Law 1566 (Greek Government, 1985). Given that the organisational changes to support the promoted name change of this class were not existent (as mentioned in section 2.1.2) (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005) an obvious conclusion is that Vlachou’s (2006) statement mentioned earlier should be expressing the way ‘inclusive classes’ work currently. As confirmation the study of Zoniou-Sideri et al. (2005) - six years after the renaming of the class by the Law 2817 (Greek Government, 2000) - reported that 63 out of 92 Greek teachers who had worked in both ‘special’ and ‘inclusive classes’ did not find a difference between the two settings. Further to that, even the latest law (Law 3699, Greek Government, 2008) did not alter the purpose and function of the ‘inclusive classes’.

A centralised educational system and its slow responses, a rigid national curriculum, a withdrawal system implemented for attendance of ‘inclusive classes’ and, additionally, “the medical model that many professionals bring into the schools” were all being scrutinized by Zoniou-Sideri et al. (2006, p.288)
even before the new legislation (Law 3699, Greek Government, 2008). In 2006, Zoniou-Sideri et al. also mention:

what is peculiar to the Greek situation is the speed that special education was established, expanded, and infiltrated general education in the last twenty years. This has created conflicting and contradictory policies and practices that hinder further the efforts of parents, students, teachers and other professionals for inclusion (p. 289).

As mentioned earlier (section 2.1.2) the Greek educational system has over time adopted “concepts and practices that have been implemented and criticised in other countries” (Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000, p. 34). The ‘speed’ of the expansion of Special Education to which Zoniou-Sideri (2006) refers to, may therefore be attributed to this uncritical adoption. Incorporating in the Greek educational system elements of other educational systems, denies it the freedom of expression as an entity born from the “economic, cultural and political” struggles of its people (Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000, p. 34). In addition, as Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris (2000) suggest it “belittles” the importance and gravity of the “historical struggles” of other countries on their route to inclusive practice (p. 34). This practice, however, might offer explanations concerning the reasons why many practitioners have been implementing practice through a medical model of disability lens and why ‘inclusive classes’ are in reality withdrawal classes. Greek governments proceeded to legislate increasingly more ‘inclusively’ with regard to special education after 1981 when Greece was incorporated in the European Union (EU). From then on Greece was “in full support of integration” in its official policies regardless of whether there was “fertile ground” for these changes (Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000, p. 33). Further, the hastiness in adopting foreign concepts in education might have contributed to the anachronistic notions permeating the ‘inclusive class’ institution (Zoniou-Sideri et al. (2006). Fyssa et al. (2014) stress that the popular forms of inclusive provision, including the ‘inclusive classes’, represent a “narrow deficit-oriented perspective that emphasises individual deficits and the need for their remediation” (p. 224). Such practices, however, “reproduce and reinforce inequalities of the Greek educational system, and at the same time create new forms of stigmatisation and segregation” (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005).
Nevertheless, a lack of empirical studies in Greece to investigate the operation and quality of provision of the ‘inclusive classes’ further hinder reasonable, substantial and quality change in notions and policies (Fyssa et al. 2014; Dialektaki, 2014). It seems that the eagerness of Greece to please its new European partners was enough to justify legislation which over time ignored social and practical reality and readiness and academic or parent voices on issues of inclusive education. This has resulted in half-measures being constantly repeated over decades which have possibly slowed down progress and denied students with SEN their true potential.

Many of the contradictions mentioned in this section regarding the Greek educational context become apparent from various studies conducted in a variety of Greek regions before and after the issues arising from the latest legislation. In a study conducted by Fyssa et al. (2014), out of 77 early childhood teachers (with 32 of them being special educators), 85.7% were reported to hold an ‘integrationist’ rather that a ‘truly inclusive’ understanding of inclusion. They also believed in the adaptation of the student with SEN to its environment as a ‘normal process’. Additionally, a significant percentage of the teachers considered withdrawal programmes (to an ‘inclusive class’) to be an effective and appropriate form of inclusion (Fyssa et al., 2014). This recent study presents similar results to a 2006 study conducted by Zoniou-Sideri and Vlachou, which underpinned a slow and/or ineffective approach to inclusive education in the previous decade in Greece. This study involved 641 mainstream education teachers employed in pre-school, primary and secondary education and these teachers believed that inclusive education was a way to reduce the isolation and stigmatisation of students with SEN. They also, however, believed that special schools were more suitable providers of safety/security and education to disabled children. It was noted in the study that “teachers hold a quite confusing interpretation of what inclusion means” (Zoniou-Sideri and Vlachou, 2006, p. 389). Finally, students with SEN were perceived as in need of ‘philanthropy’ and “‘needy’ of society’s help” (Zoniou-Sideri and Vlachou, 2006, p. 391). The latter result was part of what Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris (2000) referred to as “the defectology discourse on issues of deviance” which was permeating not only people’s way of thinking but also popular media shows and fundraisings in the 1980s and 1990s (p. 31).
Another study by Vlachou (2006) investigated the “role of special/support teachers in Greek primary schools” and the assumption that “support rooms and part-time withdrawal are the most effective ways for promoting the educational and social inclusion” of students with SEN (p. 53). The findings of this study suggested that special education teachers found themselves feeling insecure and isolated from their colleagues, since their role was restricted within “the boundaries of their support rooms” (Vlachou, 2006, p. 54). The teachers also considered that their role was more social than ‘instructional/academic’ and they referred to their intervention as one creating a supportive environment in the support room. Lastly, the teachers mentioned that the lack of a collaboration and advisory system had a negative impact on their role (Vlachou, 2006). In 2016, Vlachou and Fyssa presented the results of another study. This one investigated teachers’ support of inclusion in 52 mainstream preschools. This study showed that teachers implemented practices which encouraged students with SEN to participate only partially, which resulted in a ‘low’ to a ‘minimal’ quality of inclusion (Vlachou and Fyssa, 2016). Another empirical research study was conducted in 2016 from the students’ point of view. 2683 primary school students participated in this study and their attitudes towards their peers with disabilities were investigated (Soulis et al., 2016). According to this research, most students hold positive attitudes towards their peers with disabilities. They were not positive about inclusion, however, and as a result, “the integration of students with disabilities in Greek schools cannot be regarded successful” (Soulis et al., 2016, p. 12). In their entirety, the aforementioned studies reveal the ingrained confusion of practitioners working in inclusive - at least by name - settings regarding the meaning and implementation of inclusive practice.

In summary, this section has examined definitions of inclusive education in an effort to shed some light on a contested term. Interpretations of inclusive education in practice have also been presented within an international context, in order to show how different contexts affect inclusive practice. On many occasions ‘inclusive education’, seems to have resulted in special/segregated provision for students with SEN. In Greece, in particular, seemingly inclusive legislation has been criticised because of its contradictions and the confusion it
creates to practitioners. Reasons why and consequences of these contradictions were also discussed.

2.2 Physical Education and inclusion

This section provides a literature review presented in two main parts. The first part considers the nature and purpose of Physical Education. Emphasis is given to the manifestation of this purpose, especially in the Greek PE context. The second part provides an account of the implications of inclusion in physical education from a teacher-centred perspective.

2.2.1 The nature and purpose of Physical Education

 Philosophers have been debating “the educational worth of the subject” regarding the nature and purpose of Physical Education for decades (Green, 2008, p. 10). More specifically, the question of whether Physical Education is a form of education was initially raised by educational philosophers of the ‘liberal-analytical tradition’ who, as Green (2008) suggests, investigated the concept of education with what is known as the ‘Peters-Hirst’ approach. Named after the two ‘architects’ of the ‘liberal-analytical tradition’ Richard Peters and Paul Hirst, this approach starts with the premise that “education has fundamentally to do with knowledge of a valuable kind” (Green, 2008, p. 8). Further according to this philosophical tradition, knowledge can take “two general forms” which are called propositional and practical knowledge (Green, 2008, p. 8). Propositional knowledge is made up of “two components: information and judgement” whereas practical knowledge “refers to skills or abilities” (Green, 2008, p. 8). According to this categorisation of knowledge education “must be fundamentally about the development of theoretical or propositional knowledge” (Green, 2008, p. 8). Therefore, PE being considered an ‘endeavour’ of a practical nature “lacks the cognitive orientation and propositional content benefiting education” (Morgan, 2006, p. 98). Later, philosophers like Arnold, Aspin, Best, Reid, McNamee and Parry, argued that

if the mark of an educated person could not be reduced to the capacity to wield propositional knowledge, but included as well the ability to suffuse one’s intentions and actions with aesthetic, moral and practical know-how, and to provide pleasurable experiences that people regard as
intrinsically worthwhile, then physical education should most definitely not be denied entrance into the pantheon of education (Morgan, 2006, p. 98).

Reid (2000) explains, more specifically:

Knowledge … is not exclusively or even primarily propositional or theoretical. It is expressed not only in words or symbols, but also in actions; it takes practical, and not merely theoretical, form; it is expressed in terms of “knowing how” as well as “knowing that” (p. 21).

While philosophers redefine the understandings and limits of knowledge in order for physical education to justify its position in schooling, the practice of physical education continues. As Green mentions (2008), this philosophical debate regarding physical education has been captured by the national curriculum of various countries. As a result, the national curriculum for physical education (NCPE) for England and Wales originally claimed that “PE educates young people in and through the use and knowledge of the body and its movement”, integrating both sides of the debate (Green, 2008, p. 16). In Ireland, the primary physical education curriculum suggests that physical education “provides children with learning opportunities through the medium of movement and contributes to their overall development by helping them lead full, active and healthy lives” (Government of Ireland, 1999, p. 2). In Greece, the purpose of Physical Education is explained in the second issue of Act 304/13-03-2003 of the Government Official Journal and also refers to learning how to move as well as learning through movement:

The purpose of Physical Education in compulsory education is to primarily contribute to the physical development of pupils and, simultaneously, to help with mental and spiritual cultivation, as well as with their harmonious integration into society. Priority is given to the development of motor skills of pupils and through them, the aim is to cultivate their physical abilities and strengthening of their health (Greek Government, 2003, p. 4281).

PE teachers’ opinions on the matter of the nature and purpose of PE itself also seem to vary. In a study conducted in 2003, Green suggests that “confusion and contradiction were common features of … [PE teachers’] views” (p. 110).
PE teachers expressed a mixture of ideologies regarding PE ranging from “sports participation (for its own sake) … [to] health and character development” (Green, 2008, p. 18). Irish trainee PE teachers’ ideas also reflected the dominance of sport and health discourses where health discourses (exercising and getting fit) framed the purposes and sport (social learning through team games) shaped the nature and content of physical education (Chroinin and Coulter, 2012, p. 229).

Cypriot trainee PE teachers suggested that the purpose of PE “is to provide students with opportunities to develop their psychomotor, cognitive and affective skills” (Tsangaridou, 2008, p. 131).

The implementation of the purpose and nature of physical education, as expressed both by different curricula and PE teachers, takes a variety of forms. The Irish curriculum suggests the implementation of “athletics, dance, gymnastics, games, outdoor and adventure activities and aquatics” (Government of Ireland, 1999, p. 2) with an emphasis given to the “importance of enjoyment and play” through the PE lesson (Chroinin and Coulter, 2012, p. 222). The NCPE for England suggested the purpose of PE lessons would manifest through mastering basic movements, participating in team and individual competitive games, dance, swimming, outdoor adventurous activities, athletic and gymnastics (Department for Education, 2013). The Greek national curriculum suggests that the purpose of physical education should manifest in different ways according to students’ age (Greek Government, 2003).

Therefore, for Years 1 & 2 the PE curriculum includes the following strands: psychomotor (i.e. understanding of space and time, eye-movement coordination, balance etc.), music-dance (i.e. rhythm), team - individual - traditional - free and organised games, Greek traditional dance and finally swimming (wherever possible) (Greek Government, 2003). For Years 3 & 4 there is one additional strand: Initiation to sports. In Years 5 & 6, however, the manifestation of the purpose of PE changes with sports (such as basketball, football, handball and volleyball) and athletics to cover most of the PE time of students followed by gymnastics, Greek traditional dance and Swimming (wherever possible) (Greek Government, 2003). In secondary education, the curriculum includes the same strands with Years 5 & 6, but with different and/or
more detailed general targets for each strand (Greek Government, 2003). I cannot resist mentioning here though that although ideal, the inclusion in the Greek PE curriculum of swimming lessons, even with the note ‘wherever possible’ added, seems ironic since schools in Greece traditionally do not include a pool in their premises; even when a public pool is available near a school, the school staff provided for PE - at least in mainstream schools - is not sufficient for such an activity. The PE curricula examined here present many similarities as well as the expressed purpose of PE in these countries. However, their implementation, the resources provided, cultural characteristics and PE teachers’ idiosyncrasies and prioritisation always play a significant role and possibly differentiate these lessons.

The structure of a usual PE lesson in Greece includes warm up (with warm up and stretching exercises), the main lesson (the part of the lesson where teachers teach and implement their lesson plan) and some cooling down time (usually, slow jogging and stretching exercises). Indeed, this structure is supported by most of the official guide books for PE teachers published within the frame of the last educational reform for PE (four in total). In the first teachers’ book, created for teaching PE to Year 1 & 2 students, the authors suggest that although the lesson should not be tightly structured for children of this age, it should begin with activities in a slow pace and then increase this pace gradually (Mpournelli et al., 2006a). In the second, third and fourth teachers’ book regarding Years 3 & 4, 5 & 6 and 7-9 respectively, the authors suggest distinct differentiation in the activities throughout the PE lesson depending on when they are performed. All three books describe indicative lessons divided in three parts named Preparation, Main Part and Presentation for Years 3 & 4 (Mpournelli et al., 2006b) and Introductory Part, Main Part and Final Part for Years 5 & 6 and 7-9 (Diggelidis et al., 2006; Goudas et al., 2006). Many of the indicative lessons in these three books are designed according to Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles guidelines for teaching PE. The specific teaching styles (Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles), which will be described in detail in the section 2.3.2, are also described in detail in three out of four books provided to PE teachers in Greece both in primary and secondary education (Mpournelli et al., 2006b; Diggelidis et al., 2006; Goudas et al., 2006). The only book that does not specifically mention Mosston’s teaching styles in its
text is the first one for Years1 & 2. However, inspiration for some parts of the book has clearly come from the Spectrum of teaching styles since a relevant reference is included in its reference list. With this information in mind it is reasonable to assume that PE teachers working both in primary and secondary education should be aware of these specific teaching styles. Finally, the books include in detail the specific targets as well as methods of assessment for each Year.

Once physical education was found accepted in the “pantheon of education”, as Morgan (2006, p. 98) puts it, there was an emergence of a philosophy of sport which distinguished itself from the philosophy of education and its ‘preoccupation with issues of knowledge’ (Morgan, 2006, p. 98). Philosophy of sport investigated the “differences, as well as … the relationships between human movement phenomena like play, game, and sport and occasionally exercise and dance” (Morgan, 2006, p. 100). According to Morgan (2006), philosophical literature concludes that, since play, game and sport are “intrinsically good things, they are among the most important and serious human activities” (p. 102). This idea is expressed in the curricula of many countries and, in Ireland, the “idea of play” is incorporated in the curriculum “as valued human practice for children” (Chroinin and Coulter, 2012, p. 230). Reid (1998) suggests, however, that one of the fundamental ‘errors’ in the efforts to ‘redefine’ physical education has been the “distinction which is drawn between practical performance of physical activities and the knowledge which is related to them” (p. 32). This statement underlines not only the continuous efforts and changes in the understandings and manifestations of the nature and purpose of physical education but also the difficulties in settling in a definition by both practitioners and academics. And although physical education’s presence in the national curricula of countries shows its acceptance, efforts are still being made to offer new understandings of the “experiences in the activities that comprise physical education” (McNamee, 2005, p. 2).

2.2.2 Inclusion in Physical education: a teacher centred perspective

According to Byra (2006), “inclusive pedagogies facilitate equal opportunities for success for all learners regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, race,
ethnic background, or physical and/or cognitive ability” (p. 451). Particularly, PE for students with SEN in inclusive settings requires:

…a recognition [on behalf of key stakeholders] and obligation to modify and adapt existing teaching, learning and assessment strategies in order to facilitate full access and entitlement to the curriculum (Vickerman, 2007b, p. 398).

Although a special or personalised curriculum was introduced with the 2008 law regarding special education in Greece, it is only suggested for students with ‘mild special education needs’ and it can be implemented after a proposal from the local KEDDY (Greek Government, 2008). The expression of this law leaves space for interpretations and, as a result, the students depend on their teachers’ goodwill or correct interpretation to receive a suitable and appropriate education.

A realisation that not only teachers, but also students with SEN are key stakeholders in SEN, has prompted researchers to seek the student voice both in PE and in SEN. As Vickerman (2012) notes when referring to students with SEN, “within a PE context, it is evident from research that children’s voices are often overlooked” (p. 252). Indeed in 2006, Dyson (2006) noted that “there is no clear line of inquiry of students’ perspectives in physical education that exists over a period of time” (p. 342). Today students have been “recognised as key stakeholders in their own lives” (Vickerman, 2012, p. 251) and want to ‘speak up’ “as part of valuing their independence and autonomy” (Coates and Vickerman, 2010, p. 1518). As a result, studies representing and investigating the voice of students with SEN in PE are now taking place (Haegele and Sutherland, 2015). Findings of these studies suggest that students with SEN had both positive and negative experiences in PE (Haegele and Sutherland, 2015; Coates and Vickerman, 2008). Positive experiences related to students feeling included while participating “skilfully in activities”, having “a sense of belonging amongst their peers” and being able to “share in the benefits of the activities” (Coates and Vickerman, 2008, p. 170). Other positive experiences related to positive peer interactions during PE (e.g. caring by peers demonstrated as “patience, sharing, and social support”) (Haegele and Sutherland, 2015, p. 260). Negative experiences involved bullying,
discrimination, social isolation and achievements being ignored or overlooked because of students’ with SEN disability (Haegele and Sutherland, 2015; Coates and Vickerman, 2008). In addition, PE teachers’ lack of experience or training has also been reported as leading to negative experiences of students with SEN, who therefore felt excluded from PE (Coates and Vickerman, 2008). Adding to that physical and material barriers to inclusion in PE have been reported to limit participation in the PE lesson by students with SEN (Coates and Vickerman, 2008). However, positive teacher attitudes towards inclusion (Haegele and Sutherland, 2015) and empowering students with SEN to make their own choices (Coates and Vickerman, 2008) have been reported to improve inclusion in PE.

Having identified in the previous section the difficulties in defining the term inclusion both internationally and in the Greek context (section 2.1.3) my study sets out to explore Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion. While PE teachers’ perspectives as key stakeholders in relation to inclusion are quite well explored internationally (Qi and Ha, 2012), this is not the case in Greece. The following literature review shows the limited extent to which teachers’ perspectives have been explored in the Greek context. It also sets the context of the present study by exploring PE teachers’ beliefs and attitudes towards inclusion through a range of international and Greek studies. The second part presents teachers’ and PE teachers’ challenges and barriers to inclusion. Studies reporting teachers’ challenges in other specialities are included in the second part since many of them are common to all educators regardless of what they teach. The studies included in this section were selected for their relevance to the purpose of my study either from their title or their abstract. Combinations of several keywords were used (such as inclusion/inclusive, physical education/PE, teacher, attitudes, special, disability) in searching bibliographic databases through EBSCOhost (Education Research Complete, ERIC, British Education Index). Google books, google scholar and google were also used to find relevant information and articles. A clear focus was on the identification of Greek studies.
2.2.2.1 PE teachers’ attitudes and beliefs towards inclusion.

Past research studies examined by Tsangaridou (2006) have revealed that, in general, PE teachers’ attitudes and beliefs can be constructed in three different contexts: (a) their initial school experiences, (b) their previous life experiences and (c) their teaching training experiences. It has also been suggested that teachers’ beliefs can influence their teaching actions to a great degree (Tsangaridou, 2006). The literature on PE teachers’ attitudes and beliefs toward the inclusion of students with disabilities has grown substantially over the past three decades. In 2006, a review of relevant research by Meegan and MacPhail revealed that quantitative research methods have dominated the existing literature in this area, as opposed to qualitative approaches. Surveys, for example, have been widely used to explore teachers’ attitudes and beliefs toward inclusion in PE using Rizzo’s (1993) Physical Education Attitudes Toward Individuals with Disabilities (PEATID-III) survey (cited in Combs et al., 2010; Meegan and MacPhail, 2006; Obrusnikova, 2008).

Meegan and MacPhail (2006) examined the relation between specific special educational needs and selected factors affecting PE teachers’ attitudes in Ireland. The specific special educational needs the researchers referred to were emotional and behavioural disorders (EBD), specific learning disabilities (SLD), mild-moderate mental impairments (MMMI) and moderate-severe mental impairments (MSMI). The selected factors were gender, previous experience and academic preparation. In the process of the research, PEATID III questionnaires were sent to 745 secondary schools of the Republic of Ireland and the response rate was 25%. The results showed that, in terms of the disability classification, participant PE teachers were ‘undecided’ about teaching students with SLD, EBD and MMMI. Their attitudes were, however, less favourable about teaching students with MSMI. The findings regarding gender showed that female participants held more positive attitudes concerning two of the SEN classifications. Previous experience in working with children with SEN did not prove important when teaching students with EBD and MSMI. It was, however, important for teaching students with SLD and MMMI. Finally, the findings of this research concerning PE teachers’ academic training showed that only 13 participants had attended courses regarding SEN preparation.
PEATID III was also used by Obrusnikova (2008) alongside a brief survey that included items regarding the education, experience, demographic characteristics and perceived competence in teaching students with disabilities of the 168 teachers participating in the study. PE teachers’ beliefs regarding teaching students with disabilities were generally positive apart from teaching students with emotional and behavioural disorders that PE teachers’ answers were neutral. Obrusnikova (2008) also found that there is a statistically significant relation “between the overall belief score of the teachers and the perceived competence of teaching children with disabilities” (p. 641). Lastly, PE teachers who had less favourable beliefs also mentioned receiving little or no training regarding teaching students with emotional and behavioural disorders. This is not surprising given that a literature review regarding inclusion in Physical Education showed that negative feelings towards inclusion were often associated with PE teachers’ inadequate training, experience and knowledge in the inclusion of students with SEN (Block and Obrusnikova, 2007).

In another mixed methods study carried out by Combs et al. (2010), PEATID III was used to help the identification and selection of four in-service elementary school PE teachers; two with positive attitudes towards inclusion of students with mild to moderate learning difficulties and another two with negative attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream settings. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the four selected PE teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion, the reasons for attitude formation and their effect on PE teachers’ way of teaching. This was done through in-depth interviews. The analysis of the qualitative data revealed that teachers with positive attitudes engaged in behaviours that “researchers in physical education have associated with increased levels of student learning and effective teaching” (Combs et al., 2010). As a result, teachers with positive attitudes have been described as using a variety of teaching styles, in contrast with PE teachers with negative attitudes whose practice consisted mainly of instructional time, thus leading to less ‘inclusive’ PE lessons. Furthermore, the findings revealed that only the PE teachers with positive attitudes had taken special education or adapted physical education classes. Finally, the issue of ‘student success’ was described in different ways by the participants. Those PE teachers with a positive attitude toward inclusion referred to ‘success’ as
improvement in student motor performance, which showed PE teachers’ focus on resolving specific issues during the lesson. As such, it is an indicator of more inclusive behaviour, according to the authors. On the other hand, those PE teachers with negative attitude appeared to consider that success for the included students was for them to be “busy, happy and good” (Combs et al., 2010, p.124).

Quantitative studies concerning Greek PE teachers attitudes towards inclusion present contradictory results (Doulkeridou et al., 2011; Papadopoulou et al., 2004). Papadopoulou et al. (2004) conducted their research in Athens, Greece, with 93 in-service participants working either in public or private education. The purpose of this study was to examine PE teachers’ attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream settings, using the Teacher Integration Attitudes Questionnaire. The findings revealed that PE teachers were doubtful regarding the function of inclusion in Greek schools and the majority held negative attitudes toward it. As in the previously mentioned study teachers’ attitudes were also strongly related to the level of training that they had received in regard to special educational needs, as well as to whether they felt they had the skills and knowledge to include students with SEN in their lessons. Finally, female PE teachers were more positive toward inclusion compared to their male colleagues.

A later study in Greece by Doulkeridou et al. (2011), revealed that PE teachers’ attitudes regarding the inclusion of students with special educational needs into PE lessons were mainly positive. This research sample consisted of 410 PE teachers from different prefectures in Greece. The results were based on quantitative analysis of data gathered using a Greek adaptation of the questionnaire ‘Attitudes toward Teaching Individuals with Physical Disabilities in Physical Education’ (ATIPDPE). The results concerning differences in attitudes between the genders are contradictory to the previously mentioned study. Doulkeridou et al. (2011) showed that there is no significant difference, which, according to the authors, shows a progress of physical educators’ attitudes toward inclusive PE classes. However, as in other studies reviewed in this section, most of the 410 PE teachers in this study thought that their academic training concerning SEN was inadequate.
Although their research does not refer to PE teachers, the study by Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou (2014) will be presented briefly, since it gives a more current understanding of Greek teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion. In this study, Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou (2014) included 416 teachers from preschool, primary and secondary education settings. These teachers were neutral towards the inclusion of students with ‘behavioural and academic difficulties’, positive towards the inclusion of students with ‘social difficulties’ and negative towards students with ‘physical disabilities’. This finding of Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou (2014) is in contrast with the conclusions in an earlier study which suggested that the inclusion of students with ‘physical disabilities’ presented more of a challenge to PE teachers than to teachers of other specialities due to the nature of the PE lesson (Sideridis and Chandler, 1996). In Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou’s (2014) study, however, the attendance in special education seminars seemed to have positively affected teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion.

There have also been efforts to explore PE teacher perceptions and attitudes toward the inclusion of children with disabilities through the use of qualitative research methods. Findings from qualitative studies have explored aspects involving PE teachers, disability and inclusion. Studies by Hodge et al. (2004) and Smith and Green (2004) examined the behaviour, beliefs and views of seven and nine high school PE teachers concerning inclusion. The first study was held in the West Midlands region of England and the second in the USA (California, Ohio and Pennsylvania). In both studies, the findings suggested that, although PE teachers understood the value of inclusion for students with SEN in the PE lesson, they were concerned as to whether it was something possible for all students. They also expressed a belief that inclusion is highly dependent on the level of disability of the students. The latter finding is not new in the literature regarding inclusion in PE and has been reported in many of the studies discussed in this section (Sideridis and Chandler, 1996; Meegan and MacPhail, 2006; Obrusnikoba, 2008; Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou, 2014). As Block and Obrusnikova (2007) suggest in their review of literature PE teacher attitude is influenced “not only by type of disability but also by level of disability” (p. 117).
The research of Hardin (2005) and Ammah and Hodge (2005) both sought to explore and understand PE teachers’ inclusion beliefs as well as inclusion experiences and practices. This was done within a sample of five and two participants respectively. Hardin’s (2005) research was conducted in the USA, with the use of semi-structured interviews, field observations, stimulated recall interviews and Q-Sort interviews (interviews where teachers were asked to sort out a variety of cards according to their importance, which would lead to answering questions related to their ordering). During the data analysis, Hardin (2005) identified the following themes: (a) teaching experience is supreme, (b) teachers teaching teachers, and (c) only one course. This latter one refers to the adapted physical educational courses during studies at university (p. 8-9). Concerning these themes, it was emphasised by the PE teachers that more intense and frequent contact with students having various disabilities should exist during PE teachers’ training experiences. Findings of this study showed that the PE teachers had mixed attitudes towards the inclusion of students with SEN. As far as Ammah’s and Hodge’s (2005) study is concerned, it was found, through the use of naturalistic observations and interviews, that the investigated American PE teachers were questioning whether inclusion practices could be successful for all students with disabilities. PE teachers’ perceived efficiency of their inclusion practices seemed to also be overestimated according to the research analysis.

Morley et al. (2005) recruited a relatively large number (for a qualitative study) of PE teachers (43) from a large city in Northern England to examine their views about inclusion. By using semi-structured interviews, the analysis of the data showed that PE teachers in this study viewed inclusion as a process that could be improved inside the school system. As in previously mentioned studies, the functional ability of the students was suggested as an important factor affecting inclusion. The PE teachers’ prior training was considered as being important to inclusion, as the teachers had suggested that their prior training had been inadequate. Finally, students with behavioural difficulties were mentioned as the most difficult group to be included in the PE lesson. This result is in contrast to research suggesting that students with ‘physical disabilities’ were considered more difficult to include in PE (Sideridis and Chandler, 1996).
In summary, both quantitative and qualitative studies presented in this section refer to a variety of beliefs and attitudes (positive, negative and mixed) held by PE teachers with regard to inclusion. These beliefs and attitudes were discussed in terms of their previous experience and perceived competence in teaching students with SEN, perceived effectiveness of inclusive practices, SEN training, gender of the teachers and level of student disability. These studies were conducted using a variety of research tools providing both quantitative and qualitative data. Few of these studies referred to the Greek physical education and inclusion context. The factors that affect PE teachers’ beliefs and attitudes towards inclusion are further explored in the following section.

**2.2.2.2 Teachers and PE teachers challenges with respect to inclusion**

Identifying the obstacles to an inclusive education is the first step towards inclusion. However, oversimplifying the term and trying to reach a decision concerning just the ‘location’ where children with SEN should be educated is something that was dismissed by advocates of the ‘social model of disability’ such as Barton (1998) who suggested a more holistic approach to this issue. To this end, this part of the literature review will investigate literature that mentions factors which might affect teachers’ perceptions towards inclusion and the challenges or difficulties they may face or may expect to encounter.

In a review of the literature towards inclusion/integration undertaken by Avramidis and Norwich (2002) several factors were mentioned as affecting teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion. One of these factors concerns the severity and the type of the special educational need. In a study carried out in Greece, the evidence showed that teachers were not positive about including students with behavioural disorders, hearing impairment, blindness and deafness since the severity of these particular special educational needs was not thought to be easily accommodated in mainstream settings (Padeliadu and Lampropoulou, 1997). These results are reinforced by other studies indicating that, the more severe the learning difficulty of the child, the less confident and willing teachers become when it comes to working with them (Avramidis et al., 2000; Avramidis and Kalyva, 2007; Forlin, 1995). Furthermore, the issue of safety in the PE lesson, which was raised in another study, led PE teachers to have a more
positive attitude towards including students with physical disabilities, sensory
disabilities and learning difficulties in the PE lesson than towards those with
other types of needs (Morley et al., 2005). Koutrouba et al. (2006) reported that
secondary school teachers from Cyprus thought that both the type and severity
of the disability affected inclusion and Koutrouba et al. (2008) revealed that
71.2% of the Greek secondary school teachers in their study
not at all agreed … with the view that the inclusion of SEN students with
mental retardation problems in ordinary classrooms could be a ‘normal
and uneventful’ process (p. 416).

Teachers’ attitudes changed, however, when it came to the inclusion of
students with learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia) and a large percentage of them
‘strongly agreed’ or ‘fairly agreed’ with the aforementioned view (Koutrouba et
al., 2008).

Other studies have found that teaching experience also affects teachers’
perceptions about inclusion. Regarding Physical Education, experience is
considered a major factor “in gaining confidence with working with children with
SEN” (Morley et al., 2005, p. 101). In another study, the positive attitude held by
Cypriot teachers was ascribed to the fact that they had ‘greater and more
positive experience in the teaching of pupils with SEN’ (Batsiou et al., 2008).
Other studies mention that experience in teaching students with SEN in
mainstream classrooms results in more positive attitudes towards inclusion on
behalf of the teachers (Avramidis et al., 2000; Avramidis and Norwich, 2002). In
Greece, Coutsocostas and Alborz (2010) concluded that “fewer years of
teaching experience” in general is associated with “positive attitudes towards
the inclusion of pupils with cLD [complex learning difficulties]” in their study (p.
160). On the other hand, another study suggested that Greek teachers with
greater teaching experience (not necessarily in teaching students with SEN)
appeared to be more comfortable in teaching students with SEN (Tsakiridou
and Polyzopoulou, 2014). Interestingly, an older study in Greece suggested that
“teachers working in Special Education are significantly less positive towards
integration than their colleagues in regular education” (Padeliadu and
Lampropoulo, 1997, p. 180). Reinforcing these last studies, Meegan and
MacPhail concluded that “previous experience in working with students with
SEN does not necessarily lead to positive attitude formation”, bringing into question the probable different ways that the word ‘experience’ is used by every author (Meegan and MacPhail, 2006, p. 86).

The age and gender of the teachers are also considered crucial factors in relation to their perceptions about inclusion. Concerning age, Padeliadou and Lambropoulou (1997, p. 180) and Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou (2014) concluded that “as they become older … teachers become more intolerant towards disabled students”. On the other hand, Batsiou et al. (2006) found, in their review of the literature, that younger teachers “were more positive with regard to inclusion” (p. 203). As far as gender is concerned, female physical educators were found to be more positive towards inclusion in comparison with their male colleagues (Papadopoulou et al., 2004; Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou, 2014). Although these findings are in agreement with the results of many other studies (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002), there are also studies supporting the opposite. Avramidis et al. (2000) found, for example, that there is no significant relationship between the gender of teachers and their perceptions about inclusion. This shows that there is some inconsistency with evidence regarding gender among various studies (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002).

As mentioned earlier (section 2.2.2.1), the level of training of teachers has been associated with less or more positive attitudes towards inclusion. This is why academic preparation and ‘pre- or in-service courses’ are considered important in the formation of teachers’ positive attitudes (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002). Other studies report that, although teachers may have positive attitudes towards inclusion, their level of their confidence decreases when it comes to teaching students with SEN, since they feel unprepared (Doulkeridou et al., 2011; Fejgin et al., 2005; Hodge et al., 2004). On a similar note, Meegan and MacPhail (2006) found that most of the Irish physical educators in their study stated that they did not have adequate training in SEN in PE. Adding to that, the ‘absence of expertise’ among the Greek PE teachers was one of the main factors that compromised their positive attitude towards including pupils with SEN in the PE lesson (Batsiou et al., 2008, p.214; Papadopoulou et al., 2004). Coutsocostas and Alborz (2010) mention that more than half the Greek secondary school teachers of their study reported a lack of training in SEN. Indeed, only three out of five schools of Physical Education and Sport Science in Greece (the
university faculties where PE teachers in Greece acquire their degree) offer a compulsory module, which was recently introduced (2015-2016) focusing on adapted physical education or issues of special education (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2016; Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2015; University of Thessaly, 2015; Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2016; Dimocritus University of Thrace, 2015). Until then modules regarding adapted PE were offered as optional modules and therefore student PE teachers were never introduced to core concepts of inclusive PE. A more recent study from Tindall et al. (2015) suggested that Irish pre-service teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion and towards teaching students with SEN were more positive after participating in an Adapted Physical Activity programme “designed to facilitate a ‘disability teaching experience’” (p. 210). Similarly, secondary school teachers in Greece who reported having attended some kind of training in SEN felt more confident in teaching students with SEN (Coutsocostas and Alborz, 2010).

Green (2002) suggested, however, that it is quite common to ‘overemphasise’ the significance of training when it comes to implementing inclusion. This is not to say that training has no influence on teachers’ views and practices. It certainly affects them and, the more recent the training, the more obvious that influence is. However, some research suggests that professional training has little or no impact on the ideologies or practices of PE teachers (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Green, 2002). In contrast, Vickerman and Coates (2009) suggest that 62% of the 202 trainee and 19 recently qualified PE teachers in their study “strongly agreed that children with SEN should be included in mainstream schools” (p. 148). This can probably be related to the fact that the ‘majority of the respondents’ of this study were involved in “considerably more practical training than theoretical” regarding SEN (Vickerman and Coates, 2009, p. 147).

47% of recently qualified teachers, however, suggested that they would have liked it if “more ideas on practical activities and delivery” had been provided during training and 21% of them would have appreciated “more experience of teaching the full range of SEN” during initial teacher training (Vickerman and Coates, 2009, p. 150).

In their study, Fejgin et al. (2005) collected data from 363 PE teachers in Israel. This was done in an effort to find a correlation between burnout and inclusive Physical Education. Fejgin et al. (2005) suggest that
teacher burnout ... is defined as a syndrome characterized by physical, mental and behavioural fatigue. Burned-out teachers may express feelings of boredom, anger, anxiety, self-blame, and even depression (p. 31).

They found that the more students with SEN that were in one particular class, the higher the burnout level of the teachers. They also found that the more help and support the teacher received for teaching students with SEN and, the more suitable the work environment at school for these students the lower the burn-out level (Fejgin et al., 2005). It should be mentioned here that in Fejgin et al.’s (2005) study, as in most studies in physical education, support focused on the use of human support such as “peer tutors, teacher assistants, or specialists such as an adapted physical educator” (Block and Obrusnikova, 2007, p. 105).

Smith and Green (2004) made an effort to understand PE teachers and their process of inclusion “in relation to the networks of interdependency in which they are enmeshed” (p. 594). Their study revealed a connection between the national curriculum for PE and the emphasis given on achievement, skills and performance, which “serves to exclude, by degrees, many pupils with SEN from the learning situations and experiences” (Smith and Green, 2004, p. 603). The connection between curriculum and achievement/performance was also mentioned – not particularly regarding PE this time – by Vlachou (2006) who, while criticising the Greek national curriculum, mentions that it is demanding and that it fosters academic achievement as the most important purpose. In addition, the Greek national curriculum seems to prohibit teachers from individualising their teaching (Vlachou, 2006). Lastly, “the networks of interdependency” mentioned earlier can be spotted in the support system which teachers in Greece face. As Smith and Green (2004) suggest

the interdependent networks in which PE teachers find themselves’ relate to power relations who affect their relationships not only with their colleagues but also with the government and ‘other agencies (p. 595).

Since as mentioned earlier (section 2.1.3) the Greek educational system is centralised, teachers in Greece are directly affected by government decisions and/or inadequacies. A Greek Pedagogical Institute study (Pedagogical Institute, 2004) revealed that 54.7% of the ‘inclusive classes’ operated in
“storage rooms, teachers’ staff rooms, corridors or other support spaces in mainstream schools which have been converted into classrooms” (p. 34). Teachers in Greece often use the head teacher’s office as a classroom for the ‘inclusive class’ because they lack an alternative option. This is supported by Koutrouba et al. (2008) whose study in Greece noted that:

there is a remarkably high percentage of teachers who believe that the existing infrastructural equipment and the financial resources provided in regard to inclusion are highly insufficient. Obviously, building modern school units and financing old ones, simplifying the procedures of special equipment acquisition and training the teachers who are asked to practice inclusion would facilitate the whole process and foster willingness on the part of educators (p. 419).

Hwang and Evans (2011) investigated possible gaps between teachers’ beliefs and practice regarding physical education and inclusion in the Republic of Korea. Although their study was based on information regarding teacher practice reported by the teachers themselves and not on observed practice, they brought into light an issue which possibly affects inclusion implementation; that of the relation between teachers’ beliefs about inclusion and their practice. Argyris and Schon (1974) suggest:

When someone is asked how he would behave under certain circumstances, the answer he usually gives is his espoused theory of action for that situation. This is the theory of action to which he gives allegiance, and which, upon request, he communicates to others. However, the theory that actually governs his action is his theory-in-use, which may or may not be compatible with his espoused theory; furthermore, the individual may or may not be aware of the incompatibility of the two theories. (p. 6-7).

These ‘espoused theories of action’ and ‘theories-in-use’ are also referred to as “teachers’ theories, personal theories, practical theories, or theories of professional practice” (Tsangaridou and O’Sullivan, 2003, p. 133). These theories may or may not be consistent with each other and the teacher may not even be aware of such incompatibilities (Tsangaridou and O’Sullivan, 2003). Teachers’ beliefs and thus theories ‘may have been acquired and formed during
their experiences as pupils in schools, from life experiences, or by their teacher education professional preparation program' (Tsangaridou, 2006, p. 497). As a result, it is suggested that “the only way to determine the teacher’s theories-in-use may be through the observation of these professional practices” (Sanders and McCutcheon, 1986 cited in Tsangaridou and O’Sullivan, 2003, p. 133). With regard to physical education, Tsangaridou and O’Sullivan (2003) mention that, although some previous studies show alignment between teachers’ theories of action and theories-in-use, some other studies — the most recent of which was conducted in 2000 — suggest the opposite. Additionally, Tsangaridou (2006) suggests that “very few studies have investigated the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices” (p. 497).

A relevant study conducted by Tsangaridou and O’Sullivan (2003) concluded that the four participants of their study held clear views “about student learning and what constitutes a physically educated student” (p. 132). They also found that the theories and beliefs of these PE teachers were consistent with their practice. In another, more recent study regarding trainee PE teachers’ beliefs and practices, it was also revealed that there was a consistency between their held theories and their theories in use (Tsangaridou, 2008).

This section has provided an account of the challenges PE teachers face concerning the implementation of inclusion in a multinational and Greek context and on an individual level. These challenges referred to issues of:

- level of disability of students with SEN in combination with teacher confidence and willingness
- teaching experience
- age and gender
- teacher training
- teacher burnout
- organisational issues
- teachers’ ‘espoused theories of action’ and ‘theories-in-use’.

These issues suggest that inclusive education is a challenging task which generates a plethora of attitudes among teachers (section 2.2.2.1).
2.3 Teaching Physical Education

This section provides a literature review presented in two main parts. The first part considers approaches to teaching Physical Education with an emphasis to approaches accommodating inclusive practice. The second part focuses on providing information and relevant research with regard to Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles.

2.3.1 Approaches to teaching Physical Education

According to Jarvis (2006a), ‘teaching’ has “traditionally had a number of different meanings”. These include: “to give systematic information to a person, to work as teacher, to instruct someone on how to do something, to be an advocate for a moral principle, to induce a person by example or punishment to do or not to do a thing, and to make a person disinclined to do a thing” (p. 3).

Teaching physical education, in particular, has been described as “similar to teaching other lessons, but because the PE curriculum, the resources used, the organisation and conditions of the lesson and the way students participate in it are completely different to other lessons, it presents [teaching PE] with distinctiveness” (Emmanouil, 2002, p. 48 [translation from Greek]). The unique nature of the PE lesson was discussed in detail in section 2.2.1. Emmanouil (2002), however, in the book provided to me and my classmates by the university during my undergraduate studies, expressed some of the practical issues relating to this uniqueness. The practical nature of the PE lesson has been addressed with a series of different ‘ways’ of teaching over time. These ‘ways’ of teaching have been called methods and/or styles.

Teaching styles, in particular the word ‘style’, “is a much more difficult word to define” (Jarvis, 2006b, p. 30). Confusion is often observed on whether and when to use the term ‘teaching style’ or ‘teaching method’ even among academics. Jarvis (2006b) offers a clear explanation of the terms by comparing them:

The distinction drawn between method and style is important here, since teaching methods are about the science of teaching whereas teaching styles are about the art of teaching (p. 30).

More specifically,
Teaching methods are about the technical processes of teaching, whilst teaching styles are more about the teachers and the way they conduct themselves during the teaching session (Jarvis, 2006b, p. 30).

In addition, Byra (2006) defines the term teaching styles as “planned interactions between teachers and learners that result in the accomplishment of a set of specific outcomes” (p. 449). However, he also adds that teaching styles are often referred to in the literature as ‘teaching strategies’ (Byra, 2006, p. 449).

In Greek physical education, the term strategy - or in Greek ‘στρατηγική’ - is usually mostly used in relation to learning and not in relation to teaching, probably because of its correlation to military operations. The term ‘μέθοδος’, from which the English term ‘method’ derives etymologically, is the only established term in Greek language used on a variety of occasions and in relation to teaching. It is used in the same way and has the same meaning as in English. In teaching though there is not as strict a differentiation between the use of the terms method and style. The term style was introduced to the Greek language directly from English; the word ‘στίλ’, though, is mostly used in Greece relation to clothing design and dressing. However, in the Greek guide books for PE teachers, Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles (see section 2.2.1 and further down in this section) are referred to as both styles or methods - in Greek: ‘στίλ ή μέθοδοι διδασκαλίας του Mosston’ - and they are used interchangeably without providing clear definitions (Mpournelli et al., 2006; Diggelidis et al., 2006; Goudas et al., 2006). A lack of terminology is therefore observed in the Greek physical education context, with the word ‘μέθοδος’ (method) being used most of the time for both terms method and style.

Teaching methods that have historically been used in physical education are the ‘direct method’ otherwise called ‘reproductive or teacher-centred method’ and the ‘indirect method’ or ‘creative or child-centred’ as it is otherwise known (Emmanouil, 2002). As their name suggests the ‘direct or teacher-centred or reproductive’ approaches to teaching PE refer to ways of teaching where teachers are the main decision makers during lessons (Emmanouil, 2002; Rich, 2000). In contrast, the ‘indirect or creative or child centred’ approaches to
teaching permit students to use their creativity and make more decisions in the learning process (Emmanouil, 2002; Rich, 2000; Byra, 2006)

Teacher-centred teaching approaches were “the norm” until the 1960s (Byra, 2006, p. 449). Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles’, however, which was introduced by Mosston in 1966 and was later refined by Mosston and Ashworth has been a landmark in teaching PE (Goldberger et al., 2012). Due to its importance to the Greek PE context and to the present study, literature regarding Mosstons’ Spectrum of Teaching Styles is reviewed separately in the next section (section 2.3.3). However, it should be mentioned that even the ‘teaching styles’ that Mosston introduced were separated into teacher-centred and student-centred styles. Both categories present advantages and disadvantages. As Capel (2005) suggests ‘direct’ teaching methods are mostly known for the control of the class they give to the teacher, thus providing more structured and uniform results (Rich, 2000). On the other hand, ‘indirect’ teaching methods take away some of the control from the teachers and give it to students; students thus can be more creative since they “take an active role in the learning process” (Rich, 2000. p. 78).

According to Rich (2000) ‘direct’ teaching approaches are useful in teaching students with SEN who benefit from structure. ‘Indirect’ teaching behaviours are also said to be useful for “high functioning” students with SEN or students with SEN “learning basic motor skills, or learning skills not requiring one correct response” such as infants and toddlers (p. 78). However, in the history of teaching PE these are not the only two methods of teaching PE to students with SEN. Adapted physical education - a “comprehensive subdiscipline” of PE - emerged from the need to serve ‘handicapped pupils’ in a more humanistic way in the 1950s (Winnick, 2000). According to Winnick (2000) adapted PE it is defined as

An individualized program of physical and motor fitness; fundamental motor skills and patterns; and skills in aquatics, dance, and individual and group games and sports designed to meet the unique needs of individuals (p. 4).

Adapted PE from this point of view includes all the activities that a regular PE curriculum includes (see section 2.2.1). It is also designed to meet ‘long-term
unique needs" of individuals and it can take place in ‘integrated’ as well as segregated ‘environments’ (Winnick, 2000, p. 5). Adapted PE therefore can be inclusive depending on the placement of the individual. However, inclusive PE as well as inclusive education as discussed earlier (see section 2.1.3) are not only dependent on the placement but also the quality of inclusion. Use of an adapted PE lesson in a mainstream environment can enhance the experience of a PE lesson not only for students with SEN but also for students without SEN. After all, as Winnick (2000) suggests

although an adapted physical education program is individualized, it can be implemented in a group setting and should be geared to each student’s needs, limitations, and abilities (p. 5).

It is also suggested that the teacher of an adapted PE lesson should provide and create a “positive environment where students can succeed" (Winnick, 2000, p. 8). An adapted PE lesson therefore in a mainstream environment serves the values of an inclusive lesson and the concept of inclusion as understood and discussed earlier in this review. This conclusion is supported by an understanding of inclusion in which “flexibility, adaptation and openness to change are seen as critical success factors” (Vickerman, 2007a, p. 61).

Designed to “ensure maximum participation and access to physical activity for children with SEN”, the inclusion spectrum was a development of Winnicks’ “notion of flexible teaching and learning strategies” by Youth Sport Trust and English Federation for Disability Sport in the UK (Vickerman, 2007a, p. 63). It is the latest development regarding strategies for inclusion of students with in PE, however, it can also offer the flexibility needed to include all students in PE (Vickerman, 2007a). The inclusion spectrum offers teachers the choice of five strategies of open, modified, parallel, disability sport and separate activities. A teacher can therefore choose how to conduct a lesson ranging from a lesson without any adaptations (open), to completely separate activities for students with SEN (Vickerman, 2007a, p. 63). The three other strategies in between these two offer: modified activities for the whole group (modified), the same activities being conducted in different ways by different groups (parallel) and people without SEN being involved in disability sport activities (Vickerman, 2007a). Although the first and last of the five strategies cannot be considered
inclusive – according to what has been discussed in many of the previous sections - their presence in the inclusion spectrum emphasises the importance of teacher decision and choice in the lesson. Although not widely known and with no research studies investigating its effectiveness as yet, the inclusion spectrum offers alternatives to PE teachers when planning inclusive lessons.

Policy makers and practitioners in Greece do not seem to be aware of the inclusion spectrum. In order to prepare teachers to include students with SEN in mainstream PE lessons, the PE teachers’ guide books include just a few pages of ‘guidance for students with SEN’. The Year 5 & 6 book provides details about several kinds of SEN and how to identify them (Diggelidis et al., 2006). Year 3 & 4 and 1 & 2 books also provide generic information about how teachers need to differentiate their lessons in order to include students with SEN (Mpournelli et al. 2006a; Mpournelli et al, 2006b). However, as mentioned earlier (see section 2.2.2.2) PE teachers’ confidence tends to decrease when teaching students with SEN, especially when they feel unprepared; a few pages in teachers’ guide books are unlikely to increase this confidence. Policies makers should therefore take into consideration such studies in order to take relevant measures to increase teacher confidence and knowledge.

In the UK on the other hand, inclusion in education and in PE receives more attention and constant efforts are being made to achieve this. In addition to consistency in definitions, policies and implementations regarding inclusive education, there is a growing awareness regarding inclusion in all levels of society. Indicative of this trend is the initiative of Youth Sport Trust - a charitable organisation devoted to improving the lives of youth through PE and sport – sponsored by the supermarket chain Sainsbury’s. Their cooperation resulted in a training programme which “equips qualified teachers with tools and practical ideas to fully include all pupils in curriculum physical education” (Youth Sport Trust, nda). Through this programme teachers are helped to improve their confidence and skills in: “enabling inclusion of all pupils, challenging and progressing all pupils” and become able to apply these values in their own school environment (Youth Sport Trust, nda). Training in the inclusion spectrum is provided to the teachers and additional access to online resources furthers their knowledge and confidence in inclusive teaching. Another initiative in the UK supported “the development of opportunities for the young disabled people
to access high quality physical education and school sport” through the cooperation of the DfE with the Youth Sport Trust (Black et al., 2015, p. 362). TOP Sportability, the resulting initiative, aimed to provide more options for physical activity to disabled students, to introduce “sports and activities in support of the schools Games programme” and to “create a vehicle for the inclusion of disabled and non-disabled young people together” by providing a free online resource offering schools practical advice on how to achieve them (Youth Sport Trust, nd). Initiatives like these show a whole society effort and awareness which develop and transform the notion of inclusion in education and in PE in particular. Such initiatives do not exist in Greece where inclusion is being implemented by teachers who often feel unsupported and underprepared (see section 2.2.2.2).

Having broadly defined the basic terms and approaches to teaching PE, the following sections will explore literature regarding a set of teaching styles for physical education. The Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles mentioned earlier is relevant to the Greek educational system and, in particular to Greek PE, since the reform of the national curriculum for PE in 2006 (Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011; Syrmpas et al., 2016, Goudas et al. 2006; Mpournelli et al., 2006a; Mpournelli et al, 2006b; Diggelidis et al, 2006). The following section presents literature regarding research on the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles in physical education settings.

2.3.2 The Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles

The Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles has been given many names over the years, in particular those that are related to its use. Goldberger et al. (2012) collected some of them: “a framework, a paradigm, a basic structure, a model, a schema, a system, a theory” (p. 268). Mosston himself referred to them as the ‘Mosston Spectrum’, since they “delineate teaching-learning options” and give PE teachers the ability to “shift among behaviours, as needed, to accommodate learners’ needs, content focus, time constraints, and the myriad goals of education” (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 5). Goldberger et al. (2012) add that “for many teachers … the Spectrum is first and foremost a guiding tool that has become integral part of their daily teaching routine” (p. 268). The reasons for this can be found in the study of the spectrum itself. As Goldberger et al.
(2012) describe in their article, *Spectrum of Teaching Styles Retrospective*, Mosston, the pioneer of the Spectrum, organised the decisions that teachers make “in any teaching/learning transaction” (p. 270) in an effort to materialise his “universal vision of teaching” (p. 269) in three sets:

(a) pre-impact, decisions that define the intent (i.e., planning and preparation decisions); (b) impact, decisions that define the actions (i.e., face-to-face implementation of the pre-impact decisions); and (c) post-impact, decisions that define assessment (i.e., feedback about performance) (p.270).

This set of decisions permeates all of the teaching styles. Mosston recognised that there is a set of decisions made during the lesson, not only by the teacher but also by the learner (Goldberger et al., 2012; Doherty and Brennan 2008). Not only that, but “decisions made by teachers define their teaching behaviours and those made by learners define their learning behaviours” (Doherty and Brennan, 2008, p. 184). The degree to which the teacher and the learner are involved in the decision-making process creates a different teaching style (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002; Goldberger et al., 2012; Doherty and Brennan, 2008). As a result

at the one end of the Spectrum is the command style, defined by the teacher making all decisions and the learner responding in synchronization. At the other end of the Spectrum is a teaching style in which the learner makes all decisions and the teacher serves as more of a resource. This is the self-check style (Goldberger et al., 2012, p. 270).

In between, there are nine teaching styles with different levels of decision making on behalf of the teacher and the learner (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002). These teaching styles are the Practice style (B), Reciprocal style (C), Self-check style (D), Inclusion style (E), Guided discovery style (F), Convergent discovery style (G), Divergent discovery (H), Individual programme style (I), and Learner initiated style (J) (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002). It was Mosston’s decision to label the teaching style with a letter from the alphabet so that the labelling would not mislead anyone (Goldberger et al., 2012). The Command and Self-check styles are, thus, represented by the letters A and K. It is interesting to mention, at this point, that other teaching methods that do not follow exactly the decision-
making process of the Mosston Spectrum “are referred to as ‘being under the canopy’ of the nearest landmark style” (Goldberger et al, 2012, p. 274; Byra, 2006).

The Spectrum itself was also divided by Mosston into two clusters, according to the “type of learner cognitive involvement” (Goldberger et al., 2012, p. 276). This happened after a realisation that the teaching styles closer to style A (A-B-C-D-E) “required the learner to engage in convergent thought”, whereas on the other hand, the styles closer to style K (F-G-H-I-J) “required the learner to engage in divergent thought” (Goldberger et al., 2012, p. 276).

For a better understanding, the Spectrum of Teaching Styles is presented in below (Table 2) according to the teacher and student decision-making processes within a task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spectrum style</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style A</strong> Command</td>
<td>Teacher makes all decisions</td>
<td>Students reproduce and replicate task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style B</strong> Practice</td>
<td>Teacher makes majority of decisions and gives students feedback personal or general.</td>
<td>Students work at own pace while reproducing and replicating task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style C</strong> Reciprocal</td>
<td>Teacher makes majority of decisions and specifies task criteria</td>
<td>Students work in pairs and provide feedback to each other according to specified criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style D</strong> Self-check</td>
<td>Teacher makes majority of decisions and specifies task criteria</td>
<td>Students evaluate /assess themselves against specified criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style E</strong> Inclusion</td>
<td>Teacher makes the majority of decisions and presents tasks with varying degrees of difficulty</td>
<td>Students decide on which level of difficulty to perform a task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style F</strong> Guided discovery</td>
<td>Teacher designs a series of questions to elicit a specific response</td>
<td>Students discover a pre-determined learning target by answering questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style G</strong> Convergent discovery</td>
<td>Teacher designs a single question</td>
<td>Students engage in questioning and reasoning to find a solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style H</strong> Divergent discovery</td>
<td>Teacher designs and explains a relevant question or problem</td>
<td>Students engage in critical thinking to discover the answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style I</strong> Individual programme</td>
<td>Teacher only chooses the general subject matter</td>
<td>Student is planning and investigating within the subject matter context individually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style J</strong> Learner initiated</td>
<td>Teacher supports and advices</td>
<td>Students take initiative on context and design a full learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style K</strong> Self-teaching</td>
<td>Not relevant to primary PE</td>
<td>Student is fully independent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002; Doherty and Brennan, 2008, p. 184).

2.3.3 Research on the Spectrum of Teaching Styles

Initial research on the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles was conducted on the basis of ‘versus’ (one teaching style versus the other styles) in order to discover which one was the best regarding student learning (Byra, 2000). This trend was abandoned in the mid-1980s, since Mosston himself “emphasized the spectrum from a ‘non-versus’ perspective” in 1981 (Byra, 2000, p. 230). This ‘non-versus’ perspective is based on the understanding that no teaching style is better than the others, rather that all of them have their own place “in reaching a specific set of objectives; hence, no style, by itself, is better or best” (Mosston, 1981, p. viii, cited in Byra, 2000). As a result, studies conducted after the mid-1980s have investigated, amongst other things, skill acquisition, motor skill learning, “student learning in the social and cognitive domain” through validation/confirmation of theoretical assumptions regarding the teaching styles.
In the following review, a variety of international studies regarding student and teacher behaviours published from 2000 onwards relating to understandings and implementations of different teaching styles of the Spectrum will be discussed with a focus on Greek studies.

Cothran et al. (2000) investigated college students’ experiences and perceptions with regard to different teaching styles in PE. 438 college students in the USA were provided with a short descriptive scenario of each teaching style. They were then asked to answer a survey represented by four statements and a 5-point Likert scale for each of the scenarios. The results of this study revealed that these students had mostly been taught with teaching styles from the reproductive cluster and, in general, the majority had been taught with 5 of the 11 teaching styles. Students also did not view the styles of the productive cluster as positively as the ones from the reproductive cluster “at promoting fun, learning and motivation”, but all of the teaching styles were “rated as having some positive level of educational influence” (Cothran et al., 2000, p. 100).

Curtner-Smith et al. (2001) conducted their study with the aim of identifying the teaching styles used by 18 PE teachers who worked in an urban environment in the USA and in light of a newly introduced National Curriculum for physical education. They recorded (videotaped) two lessons from each of the PE teachers, which they later analysed using the Instrument for Identifying Teaching Styles (IFITS). With this systematic observation instrument, a coder records ‘which teaching style a teacher is using or whether he/she is engaged in managerial activity’ every 20 seconds (p. 182). Statistical analysis of the results showed that most of the time urban PE teachers used the practice style of teaching during their lessons.

In 2002, a comparative study was conducted between Greece and Hungary regarding the use of teaching styles by PE teachers (Salvara and Birone). The participants were 42 Greek and 42 Hungarian primary school PE teachers, whose lessons were observed for the study. After videotaping the lessons, the observations were coded with the use of the Instrument for Identifying Teaching and Learning Behaviours (I ITLB). This instrument was “developed to record the amount of time in which teachers and learners use each of the teaching and learning behaviours” (Salvara and Birone, 2002, p. 56). The analysis of the
results showed that Greek and Hungarian PE teachers in this study used more teaching styles from the reproduction cluster. The Hungarian teachers, however, also seemed to have increased use of two styles from the production cluster. The authors suggest that differences in the use of teaching styles also reflected differences in the national curricula for PE.

Chatoupis and Emmanuel published two studies in 2003 regarding teaching styles. One of them referred to the issues they faced while teaching Year 5 and Year 6 classes with the inclusion teaching style in an elementary school in Greece. Their case study resulted in them identifying these issues, as well as in suggesting tips for PE teachers whose students are not familiar with the decision making process that this style requires (Chatoupis and Emmanuel, 2003a). In their second study, Chatoupis and Emmanuel (2003b) investigated “the effects of style B [Practice] and style E [Inclusion] on fifth-grade students’ athletic competence” (p. 4). They additionally investigated possible “differences in perceived athletic competence between boys and girls, as well as the interactive effects of teaching styles and gender on perceived athletic competence” (Chatoupis and Emmanuel, 2003b, p. 4). Participants were 111 students from three public schools in Athens, Greece. The study lasted for 12 weeks and all students were taught by the same PE teacher, who was experienced in using the Spectrum of Teaching Styles. The students from each of the three schools were randomly assigned as the control group and the treatment groups; one of the treatment groups of each school was taught with the Practice and the other with the Inclusion style. The perceived athletic competence of the students was measured with a Harter’s Self Perception profile for Children subscale, which was provided to the students before and after the ‘treatment’ period (Chatoupis and Emmanuel, 2003b). The analysis of the data showed that both treatment groups with the Practice and Inclusion style performed better than the control group in terms of perceived athletic competence. As far as gender was concerned, girls had higher perceptions of athletic competence with the Inclusion style than with the Practice style and the control group and boys did better with both styles than with the control group (Chatoupis and Emmanuel, 2003b).

Kulinna and Cothran (2003) investigated PE teachers’ self-reported use and perceptions of various teaching styles. The participants of their study were 212
PE teachers from primary and secondary education settings in the USA. To conduct this study, the researchers modified an instrument initially “designed to assess students’ experiences and perceptions of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles” (Kulinna and Cothran, 2003, p. 600). This instrument included 11 scenarios, one for each of the teaching styles, which was used to help teachers identify their teaching process. The study’s findings showed that teachers used between 3 and 11 teaching styles, with the majority of them using 8 of the teaching styles. Regarding their perceptions of the teaching styles, the findings revealed that the most favourable teaching styles were the Command (A), Practice (B), Reciprocal (C), Inclusion (E) and Divergent discovery (H) (Kulinna and Cothran, 2003).

Cothran et al. (2005) investigated the use of teaching styles in the USA, Korea, Australia, France, England, Portugal and Canada. Participants were 1,436 PE teachers from these countries. They completed an instrument (the same modified instrument mentioned in the previous study) which included “a scenario for each of the 11 teaching styles” (Cothran et al., 2005, p. 195). The scenarios were followed by 5 statements represented by a five point Likert scale and investigated their teaching styles use and their beliefs regarding these styles. The results showed that teaching style experiences were significantly different in each country. The results also indicated that Korean teachers used the Command and Self-Teaching styles more than other styles, French teachers used the Practice style, English teachers used mostly the Reciprocal, Inclusion, Guided Discovery, Divergent Discovery, Individual Programme, and Learner Initiated styles, while the Self-check style was mostly used by Canadians. The Convergent Discovery was the one most used by Australian teachers. The results also indicated that there was a variation among teachers’ beliefs about the teaching styles among countries. The national contexts and their influence on teacher action were taken into consideration in the discussion of the findings by the authors.

In a UK study, Morgan et al. (2005) investigated the effects of the command/practice, reciprocal and guided discovery teaching styles on the teacher behaviours that influence motivation climate and students’ motivation in the PE lesson. Participants were, initially, four initial teaching education students and 92 students from two different schools. The student teachers were
filmed while teaching three lessons to randomly selected classes in these schools. The data was collected by analysing the videos. This was done in order to measure the motivational climate using “the task, authority, recognition, grouping evaluation and time structures (TARGET)…configuration modification of the Behavioural Evaluation Strategies and Taxonomies software” (Morgan et al., 2005, p. 264), alongside the written responses from the students. The analysis of the data showed that the Command/Practice styles resulted in more “performance focused teaching behaviours…in comparison to the reciprocal and discovery styles” (Morgan et al., 2005, p. 274). Additionally, students seemed to enjoy being taught with the Reciprocal and Guided discovery teaching styles more.

Salvara et al. (2006) investigated the teaching styles from a student goal orientation perspective. The study was conducted in Greece and the participant students were divided in four groups in order to be taught in different teaching styles. The “27-item Learning and Performance Orientations in Physical Education Questionnaire (LAPOPECQ)” was used in order to examine students’ perceptions regarding their ‘orientations’ (Salvara et al., 2006, p. 57). The results showed that it was not only the teaching style that students are being taught with that had an impact on their motivation but also that child centred teaching styles had a better and more positive impact on student motivational orientation. Conversely, students taught with teacher centred teaching styles were more ego oriented, worried more about their mistakes and were more competitive towards their peers (Salvara et al., 2006).

Another Greek study (Derri and Pachta, 2007) compared the Command and Guided discovery teaching styles with regard to their effect on student motor skill and on concepts acquisition and retention. The study concluded that both teaching styles “contributed to skill acquisition” (Derri and Pachta, 2007, p. 42). The Guided discovery style, however, seemed to be more effective for motor skill learning and retention than the Command style. In a similar study, Mouratidou et al. (2007) investigated whether teaching PE with the Reciprocal teaching style could promote moral reasoning and development of the students. Using a control and an intervention group and the previously mentioned LAPOPECQ questionnaire, the researchers found that the intervention group had been affected positively with regard to their moral reasoning and
development in comparison to the control group (Mouratidou et al., 2007). Another study, regarding the Reciprocal style of teaching once again, was conducted in 2015 by Chatoupis. This study investigated whether pairing primary school students by companionship could "promote ... motor skill development and comfort levels more than working with non-friends within the framework of the reciprocal style of teaching" (Chatoupis, 2015, p. 310). Participants were 52 Greek students who were divided in three groups (two treatment and one control groups). The results showed that students who were paired with a friend "showed significant improvement from pre-test to post-test, whereas learners paired with a non-acquaintance or in the control group did not" (Chatoupis, 2015, p. 319) with the reciprocal style of teaching. Additionally, students felt more comfortable receiving feedback from a friend.

SueSee and Edwards (2011) investigated the self-identified and observed use of teaching styles of teachers teaching senior (Years 11 and 12) physical education in Queensland (Australia). The study consisted of two parts. Questionnaires developed from the ‘Instrument for collecting teachers’ beliefs about their teaching styles in physical education’ were sent to a number of school with senior physical education for the first part of this study. This resulted in 110 responses from PE teachers. Additionally, 27 lessons of 9 of these PE teachers were videotaped for further observation. The results of this study showed that the teachers under investigation were not using “a wide variety of styles” (SueSee and Edwards, 2011, p. 216). More specifically, the styles used during the observations of the 9 teachers were the Command style, Practice style, Reciprocal style, Self-check style and Convergent discovery style, with the dominant one being the Practice style (SueSee and Edwards, 2011). The results from the questionnaires showed that the most often reported used teaching style was the Practice style, followed by the Command style (SueSee and Edwards, 2011).

Gorozidis and Papaioannou (2011) investigated PE teachers’ self-efficacy, achievement goals and attitudes and intentions towards implementing the newest Greek physical education curriculum. Participants were 430 junior high school PE teachers from Greece. At the beginning of their study, the researchers assumed that “any effects of performance approach goal orientation on curriculum implementation would be mediated by self-efficacy to
implement student-centred methods” (Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011, p. 237). The results of the study showed that many of the participant teachers believed that “it is enough to implement some of the proposed teaching tasks using their familiar teacher-centred styles”, however, meaning Spectrum styles from the reproduction cluster (Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011, p. 246).

The Reciprocal and Self-check styles were investigated by Kolovelonis et al. (2011) with regard to student basketball’s ‘chest pass’ performance. 64 Greek Year 6 students were randomly assigned to three experimental and one control groups. The three experimental groups were taught with the Reciprocal style, the Self-check style and sequentially with the Reciprocal and Self-check styles respectively. The results showed that both teaching styles were effective “in enhancing pupils’ chest pass accuracy” (Kolovelonis et al., 2011, p. 43). The students of the group who were taught with the sequential Reciprocal and Self-check styles were, however, better in ‘chest pass’ accuracy than those who were taught exclusively with just one of the teaching styles.

A different set of teaching styles, the Command, Practice and Inclusion styles, were investigated by Sanchez et al. (2012) with regard to students’ perceptions of them. Participants of the study were 77 college students from the USA. The intervention consisted of three weeks of Pilates lessons being taught with the Command, Practice and Inclusion teaching styles. Data were collected with questionnaires, ratings of perceived exertion and four randomised interviews after each of the lessons. The results of this study showed that students felt “more physically involved in the inclusion-style lessons than in the practice- and command- style lessons” (Sanchez et al., 2012, p. 326). Additionally, the reported social involvement was the same for all three teaching styles, whereas the perceived cognitive involvement of the students was “much greater in the inclusion-style lessons than in the command- and practice-style lessons” (Sanchez et al., 2012, p. 327). Finally, students’ favourite teaching style was reported to be the Command style.

The Self-check style and the hypothesis that it creates “a mastery-oriented climate … promoting adaptive achievement goals, intrinsic motivational and metacognitive activity in physical education classes” was investigated by Papaioannou et al. (2012, p. 110). The participants of this study were 279
Greek Year 6 students. Half of them were taught with the self-check style. The other half were taught with the Practice style. Both completed questionnaires before and after the intervention. The initial hypotheses of the investigation were confirmed. The results showed that the self-check style activated processes such as self-monitoring and planning (Papaioannou et al., 2012). They also showed that the Self-check style “contributes to the development of a positive motivational climate which is characterized as high mastery and low performance oriented” (Papaioannou et al., 2012, p. 116).

A 2014 study by Byra et al. (2014) investigated the behaviours of teachers and students in the Command, Practice and Inclusion styles of teaching. Participants of the study were 77 college students from the USA who participated “in three 50-minute lessons with different teaching styles” (Byra et al., 2014, p. 3). The data were collected with three observational instruments, which focused on instructional climate, time-on-fitness and teacher feedback respectively. Regarding the instructional climate (instruction and activity time), the results showed that the Inclusion style lesson had significantly more time allotted to instruction and less to activity compared to the Command and Practice style lessons (Byra et al., 2014). Regarding the time-on-fitness (“time spent within the instructional climate category of physical activity” (Byra et al., 2014, p. 9), these results showed that during all three teaching style lessons, students were engaged in similar active fitness during activity. Finally, with regard to teacher feedback, the results showed that although most of the feedback received by the student was positive, this was happening more often during the Practice and Inclusion style lessons (Byra et al., 2014).

Finally, Syrmpas et al. (2016) investigated Greek PE teachers’ implementations and perceptions of Spectrum teaching styles. Participants of this study were 219 PE teachers who completed a Kulinna and Cothran, 2003, Greek adaptation questionnaire (Syrmpas et al., 2016). The results of this study showed that, in general, teachers used a variety of teaching styles, with those from the reproduction cluster used more often than the production teaching styles. More specifically, the Command, Inclusion and Practice teaching styles were used more often than the “self-teaching, learner-initiated, and learner-designed individual programme teaching styles” (Syrmpas et al., 2016, p. 8). The results, however, showed that some of the teaching styles from the
production cluster; such as the Guided discovery, Divergent discovery and Convergent discovery, were used more than some other teaching styles from the reproduction cluster; such as the Reciprocal and Self-check styles (Syrmpas et al., 2016). Lastly, PE teachers perceived all teaching styles as being “equally beneficial to students” (Syrmpas et al., 2016, p. 11).

The studies presented in this section have investigated either all of the teaching styles of the Spectrum or sets of some of them. In Appendix 1 all the studies in this section have been summarised in a table according to the aims of the study, number of participants, methods used and conclusions and according to the country that they were conducted. The aims, and thus the outcomes of the studies varied. Some studies’ findings referred to teachers’ use and implementation of the Spectrum of teaching styles (Cothran et al., 2000; Curtner-Smith et al., 2001; Salvara and Birone, 2002, Kulinna and Cothran, 2003; Cothran et al., 2005; SueSee and Edwards, 2011; Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011; Syrmpas et al., 2016). A variety of Spectrum teaching styles were reported as being used by practitioners in many countries. However, the Command and Practice and Reciprocal styles and generally styles from the reproduction cluster were mostly preferred by the PE teachers. In Greece, a recent study revealed that teachers used the Command, Practice and Inclusion styles more frequently (Syrmpas et al, 2016). A general tendency of PE teachers to teach with Spectrum styles from the reproduction cluster is recorded in this literature review. Byra (2006) suggests that a reason why many teachers prefer teaching with ‘direct’ teaching styles is that “significant achievement gains are made in skill performance” of students when using them (p. 461).

Studies recording students’ experiences with the Spectrum of Teaching Styles revealed that students were also being taught more frequently with styles from the reproduction cluster (Cothran et al., 2000; Morgan et al., 2005). In addition, students in the USA were reported to view styles from the reproduction cluster as positively as styles from the production cluster (Cothran et al., 2000). However, a study in the UK showed a student preference to the Reciprocal and Guided discovery styles (from the reproduction and production clusters respectively) (Morgan et al., 2005).
Other studies compared teaching styles of the Spectrum with regard to teacher behaviour, perceived athletic competence, creation of motivation climate, comfort levels and skill acquisition (Chatoupis and Emmanouel, 2003b; Morgan et al., 2005; Salvara et al., 2006; Derri and Pachta, 2007; Chatoupis, 2015; Kolovelonis et al., 2011, Papaioannou et al., 2012; Byra et al, 2014). Regarding teacher behaviour, the Inclusion style required a lot more time spent to instruction giving by the teachers in comparison to the traditional ‘instruction’ styles of Command and Practice (Byra et al., 2014). In another study, the Practice and Inclusion styles improved the perceived athletic competence of students, however, girls’ perceived athletic competence was higher with the Inclusion style. For boys, both teaching styles were equally beneficial (Chatoupis and Emmanouel, 2003b). Moreover, motivational climate in class was affected positively by teaching styles from the production cluster since teaching with styles from the reproduction cluster resulted in increased stress and competitiveness among students (Morgan et al., 2005; Salvara et al., 2006). Students comfort levels increased when being paired with friends (Reciprocal style) which in turn increased motor skill acquisition (Chatoupis, 2015). Motor skill acquisition was found to improve with two more teaching styles, the Command and Guided discovery (Derri and Pachta, 2007). Motor skills retention though was better with the Guided discovery style (Derri and Pachta, 2007). Finally, motor skill acquisition was equally achieved by students through the Reciprocal and Self check teaching styles (Kolovelonis et al., 2011). It should be noted that some studies in this review compared styles from both the reproduction and production cluster with regard to motor skill acquisition, although it is considered to be better gained through teaching styles from the reproduction cluster (Byra, 2006).

Teaching styles were also investigated with regard to students’ moral reasoning and physical involvement and metacognitive regulation (Mouratidou et al., 2007; Papaioannou et al., 2012). The Reciprocal teaching style was found to improve students moral reasoning and development (Mouratidou et al., 2007). The Reciprocal style, as a traditional peer teaching style, is suggested to elicit such ‘responses’ by students through the processes of giving and receiving feedback and analysis of peers’ skill performance (Byra, 2006). The Self-check style proved useful in creating advanced task involvement and metacognitive

There is obviously a great range of research interest regarding the Spectrum of Teaching Styles. None of these studies, however, investigated the Spectrum in the relation to students with SEN and inclusion. The Inclusion style, although investigated in some of the studies, did not relate to the concept of inclusion as framed in the literature and discussed in the previous sections (2.1, 2.2). In addition, the majority of methods used to conduct these studies have employed questionnaires, structured observations and interventions and have analysed and presented their data statistically (Appendix 1). These methods were also employed by studies conducted in Greece (see blue highlights in Appendix 1). Although not necessarily quantitative, most studies in this review analysed their data in a quite quantitative way using inferential and descriptive statistics. This can be attributed to the number of participants in many of these studies which would make for qualitative analysis of the findings very time consuming. A need for more qualitative approaches in the study of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles in Greece is therefore identified, in order to investigate teachers’ beliefs and practice in depth. In addition, although the Inclusion style is investigated in the literature, there is a need for studies which investigate the concept of inclusion along with the Spectrum of Teaching Styles in the PE lesson.

2.4 Empirical aims of the study and research questions

Inclusion in relation to special educational needs is considered to be a main goal of educational policies in many countries, and for that reason is an issue included in their legislation. Implementing inclusion, however, is a difficult task and the factors that enable effective inclusive practices have been the focus of several studies in recent years (Doulkeridou et al, 2011; Corbett, 2001). In relation to physical education numerous studies have revealed that a number of factors affect the attitudes and beliefs toward inclusion of students with SEN in the PE lesson. The use of specific teaching styles from the Mosston Spectrum), during the teaching of PE, has been investigated either by specifically testing their effectiveness on teaching and learning and/or by the comparison of two or more teaching styles.
However, research and literature have focused mostly on quantitative forms of data collection and analysis concerning PE teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion with only a small number of studies using qualitative methods (Meegan and MacPhail, 2006; Morley et al, 2005). In the Greek context, while researching the relevant literature it was found that there are only two recent studies concerning PE teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion and they both used quantitative methods for the collection of data (Papadopoulou et al, 2004; Doulkeridou et al, 2011). The collection of data in various studies concerning the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles has also focused on the effectiveness of teaching styles and/or comparisons between/among them. There are no studies that explore the connection between the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion.

This study was therefore designed to fill a number of existing gaps in the literature through:

- a detailed examination of PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion of students with SEN in the PE lesson in Greece using qualitative methods;
- examination of the use of particular teaching styles (Mosston’s Spectrum) in the PE lesson and their connection to inclusive practices;
- exploration of the effects of participants’ understandings of inclusion on their teaching practices;
- the possible socio-cultural sources of these understandings and the connection between the use of particular teaching styles and inclusive practices.

By examining these subjects this study will offer perspectives regarding the connections between PE teachers' beliefs and their practice derived from the actual teaching strategies used for the inclusion of student with SEN in the PE lesson. It is intended that the findings will offer suggestions for the improvement of existing provisions for students with SEN in Greece. In addition, this study seeks to contribute at a theoretical level to the understanding of inclusion in relation to Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles.
The research questions that are posed are:

1. What are Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?
   1.1. What influences Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?
2. What inclusive practices are implemented in the PE lesson?
3. What are the teaching styles from the Mosston’s Spectrum that Greek PE teachers’ use during lesson?
4. What are the connections between the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and understandings of inclusion?

The next chapter provides details of the methodology used in attempting to find answers to these questions.
3. METHODOLOGY CHAPTER

This chapter presents the philosophical underpinnings of the study and the methodological framework that was used. This is followed by details of the participants and their contexts, the research tools, the methods used for analysing the data and the ethical issues that were considered when planning the study and collecting the data.

3.1 Approach to research

This study examined Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion of students with SEN within their teaching, as well as inclusive practices in the PE lesson. More specifically the research questions that derived from the review of the literature are:

1. What are Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?
   1.1. What influences Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?
2. What inclusive practices are implemented in the PE lesson?
3. What are the teaching styles from the Mosston’s Spectrum that Greek PE teachers’ use during lesson?
4. What are the connections between the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and understandings of inclusion?

A qualitative design was the best fit for both the purpose and the exploratory nature of this study as explained below.

The term ‘qualitative research’ is used very often to describe ‘anything that is non-numerical data’ (Pope, 2006, p.21). It is also considered as focusing on ‘process, meaning, and understanding’ (Merriam, 1998, p. 8). Often the term qualitative is used interchangeably with the term interpretive. However, Pope (2006, p. 21) notes that

A qualitative research can be interpretive, positivist, or critical dependent largely on the theoretical disposition of the researcher … qualitative research can be portrayed as a process to obtain an in depth understanding of the meanings and descriptions of situations presented by people
irrespective of whether or not the collection of data results in numerical or non-numerical data. A qualitative researcher would also “argue that if we want to understand people’s actions we have first to understand those actions in the way that the participants do” (Pope, 2006, p. 22).

Maxwell (2005) identifies five ‘intellectual’ goals which can be achieved through qualitative research:

1. “Understanding the meaning, for participants in the study, of the events, situations, experiences, and actions they are involved with or engage in…
2. Understanding the particular context within which the participants act, and the influence this that this context has on their actions…
3. Identifying unanticipated phenomena and influences, and generating new, “grounded” theories about the latter…
4. Understanding the process by which events and actions take place…
5. Developing causal explanations…” (p. 22-23).

The first of these goals agrees with the goal of this study, which is to understand the meanings that the participant PE teachers give to the concept of inclusion and, consequently, to their actions (e.g. possible inclusive practices and possible use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles). The second goal of qualitative research is also one of goals of this study, since the Greek educational context within which PE teachers act is taken into consideration in order to investigate the influences on PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion. The third goal is not resonant with this study because the focus is to investigate the understandings of inclusion and possible use of inclusive practices and Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles, phenomena which are well known in both educational reality and in the Greek educational context, as discussed in section 1.4. The fourth goal does, however, match the goals of this study, since understanding the process of events is a prerequisite of interpretation as it is described below (section 3.1.1). Finally, the fifth goal is not relevant to this study since I am not intending to identify causal explanations.
Since three of Maxwell’s suggested intellectual goals agree with what I am trying to achieve through the research questions, this present study can be considered as qualitative and interpretive nature.

3.1.1 Research paradigm

In an effort to better examine Greek PE teachers’ perceptions in-depth and in order to better observe and identify the teaching styles from the Mosston’s Spectrum they use during the lesson, as well as their inclusive practices, the present study is situated within interpretivism. The interpretative nature of this study emerged from a belief that reality is ‘multi-dimensional and ever changing’ and that its meanings and interpretations depend on the individuals’ views, backgrounds and connections to the particular reality (Merriam, 1998, p. 202).

Interpretivism is a “worldview … [in which] individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work” (Creswell, 2013, p. 24). Interpretation is a subjective process which “promotes communication with the cultural conditions of a society and an understanding of why things operate” (Pope, 2006, p. 22). Consequently, the interpretivist researcher relies upon the “participants' views of the situation being studied” and recognises the impact of their own background and experiences on the research (Creswell, 2003, p. 8). With regard to research, Merriam (1998) suggests:

“The researcher brings a construction of reality to the research situation, which interacts with other people’s constructions or interpretations of the phenomenon being studied. The final product of this type of study is yet another interpretation by the researcher of others' views filtered through his or her own” (Merriam, 1998, p. 22).

Pring (2000) suggests that researchers conducting their research within the interpretive paradigm are doing so because the social world “cannot be studied as an object of science and observed as a thing in itself … Rather is it interpreted, and to some extent a construction of those interpretations” (p. 96, author’s italics). Social constructivism lies within the interpretive paradigm (Pope, 2006) and, in conducting research, one has to consider that
Subjective meanings … are not simply imprinted on individuals but are formed through interaction with others (hence social construction) and through historical and cultural norms that operate in individuals’ lives (Creswell. 2013, p. 25).

There is a huge variety of constructions in the world, as many as the interpretations of reality by people throughout the history of the world. Social constructions regard “subjective meanings of [peoples’] experiences – meanings directed toward certain objects or things” (Creswell, 2013, p. 24) and other meanings regarding ideas, concepts and connotations. As a result, truth and the “rules which constitute social life and social facts … are socially constituted and their continued existence depends on social agreement” (Pring, 2000, p. 102).

This study explores the participants’ understandings of inclusion, along with their practice in a particular (Greek) environment; therefore, this study seeks to understand the interpretations of a situation, as well as group perceptions within participants’ social realities. These are the reasons why this study did not use quantitative research approach. As Denzin and Lincoln (1998) suggest quantitative researchers examine the “constraints of everyday life” in an ‘abstract’ and not direct way (p. 10). Being at the heart of a situation and directing attention to “the specifics of particular cases” is what qualitative researchers are committed to do (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998, p. 10). A quantitative approach to this study was not considered since as noted by Denzin and Lincoln (1998) “quantitative researchers seldom are able to capture the subject’s perspective because they have to rely on more remote, inferential empirical materials” (p. 10). Such approaches to research are designed to investigate general ‘laws’ and are referred to as ‘nomothetic’ (Cohen et al. 2007; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998). In this study, I do not seek to define a general theory or conclusion but to get closer to people’s individual and idiographic experiences and perspectives. Interpretation and understanding of the perspectives of the participants are the ultimate goals of this study.

Pope (2006) suggests that “an interpretive approach to research employs a practical orientation” (p. 23). An approach like this involves the researcher investigating real life, which is usually done in everyday settings. It also involves
the researcher trying to “gain access to the ‘meaning’ behind people’s actions” (Pope, 2006, p. 23). In the field of educational research, and more specifically, in “special needs research”, interpretative approaches have not always been utilised as often as they are today, and the use of quantitative approaches has been “dominant” (Avramidis and Smith, 1999, p. 29). The shift to more qualitative approaches in ‘special needs research’ and educational research in general was realised after criticism that the

“Experimental settings and the study of large samples often do little to add to our understandings of the realities of teaching and learning in the natural settings of ordinary and special schools” (Avramidis and Smith, 1999, p. 29).

Following this new tradition, there was “an increased utilisation of qualitative methods” in education (Avramidis and Smith, 1999, p. 30). Specifically regarding teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion, Avramidis and Norwich (2002) called for more studies employing alternative methods within the ‘social constructivist view’, since a large number of studies in this field “employed traditional quantitative research designs (survey) and investigated ‘individualistic’ experiences of inclusion” (p. 144). One should not be confused, however, into thinking that surveys, as exemplary mentioned in Avramidis and Norwich (2002) are tools for the collection of only quantitative data. As Avramidis et al. (2000) explain surveys are merely methods for data collection, which can be used alongside other methods to collect qualitative data. In physical education, the use of the interpretive paradigm allows researchers to “gain a more enriched sense of what physical education and sport means to individuals and how those meanings can be adopted to enhance future curriculum and policy initiatives” (Pope, 2006, p. 31).

The aim of an interpretative study is “to understand the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it” (Mertens, 2010, p. 16), and the use of qualitative methods, such as observations, interviews, document reviews, ‘artefacts analysis’ and ‘cultural records’ present the qualitative researcher with a wide range of tools for research (Mertens, 2010; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998, p. 29). In the present study, I have used observations and interviews as my research tools. As discussed later (see section 3.2.2)
observations are an obvious tool to use when seeking to study ‘real life’ in any context (Robson, 2002) and interviews “seek to interpret the meaning of central themes in the life world” of the participant (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 272). Documentary analysis was used to review the relevant legislation (see sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3) and revealed elements that refer to all Greek schools. ‘Artefact analysis’ and ‘cultural records’ were not used because although culture and history clearly play a significant role in ‘lived experience’ they can be investigated as expressed directly from a participant.

3.1.1.1 Ontology: Subjectivist ontology

In exploring their ontological assumptions, researchers are trying to pinpoint their views amongst “different ways of viewing the world – of viewing what there is to study” (Thomas, 2009, p. 86). This section therefore offers an insight on how I view the world, and as such, a view on the assumptions that permeate this study.

Pope (2006) suggests that “there can be multiple interpretations of reality but … such interpretations are in and of themselves a part of the knowledge” itself (p. 22). This ontological position, which derives from the interpretivist paradigm permeates this study from beginning to end. The objective of this study is to explore understandings of inclusion in the PE lesson by PE teachers and, as a result, multiple interpretations are produced and shown in the data, as opposed to simply showing just one account. According to Pope (2006),

“Interpretivism involves an ontology whereby social reality is seen as the product of processes through which participants collectively negotiate and produce socially constructed meanings for actions and situations” (p. 22, author’s italics).

Inevitably, interpretative studies engage with questions regarding the ‘hows’ and ‘whats’ of social reality (Pope, 2006). The present study seeks to explore peoples’ experiences, their individual interpretations and the way these interpretations affect their actions. Semi-structured interviews have been employed to this end, since other methods would not offer the same level of richness in describing the experiences of the participants from their particular point of view. Additionally, through the semi-structured observations, which were also employed in this study, as well as the analysis of the data, my voice
as the researcher, since I inevitably interact with the participants of the study and the data, comes to the surface.

The concept of inclusion was and has been considered as a subjective construct in this study, as well as in a variety of other studies and writings. As a subjective construct, it is given various meanings and is perceived in a variety of ways by both PE teachers and teachers in general. The variety of the many subjective understandings of the participant PE teachers creates many different ‘truths’ relating to the concept of inclusion, which, in turn, are collectively negotiated to produce socially constructed and acceptable meanings. The ontological stance of this research is, therefore, that the understandings of inclusion in Greek primary education are collectively negotiated and a result of the initial and continuous multiple understandings of it.

3.1.1.2 Epistemology: Social constructivism

Epistemology concerns the ways that researchers acquire knowledge about the phenomena they investigate. As Braun and Clarke (2006) put it, “the research epistemology guides what you can say about your data, and informs how you theorize meaning” (p. 85).

A social constructivism epistemology relates to a belief that “all knowledge is essentially subjective and support[s] the idea that the conduct of research is also subjective and interactive” (Pope, 2006, p. 22). As such, for social constructivists, knowledge is built through the interaction with others. Through a social constructivist epistemology, I believe that I cannot discover an absolute truth but rather, a reality of the phenomena under investigation through a specific perspective. The specific perspective in the present study comes from the participants and their “own points of view” (Williamson, 2006, p. 85). Since this study is situated within interpretivism, which, as mentioned earlier, seeks to explain participants’ points of view through their background and experiences, interpretation through a social constructivist lens is its epistemological premise.

3.1.2 Research methodology: Case study

The present research is designed as a case study. According to Yin (2014), a case study is
“[...] an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the “case”) in depth and within its real-world context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident” (p. 16).

The aim of the present study is to explore Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion of students with SEN in PE lessons, as well as their inclusive practices through teaching and, specifically, through Mosston’s Spectrum of teaching styles. A single-case embedded case study design was viewed as the best way to satisfy the consequent research questions. In particular, the present study is considered a single-case design, because the case of inclusion of students with SEN in the PE lesson in the Greek context can only be viewed and characterised as ‘single’. It is, additionally, considered embedded, because “within a single case, attention is also given to a subunit or subunits”, which are, in this case, the participant PE teachers’ views and lesson practices (see Figure 2) (Yin, 2014, p. 53).

Figure 2: Single-case with embedded units

Case study characteristically “involves the study of a case within a real-life, contemporary context or setting” (Creswell, 2013, p. 97) and “relies on multiple sources of evidence” (Yin, 2014, p. 17). The case under study is described by Merriam (1998) “as a thing, a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries” (p. 27). For this reason, the case study has been used in many fields, such as “psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, social work, business, education, nursing, and community planning” (Yin, 2014, p. 4). In educational research, case study “is one of the most frequently used qualitative research methodologies” (Yazan, 2015, p. 134). Robson (2002)
suggests that a case study is “a strategy” and not a method; it is “concerned
with research”; it is “empirical” regarding the data collection; “particular” on what
it investigates; “focused on a phenomenon in context” and, finally, it uses
“multiple methods of evidence or data collection” (p. 179).

Case studies usually adopt ‘multiple methods’ of investigation with
“observations, interviews, audio-visual material and documents and reports”
mentioned as the most common (Creswell, 2013, p. 97). To investigate this
case study, the chosen methods for collecting empirical data are semi-
structured observations and semi-structured in-depth interviews. The two
selected methods for this study were considered to be adequate for the
exploration of PE teachers’ beliefs and understandings, as well as their ways of
teaching with regard to inclusion of students with SEN in the PE lesson.

Before setting out to implement my case study my attention was also drawn to
an ethnographic research design. Ethnographic research according to Creswell
(2013) explains behaviour from a participant’s point of view and this was why I
was initially drawn to it. An ethnographic study, much like a case study, also
provides detailed information and description of the case under investigation
and its setting. To achieve this an ethnographic researcher is required to
engage in prolonged observations and involvement in a particular setting.
Therefore, participant observations and informal interviews/conversations are
most frequently used in ethnographies (Creswell, 2013).

Although the specifications of an ethnographic research mentioned so far seem
to initially align with the purposes of my study, other aspects of ethnography do
not. As LeCompte and Schensul (2010) suggest an ethnographic research
should be used when “participants, population sectors, or stakeholders or the
boundaries of the study population are not yet known or identified” (p. 35). In
addition, the ethnographic researcher should not predetermine responses by
the participants by the kinds of questions asked (Creswell, 2013). The aims and
purposes of this study were predetermined and decided after the review of the
literature. As a result, I knew which type of participants would be ideal for this
study, the questions I needed answers to and I had identified a clear ‘case’ with
boundaries. For these reasons a case study design was preferred. However,
the idea of using observations and interviews as the key methodological tools
for my research was initiated by its uses in ethnographies (see section 3.2.2 on use of research methods).

3.2 The case study: participants, methods and implementation

This section presents the overall case study design and schedule, the participant selection and presentation, the piloting of the methods, the observations and interviews design and the way that the data collected were handled and analysed.

As mentioned in the previous section, observations and interviews were chosen as the best ways to collect data and satisfy the research questions (table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?</td>
<td>PE teacher * 15</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What influences Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?</td>
<td>PE teacher * 15</td>
<td>Interview, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What inclusive practices are implemented in the PE lesson?</td>
<td>PE teacher * 15</td>
<td>Interview, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the teaching styles from the Mosston’s Spectrum that Greek PE teachers’ use during lesson?</td>
<td>PE teacher * 15</td>
<td>Interview, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the connections between the use of Mosson’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and understandings of inclusion?</td>
<td>PE teacher * 15</td>
<td>Interview, Observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Data collection methods used for each research question

Observations were first employed during the data collection in order to gain insight and understanding of the teachers’ actions and behaviours before the interviews. Interviews followed the observations to enhance the data collected from these but also to provide new data that it would not have been possible to collect from these observations. The enhancement of the interviews through the observations was carried out through stimulated recall interviews. Stimulated recall interviews are:
“[...]a type of retrospective verbal report, in which participants receive a stimulus – typically a segment of an audio/video recording or a written transcript of a particular teaching event involving the participant – and then attempt to recount their cognitions (i.e., thoughts or decision-making rationale) at the time the event took place” (Baker and Lee, 2011, p. 1441).

As Hardin (2005) suggests stimulated recall “enables the researcher to capture the thought processes of teachers as they analyse their instructional behaviours” (Hardin, 2005, p. 49). For the present research, the stimulated recall process included verbally reminding the participant PE teachers of events that happened during the observed PE lessons. These events were isolated and noted by me in order to stimulate further discussion. For example, during one of the observations of P2, she urged her students to encourage one of their peers with SEN, by cheering before he took a basketball shot. The game that was being played was competitive and the boy had already failed to shoot successfully a few times. After the observations, I noted this incident in my interview schedule. During the interview, I reminded the teacher of the event and I asked her on the reasons behind this action. This promoted the discussion which revealed more aspects of the teacher’s perspectives and understandings regarding inclusion and inclusive practice.

The design of the methodological tools of this study was followed by piloting of the methods and then the main study. The stages that were followed in this case study are presented in Figure 3 and explained in the following sections.
3.2.1 Participants and settings

A purposeful sampling strategy was used in the selection of the participants. According to Creswell (2013), a purposeful sampling strategy involves three decisions on behalf of the researcher: “the decision as to whom to select as participants (or sites) for the study, the specific type of sampling strategy, and the size of the sample to be studied” (p. 155).

Given the boundaries of this case study, the chosen participants were the PE teachers in primary schools which included an ‘inclusive class’ on their premises. These primary schools were located in one local authority in Western Greece. Purposive sampling was used in the selection of the participants. Purposive sampling, contrary to probability sampling, relies on the judgment of the researcher when it comes to the selection and its purpose is to focus on specific characteristics of the population of interest, which will enable the researcher to best answer his/her research questions (Thomas, 2009; Punch, 2005). In particular, purposive sampling is “based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 1998, p. 61).

For the present study, PE teachers were selected according to whether the school they served included one or more ‘inclusive classes’. By doing that, I
ensured a significant presence of children with SEN in the schools, as well as the fact that the PE teacher had, as a result, been given the opportunity to teach — at least for one academic year — in a class that includes student[s] with SEN. The sample, although, purposive on my behalf was also dependent on the willingness of the PE teachers to participate in the research and to cooperate with me as the researcher throughout the study’s different phases. PE teachers were also not selected according to race, ethnicity, gender, and/or religious background. The participants were PE teachers from primary schools in Greece in urban and suburban environments, in one of the three bigger cities of the country and some of its surrounding villages/suburbs, where I had easy access. From this point of view, the sample is also a convenience sample, since I chose to conduct the research in a city that was more accessible to me, due to specific limitations of research costs, travel expenses, and time constraints regarding travel to the location of the schools (Cohen et al., 2007). Lastly, in fulfilling Creswell’s (2013) third decision regarding the purposeful sampling strategy, the eventual number of participants was 15 PE teachers. This number relates largely to the fact that 15 PE teachers can be considered a sufficient number for both in-depth exploration, which is the goal of the study, and manageability, concerning time for data collection and data analysis. Additionally, two PE teachers were invited to participate in the pilot of the methods prior to the main study.

The reason for selecting primary over secondary mainstream schools is that students with SEN, after attending a mainstream primary school, usually continue their education in Special Secondary Schools or they do not attend school at all. Data collected in 2004 by the Pedagogical Institute in Greece revealed that out of all the Special Education Units in Greece (1192 in total) 67.6% (806) were ‘inclusive classes’ in primary education and only 2.2% (26) were ‘inclusive classes’ in secondary education (the rest are special schools in primary and secondary education) (Pedagogical Institute, 2004). In the academic year 2010-2011, these numbers increased with 1562 primary and 331 secondary schools having ‘inclusive classes’ (Pedagogical Institute, 2011). In addition at the beginning of the 2000’s that parents of children with SEN have been able to assert their children’s right to attend their local school with ‘inclusive class’ (depending on KEDDY’s suggestion) and this has tended to
happen at primary school age (Dialektaki, 2014). Thus, the probability of finding more primary schools with ‘inclusive classes’ in their premises in the area of convenience led me to focus on primary school PE teachers.

Following the decision to conduct my case study with the participation of 15 primary school PE teachers, I contacted the local authority for primary education and acquired a list of 74 primary schools in the area with an ‘inclusive class’ on their premises. I visited 15 schools and contacted the head teachers to inform them about my intentions. One of these schools proved to not have an inclusive class anymore and was mistakenly included in the local authority’s list; four schools declined to participate either through the head-teacher (1) or through the PE teachers themselves (3) and the remaining ten schools agreed to participate. Two of the schools that accepted my invitation were large schools and employed three PE teachers each. One more school employed two PE teachers, while the seven remaining employed one PE teacher each. As a result, the total number of schools which accepted the invitation for my study was 10 (see Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>PE teacher * 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>PE teacher * 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>PE teacher * 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>PE teacher * 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>PE teacher * 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>PE teacher * 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>PE teacher * 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>PE teacher * 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>PE teacher * 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>PE teacher * 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total:   | 10                   |
|          | 15                   |

Table 4: Schools and participant PE teachers per school.

Four of the participants were female (F) and the remaining eleven were men (M). Table 5 shows some of the characteristics of the participant PE teachers. PE teachers in this table are coded as P followed by a number for reasons of anonymity and confidentiality (see section 3.5).
Table 5: Participants’ main characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PE teacher</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
<th>Years of experience in teaching students with SEN</th>
<th>Training regarding teaching students with SEN</th>
<th>Numbers of students per observed lesson</th>
<th>Type of school environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Lesson a: 16 Lesson b: 15</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Placement in SEN school during university</td>
<td>Lesson a: 13 Lesson b: 12</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>Lesson a: 15 Lesson b: 14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>Lesson a: 15 Lesson b: 14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Undertaken speciality in Special Physical Education</td>
<td>Lesson a: 17 Lesson b: 18</td>
<td>Suburban (Village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>At least 2</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Lesson a: 15 Lesson b: 16</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Almost 11.5</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>Lesson a: 15 Lesson b: 47</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>Lesson a: 18 Lesson b: 20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Almost 12</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Lesson a: 14 Lesson b: not observed (see 3.2.6)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>Lesson a: 15 Lesson b: 16</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Lesson a: 22 Lesson b: 32</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Lesson a: 18 Lesson b: 17</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Term time optional module during university studies</td>
<td>Lesson a: 25 Lesson b: 19</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>‘few years’</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Lesson a: 15 Lesson b: not observed (see 3.2.6)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Lesson a: 18 Lesson b: 11</td>
<td>Suburban (Village)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With participant characteristics as presented above and the Greek educational context in the ‘background’ (see sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3) it can be argued that these fifteen PE teachers were representative of their speciality colleagues (PE teachers) in Greece. There are three reasons for this. The Greek educational system favours uniformity and most PE teachers are likely to teach in similar
ways. The training and years of experience of the teachers shows that the participants had experienced a range of types of training in relation to teaching students with SEN and had between one and 21 years of experience. Finally, the schools of this study are located in both urban and suburban / village environments reflecting a representative range of environments in Greece.

It is difficult to judge whether or not the teachers who agreed to participate were those who felt comfortable discussing issues in relation to SEN. It is possible that P5 might have been more comfortable than others in discussing such issues since as indicated in table 5 he had received more training regarding teaching students with SEN.

3.2.2 Research methods: Rationale for the use of observations and interviews

As explained above a decision was made for the data of this study to be collected via non-participant semi-structured observations of PE lessons and semi-structured in-depth interviews of PE teachers. Each of these tools provides data relating to one or more of the research questions (see Table 3). The observations mainly carry the potential to give information regarding the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and the implementation of inclusive practices in the lesson, whereas the interviews give answers regarding the PE teachers’ views and understandings concerning inclusion of children with SEN in the PE lesson.

By conducting observations, a researcher is able to observe “real life’ in the real world” (Robson, 2002, p. 310). Additionally, Robson (2002) notes that “direct observation in the field permits a lack of artificiality which is all too rare with other techniques” (p. 311). It allows the observation of complex human behaviour and possible “interrelationships among groups” (Lichtman, 2013, p. 224). Observation is also considered a ‘supportive or supplementary method’ to data collection by other methods (Robson, 2002, p. 312). In ethnographic research for example, observations are considered key in acquiring extensive data in real-life settings. The prolonged involvement in these settings by the ethnographic researcher leads in most cases to participant observations to be taking place (Cohen et al., 2007). By choosing to conduct non-participant observations in my study, I tried to minimise my impact on the observed
activities (Cohen et al., 2007). An advantage of non-participant observations in this study include the researcher being able to focus attention on the recording of the data and the participants being observed knowing that they are not going to be disturbed by the researcher. Potential disadvantages are that the physical presence of the researcher might tempt participants to engage in discussion with the researcher or to change their usual behaviour because they are being observed as discussed later in this chapter (section 3.2.6.1 and 3.5). The option of using completely unstructured observation was not chosen because in a small scale study I conducted prior to this one, it was discovered that the sole use of field notes without a clear focus resulted in lack of richness in the data in relation to the particular focus of the observation (Karageorgopoulou, 2011). On the other hand, a very structured approach to observation would “reduce the actual observation time substantially”, since structured observations normally require the use of a strict observation schedule (Robson, 2002, p. 311). The observations of this study were semi-structured, since there were particular aspects of focus (McDonough and McDonough, 1997) with regard to inclusive practices and teaching styles that PE teachers used during the PE lesson. These particular aspects of focus were noted by a set of indicators written on the side of each observation schedule (see Table 8). The indicators and the process of their choice are being described in the next section (3.2.3). The use of semi-structured observations enabled better identification of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles, possible inclusive practices and various teacher behaviours. It also allowed the general observation of behaviours connected to the Spectrum of Teaching Styles and inclusion that may be difficult to count or record in a structured observation (Thomas, 2009). Finally, observation is often used in research “to seek to find out what is going on in a situation as a precursor to subsequent testing out the insights obtained” (Robson, 2002, p. 312). For this reason, observations were conducted before the interviews, the other method of this study.

The second method for data collection in this study were semi-structured and in-depth interviews. Interview questions were informed by lesson observations in order to reach further understanding concerning PE teachers’ actions in their lessons. This was an idea that emerged from my initial interest in ethnographic research design, where the use of information gathered by observations inform
the agenda of other methods (Cohen et al., 2007). Therefore, a brief analysis of the observations was used as the basis to inform the semi-structured interviews, in an effort to gain richer information about teachers' perceptions towards inclusion, the inclusive practices and the teaching styles they use (Drever, 1995) (see Appendix 2). In conducting semi-structured interviews, Robson (2002) suggests that a researcher is able to “incorporate some more highly structured sequences” (p. 278), but also to modify the interview questions according to “what seems most appropriate” (p. 270). Additionally, in conducting in-depth interviews, a researcher is interested “in understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (Thomas, 2009). Lichtman (2013) suggests that in-depth interviews “provide greater depth than other types” (p. 192) of interview, which better serve the aims of this study. The interviews within this study address ideas and issues that derive from the literature and other ideas which had arisen from the prior semi-structured observations. A careful preparation of the interview questions holds the potential for “the individual being interviewed … [to] reveal … his or her feelings, intentions, meanings, subcontexts, or thoughts on a topic, situation, or idea” (Lichtman, 2013, p. 190).

The use of observations and interviews is quite common in qualitative studies and not without reason. Robson (2002) suggests that “data from direct observation contrasts with … information obtained by virtually any other technique” (p. 310). The reason for that is that the researcher is in a position where he/she can see the actions and behaviours of the participants for themselves. “Interview responses”, on the other hand, “are notorious for discrepancies between what people say that they have, or will do, and what they actually did, or will do” (Robson, 2002, p. 310). As a result, a combination of observations and interviews in research design is complementary, and as such, it offered the present study the ability to achieve a desired depth of information.

3.2.3 Observation design

Semi-structured observation is the first method used. I was the sole observer of the lesson and field notes were used as the basic data collection tool, along with an occasional voice recording in cases when complex situations and/or a
fast pace lesson did not allow for quick data recording. The advantage of keeping field notes while observing is that ‘their flexibility allows the observer to consider the context of the behaviours, their sequences [and] their meanings” (Simpson and Tuson, 1995, p. 46) and, as such, they are considered a useful tool in qualitative studies.

As indicated above, during previous research for my Masters dissertation (Karageorgopoulou, 2011) it was discovered that the use of unstructured observations was not sufficient in order to record PE teachers’ behaviours regarding inclusive practices and to identify teaching styles used in PE. For this reason, my first thought was to conduct structured observations using the Flanders’ interaction analysis system (FIAS) or one of its adaptations and modifications that have specifically been employed for research in physical education (Darst et al., 1983). To explain interaction analysis, Darst et al. (1983) suggest that it is “an observational procedure designed for objectively recording spontaneous teacher and student verbal and non verbal behaviour” (p. 12). Flanders interaction analysis system (FIAS), in particular, provides information about “verbal behaviour only, primarily because it can be observed with higher reliability than most nonverbal behaviour” (Darst et al., 1983, p.12).

It could be argued that FIAS is the most suitable tool for the present study, since the teaching styles are characterised by specific verbal interactions between the teacher and the students. During the lesson, however, PE teachers’ non-verbal interactions with the students are also important, especially when there is a need to employ a more inclusive practice. As with every type of structured observation as well as for FIAS, one can assume that “the social world is viewable through a prism that enables the breakdown of social activity into quantifiable elements” (Thomas, 2009, p. 183). In particular, when employing FIAS “the product of ... observation is a long list of code symbols, one symbol to one event” (Flanders, 1970, p. 6). As such there is chance that some events that are not coded will be missed from the data.

This way highlights concerns that were raised from the unstructured observations of my previous small scale study for my Master’s degree. The overall behaviour of the teacher is difficult to describe since “the ecology of a class dictates that the teacher uses more than one teaching styles in varying
degrees” (Chatoupis, 2010, p. 82). For this reason, and for the sake of flexibility, a decision was made to draw upon FIAS to create a semi-structured tool for the observations in the present study, thus creating a tool that combines a more accurate identification of the various teaching styles and also leave space for the identification and observation of other nonverbal behaviours that connect both to teaching and to inclusive practice (see table 8 for observation schedule).

FIAS sets three categories of interest for observation. These categories are teacher talk (direct or indirect influence), student talk (initiation or responses) and silence or confusion (pauses, short periods of silence, etc.) (Darst et al., 1983). Drawing upon these three categories, and adding other behavioural responses that are not included in these categories, I set the main indicators of the different teaching styles in Physical Education and the main indicators of inclusive practice which were also examined during the observation.

Although the present study is interested in identifying the teaching styles that are used by PE teachers, the teaching styles themselves are created by teacher and student interaction. For this reason, all students (with and without SEN) were observed with regard to their reaction as a group to teacher behaviour (for example if a teacher gave an instruction, did students comply?). As mentioned in the literature review chapter (section 2.3.2) Mosston’s teaching styles are created by the presence, lack or coexistence of decision making on behalf of both teachers and students (see table 2). The indicators for the teaching styles were therefore separated into the ones concerning the teacher’s behaviour and the ones concerning students’ responses or initiations concerning the lesson. The main criterion for including these indicators was the level of ‘pre-impact’, ‘impact’ and ‘post-impact’ decisions (see section 2.3.2) involved in specific actions and reactions that are usually expected to occur in a lesson (while using the Spectrum of Teaching Styles), which eventually determine the use of each teaching style. Pre-impact decisions might include decisions regarding the subject matter, ‘whom to teach’, selection of a teaching style, the time (pace, rhythm, duration, intervals and termination) and ‘organisational arrangements’ (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 21). Impact decisions involve the implementations of any pre-impact decisions and decisions about possible adjustments (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002). Finally, the basic post-impact decisions involve ‘providing feedback to the learner’, gathering information for
student performance and assessing it against criteria, ‘adjustment of decisions’ and others (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 21). Some of these decisions along with a choice of unique organisational arrangements for some teaching styles from the Spectrum (i.e. working in pairs or individually, asking and/or answering questions setting and/or checking performance criteria) are included in the following table (table 6) and are the indicators for the use of the Spectrum of teaching styles in this study. For the recognition of the teaching styles from the Spectrum not just one indicator was taken into consideration, but several. For example, one very important indicator is decision-making from the PE teacher regarding the subject matter (see table 6). This indicator can be translated in action as giving instructions regarding organisational issues in the lesson or direct instructions of what follows. However, decision-making and instructions about the subject matter can occur in many of the teaching styles of the Spectrum (see 2.3.2). Therefore, a combination of two or more indicators helped define the teaching style from the Spectrum used every time (i.e., decision-making about subject matter and start-finish time are indicators for the use of Command Style, whereas decision-making about subject matter while students reproduce in their own pace and rhythm are indicators for the use of Practice Style). These indicators are presented in the following table (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators for Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takes all the decisions concerning starting and finishing time, pace and rhythm and duration, subject matter</td>
<td>Accepts students’ requests</td>
<td>Asks questions related to the subject matter, starting and finishing time, pace and rhythm and duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks question(s) towards a particular goal.</td>
<td>Presents tasks with varying degree of difficulty</td>
<td>Gives feedback (personal or general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets performance criteria</td>
<td>Is supportive, participatory, observatory</td>
<td>Chooses the level of difficulty to perform a task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets example by own behaviour (demonstrates)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Answers question by the PE teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices individually or in group/class</td>
<td>Works in pairs</td>
<td>Makes decisions concerning starting and finishing time, pace and rhythm and duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduces</td>
<td>Gives feedback to peers according to performance criteria</td>
<td>Engages in reasoning and questioning toward a particular goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Indicators for Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002; Doherty and Brennan, 2008).
The indicators for Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching styles were transferred to the observation schedule under four categories: ‘teacher decisions’, ‘how do students work?’, ‘feedback’ and ‘teacher’s role’ (table 8). Under each category a few words representing sentences from table 6 were written. For example, under ‘Teacher decisions’ in the observation schedule I wrote

‘All, some, subject matter, designs a series of questions, designs a single question, presents class with a problem, degrees of difficulty’,

instead of writing

‘[Teacher] Takes all the decisions concerning starting and finishing time, pace and rhythm and duration, subject matter’, ‘Asks questions related to the subject matter, starting and finishing time, pace and rhythm and duration’, ‘Asks question(s) towards a particular goal’, ‘Presents tasks with varying degree of difficulty’, ‘Sets example by own behaviour (demonstrates)’ (see table 6).

Although not every detail from the left column of table 6 is represented under ‘Teacher decisions’ this was deliberate, since some details were very familiar to me as a researcher and there was no point of being reminded of them (e.g. demonstration). Also, some other indicators were included under other categories (i.e. ‘feedback’, ‘teacher’s role’). Further, some of the details in the right column of table 6 were not included under ‘How do students work’. For example, it was enough for me to be reminded once of the decision-making factor in the observation schedule - under ‘Teacher decisions’ - and not twice. Therefore, in the observation schedule it is implied that if the teacher is not making some of the decisions regarding subject matter, pace, rhythm and duration, then students are making these decisions (pace, rhythm and duration were also very familiar decisions for me and thus were not included, but were implied under ‘all’ decisions or ‘some’). In addition, if teachers are taking all the decisions, students are expected to comply with teacher instructions by ‘practicing in groups or individually’. The pattern of creating prompts for Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles is, therefore, characterised by an element of personal choice. I added indicators that I did want to focus on or not forget during the observations while did not add those I felt that would not forget because of my familiarity with them or because of they were implied earlier in the schedule. The prompts, as mentioned earlier, were designed to assist the
researcher with the teaching styles identification during the observations. This does not mean, however, that the analysis of the observation data was based solely on these prompts but also on the indicators (table 6) and detailed description of each teaching style by Mosston and Ashworth (2002) (section 3.3, table 2).

The indicators for inclusive practices were gathered from the Department for Education and Skills (DfES, 2004a) Primary National Strategy, the Index for Inclusion (Booth et al., 2000) and from Florian and Spratt (2013) tables from the article *Enacting inclusion: a framework for interrogating inclusive practice*. The indicators were included in this table (table 7) according to their suitability and the probability of being observed in a PE lesson in the Greek primary PE context. This suitability among many possible inclusion indicators was judged according to my knowledge of the educational system and my experience as a PE teacher in Greek primary schools. Their choice was also affected by the previous study I had conducted as a Masters student (Karageoropoulou, 2011) and by the pilot of the observation schedule (see section 3.2.5). Most importantly it was affected by my theoretical background regarding inclusion. From a theoretical point of view participation and quality of inclusion were necessary to be observed and although participation is quite straightforward to observe in a lesson, quality of inclusion is not. A growing number of studies have investigated this issue suggesting tools to help identify it (Wolery et al., 2000; Soukakou, 2012, Florian and Spratt, 2013). In addition the DfES (2004a) and Booth et al. (2000) have provided practitioners with important indicators regarding inclusive practice. Indicators relating to participation, access and support while taking into consideration student diversity through differentiation are of particular importance (Vlachou and Fyssa, 2016; Florian, 2014). Indicators regarding positive human interaction - a vital part of every inclusive lesson - were also taken into consideration (Black-Hawkins and Florian, 2012; Laws et al., 2012; Soulis et al, 2016). Therefore, when gathering indicators from the DfES (2004a), Booth et al. (2000) and Florian and Spratt (2013) participation, access, support, differentiation and positive human interaction were my main points of reference. Table 7 below presents the extended version of these indicators.
### Indicators for inclusive practice

- Student participate and are made to feel welcome
- Peer interaction encouraged
- Peer support encouraged
- Quality relations between teacher and students (trust)
- Peers helped to give feedback in positive ways
- Use of alternative equipment
- Time out used to maintain attention
- Effective use of additional adult support
- Clear objectives of the lesson
- Clarification of vocabulary
- Teachers checks for understanding of instruction
- Time and support given before response is required
- Question used to ensure that the whole class is listening
- Use of differentiated teaching
- Flexible approach - driven by need of learners rather than ‘coverage’ of material

---

**Table 7: Indicators for Inclusive Practice**

Indicators for inclusive practice (like indicators for teaching styles from the Spectrum) were typed on the side of a field notes page in order to be reminded of any one of those behaviours and to observe and register them when they occurred. In order to save space, these indicators were given an abridged version, as it appears in the observation schedule, and only absolutely necessary information was kept (see table 8, bottom left). A completed observation schedule can be found in Appendix 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>PE teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class:</td>
<td>Lesson: 1st or 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Students:</td>
<td>Subject matter:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of students with SEN:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher decisions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All, some, subject matter, designs a series of questions, designs a single question, presents class with a problem, degrees of difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do students work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually, within group/class, in pairs, answer questions, engage in reasoning, find solutions, discover answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback: Oral, by teacher or peers, self or from peers based on criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student decisions: Subject matter, when, how, level of difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's role: Supportive, participatory, observatory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Made to feel welcome & included. | |
Trust | |
Ensure participation/ peer interaction. | |
Use of special/adapted equipment. | |
Teaching assistants/other supporting personnel. | |
Understanding and clarification. | |
Equal opportunities. | |
Differentiation. | |
Proactiveness. | |
Flexibility | |

Table 8: Observation schedule

### 3.2.4 Interview design

Semi-structured in-depth interviews with each one of the PE teachers were conducted in order to gain a deeper understanding of the PE teachers’ perceptions about inclusion of students with SEN in mainstream primary schools, as well as their everyday lesson practices. Interviews were conducted in Greek, since the study was conducted in Greece.

Semi-structured interviews offer a ‘middle ground’ of questions between structured and unstructured ones. In a semi-structured interview, the questions are “more flexibly worded” or include “a mix of more and less structured questions” (Merriam, 1998, p. 74). This format allows the researcher to guide the interview by “a list of questions or issues to be explored” (Merriam, 1998, p.
74). This type of interview format also gives the researchers the opportunity to react and “respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview” of the participants and “to new ideas on the topic” (Merriam, 1998, p. 74). In conducting in-depth interviews, the researcher explores other people’s experiences through their own words and given meanings. The interviews addressed ideas and issues that derived from the literature review and others which arose from the preceded semi-structured observations. As shown in table 9 some of the interview questions addressed issues regarding: PE teachers’ understandings and attitudes towards inclusion, reasons behind these understandings, challenges in implementing inclusion and teachers’ practice related to inclusion. These questions were designed in such way as to provide data relevant to the main research questions 1 and 2 (see section 2.4). Data relating to the 3rd research question (section 2.4) were generated by interview questions shown in the second main part of the interview questions table (table 9, ‘Regarding Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles’). These questions addressed issues regarding PE teachers’ knowledge and use of the Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles, planning of the lessons and teachers’ overall considerations regarding their lessons. At the beginning and the end of the interviews introductory/warm up and open ended questions were asked respectively. Open ended questions were particularly asked in an effort to help PE teachers express any other opinions or thoughts they might have had as a result of the questions already asked (Drever, 1995). The main questions of the interview were, therefore, prepared in order to set the overall structure of the interview (Drever, 1995).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-structured interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Years of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experience in teaching students with SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How do you understand the term inclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Where does this understanding come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How did you form this opinion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How do you identify inclusion in Greece?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How would you describe inclusion in your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did you have any specific training regarding SEN before you started working as a PE teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How do the years of your service affect your teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you consider that you include children with SEN in your lesson? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specific questions about the lessons of each PE teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are there any advantages and/or disadvantages of having a child with SEN in your lesson?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you think that there is a difference between the way you react now when teaching in mixed classes compared to at the beginning of your career?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you have available support for your lesson?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you think that you need further support services or resources within the school? What would that include?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are there any difficulties in implementing inclusion in a primary school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you think that society plays a role in school inclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regarding Inclusion and inclusive practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you prepare your lesson beforehand? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are your priorities when planning a lesson?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are you planning to achieve by the end of the lesson?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you follow specific teaching methods? How would describe them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are you familiar with Mosston’s spectrum of teaching styles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you think you teach with these teaching styles? Which ones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specific questions about the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do different student characteristics affect the planning of your lesson?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you think that you are an effective PE teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regarding Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching styles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is there something else that you would like to add?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is there anything that made you feel uncomfortable during the interview?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9: Interview questions**

The fact that the interviews were semi-structured allowed me to ask more questions according to both the interests shown in as well as the direction of the conversation. During the interviews, I was flexible about following the sequence of the prepared questions. Although the sequence of questions was designed in a way that allowed a smooth interview process, the answers of the participant PE teachers guided this process. I was careful to ask all the necessary questions in a suitable time, however. Additionally, every participating PE teacher was asked specific questions that were derived from a brief analysis of the semi-structured observations of their lessons. They were reminded, when necessary, of parts of their lesson, and they were asked about particular behaviours and decisions by using the ‘stimulated recall’ technique mentioned earlier (section 3.2). Interviews were therefore conducted after the observations of the PE teachers’ lessons.
3.2.5 Operational procedures: piloting of methods

Prior to the main study, the methods and tools (observation schedule and interview questions) were piloted. The methods pilot was conducted in February 2013 and its aim was to test the basic instruments that were to be used in the research.

The observation schedule and the forms that were initially designed for the field notes, the teaching styles and the inclusive practice prompts, as well as the interview questions, were tested as thoroughly as possible, in an effort to identify possible mistakes and deficiencies. The method of completing the observation schedule, writing field notes, the focus of the observations as well as the questions in the interview were piloted to test and refine the approach being used (Drever, 1995).

The pilots involved two volunteer PE teachers. Both PE teachers and the schools’ headteachers were provided with informed consent forms which they signed. Information was given about the aims of the research, the reasons for conducting the pilots and methodological tools. In addition, it was clarified that the only precondition required for the research was for child/children with SEN to be part of the class that was to be observed. The two observations of each PE teacher in both schools were arranged to take place successively. During the observations, field notes were written on the observation plan and a voice recorder was used in order for short recordings to take place whenever it was difficult to write everything that was happening during the lesson with enough detail. After the end of the observations for the day, some of the recorded details were added to the observation field notes.

Since the interviews were to be partially informed by the observations the initial handwritten field notes were read in order to identify the various teaching styles that were used during the lessons. Side notes were clearly made on the observation field notes papers, which helped form some of the interview questions. The meetings for the interviews were both arranged two days after the observation pilots. The interviews themselves were conducted according to the teachers’ preference, one inside and the other outside the school premises. The first interview lasted for one hour and eleven minutes while the second only lasted 35 minutes, since that was the free time the PE teacher could provide for
the interview. At the end of each interview, the purpose of piloting the instruments was again explained to both PE teachers and they were asked whether there was something they would suggest be changed for the conduct of future interviews. They both stated that they were happy with the interviews and they would not suggest any changes.

Finally, after conducting the pilot observations and interviews, the observations field notes were rewritten in detail in Word documents to allow for the sentences to be clearer and more coherent. The interviews were also transcribed. At a later stage, the rewritten observations and interviews were translated into English, in order to seek advice from supervisors.

### 3.2.5.1 Conclusions and reflections on pilots

Concerning the observations, the observation plan worked well and I was able to focus on appropriate aspects of the lessons. Some additional prompts were thought to be useful to add both in relation to Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and inclusive practice (these related to teacher’s role in the lesson and the flexibility shown by the teacher) (table 8). A need was also realised to rewrite the field notes soon after the observed lesson, to add useful and more accurate details, explanations and interpretations. Also, a first level of analysis was considered useful and was added on the side of the analytical field notes, not just concerning Mosston’s Teaching Styles and inclusive practices, but also concerning other incidents during the lesson in order for more in depth questions to be added to the following interviews. Furthermore, the observation schedule sheets containing the long version of prompts proved to not be practical due to writing space constraints (see Appendix 3). The sheets were rewritten for this reason, and the revisions contained a summary of the prompts which were absolutely necessary for the PE teacher to be reminded of during the observations. Before this happened some more prompts were included to improve the observation schedule as mentioned earlier (see table 8). Finally, it was considered that it may be necessary to add recording time frequently during the observations, in order to be able to estimate the duration of certain aspects of the lesson.

While reflecting on the first pilot interview, I noted that it was quite leading, a fact which I tried to change in the second interview by rewriting some of the
interview questions. In addition, I noticed that I often asked two questions at a time. The following extract from the first pilot interview provides an example of both mistakes at once:

Which do you think are the difficulties in your effort to implement a more inclusive lesson? And apart from what you have already told me do you think that there are difficulties relating to the social environment?

Apart from this being a double question which can be difficult to answer for the interviewee and should be avoided (Leech, 2002), there were two assumptions in my questions which can be easily identified and possibly adopted by an interviewee. The first is that ‘there are difficulties in the implementation of inclusive practice’ and the second that ‘the social environment can be one of these difficulties’. Both questions were rewritten as follows and were included in the main interview questions (table 9):

Are there any difficulties in implementing inclusion in a primary school?

Do you think that society plays a role in school inclusion?

Also, during one of the interviews one of the PE teachers could not remember the teaching styles the way they were presented in one of the questions and an explanation had to be made concerning the Mosston’s Spectrum Teaching Styles. Because of that, I believed that there was a need to rephrase some of the interview questions in order to give the PE teachers the opportunity to provide me with their own explanation and understanding of the Spectrum. To that end, the interview questions were designed to be more open ended and expressed with vocabulary easily identifiable by the PE teachers. In addition, time restraints were thought necessary to be taken into consideration, in order for more ‘to the point’ questions to be identified before each interview. For example, I decided that the interview would have a more ‘structured’ form with questions from the interview questions schedule (table 9) to be given priority. Specifically, priority would be given to questions regarding understandings of inclusion and challenges to inclusive practice and then to questions regarding the knowledge and use of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles. In this way I tried to ensure that the most useful data would be gathered concerning the main research questions, making the most out of such interviews.
3.2.6 Operational procedures: main study

Having managed to find 15 participant PE teachers for this case study (see section 3.2.1 for details on participant selection), the main data collection was conducted during May and June 2013. Thirteen of the fifteen PE teachers were observed twice; two were only observed once due to unexpected circumstances (a school day trip and refusal of a PE teacher to be observed since he had to take care of students from two classes because of a colleague’s sudden absence). As a result, data were collected from 28 observations. The lessons I observed were of the teachers own choosing. The only requirement was that they satisfied the criterion that the class included at least one student with SEN. Field notes were made throughout the lessons in Greek, both for convenience and time saving purposes.

The interview of each participant followed the lesson observations. The interviews were conducted one-to-one, at a time and location chosen by the participants to allow participants to feel more comfortable to express their opinion in an environment of their own choice. Each participant was interviewed only once, since it is not usual for opinion on the issues explored to change radically in a short period of time. Is also not usual for opinions to change over a long period of time since, as Avramidis and Norwich (2002) commented on literature findings regarding teachers attitudes towards inclusion, teachers’ views had “not substantially changed over the years” (p. 133). Audio recording was used in an attempt to both keep a complete account of the series of exchanges between the PE teacher and me as the researcher, and to allow more flexibility to focus on what was being said and on the process of the interview. The initial goal of the researcher was to interview 15 PE teachers. This goal was subsequently achieved. The average duration of these interviews was around 34 minutes with the longest one lasting 52 minutes and the shorter 20 minutes.

3.2.6.1 Challenges during data collection

Finding and scheduling a time for all of the observations and interviews proved challenging. Occasionally, and conveniently, a few PE teachers gave me the opportunity to observe two of their lessons one after the other. On most occasions, however, I had to visit each PE teacher/school at least three times,
two for the observations and one for the interview. On some other occasions, the observations and interviews had to be rearranged, since some PE teachers were not available at the set time and date.

Participating PE teachers were observed teaching in lessons which included both children with and without SEN, and they were asked not to inform the researcher about which particular child[ren] were designated as having SEN. In this way, a necessary condition for the research would be satisfied; I would be able to observe possible inclusive practices and the teaching styles that were employed by the PE teachers not in connection with the student[s] with SEN but with the class as a whole. However, some of the PE teachers in many of the lessons observed informed me about the particular presence of children with SEN. Additionally, a few of them approached me during the lesson and started chatting for some time. Usually the times when the PE teachers approached the researcher were times when the students were either playing or following their instructions regarding an exercise or a task. After these lessons, I added a summary in the field notes of what was happening during these times.

Before one of the interviews, one of the PE teachers informed me that he only had half an hour available since he had an errand to run. I discretely offered to rearrange, but he refused. As such, this interview was conducted in this timeframe.

Other PE teachers, although they had accepted and arranged the interview meetings, showed signs of stress regarding the interview and/or even fear. They were always informed about their right to interrupt or not go through with the interviews if they did not want but they all agree to be interviewed. This stress was usually regarding the interviews questions. One of them told me that he felt like he was taking an exam. I sensed this fear regarding my conversations with the PE teachers before and even after the interviews. They were usually telling me their complaints regarding the support and equipment they have and they seemed to address their anger either towards the head teachers or the government. They were, however, saying this to me confidentially, since when asked, they did not want me to include these in their interviews. Finally, one of the PE teachers during the interview seemed to disagree with the focus of my questions. He kept answering my questions, but
he was quite intimidating while always being polite in the way that he verbally expressed his disagreement/disregard.

3.3 Data management and analysis

In managing and organising the data before and during the analysis, I drew upon Creswell’s (2013) data analysis guiding steps. Creswell (2013) suggests that five steps could be followed regarding qualitative data analysis:

- “‘Organizing the Data’ (p. 182)
- ‘Reading and Memoing’ (p. 183)
- ‘Describing, Classifying, and Interpreting Data into Codes and Themes’ (p. 184)
- ‘Interpreting the Data’ (p. 187)
- ‘Representing and Visualizing the Data’” (p. 187).

For the first step, it is suggested that researchers organise their data in computer files and “to appropriate text units (e.g., a word, a sentence, an entire story) for analysis either by hand or by computer” (Creswell, 2013, p. 182). Following participants’ consent, all interviews of this study were audio-recorded and then transcribed in Word documents. The interviews were conducted in Greek and most transcriptions were also done in Greek. One interview, however, was translated and transcribed immediately in English. Another interview was translated from Greek to English after having first been transcribed in Greek. This latter way of translation, although equally accurate, proved to be more time consuming. Most of observation field notes were also written in Greek and were all then written up in Word documents. As well as transferring the exact field note information additions were made. These additions regarded the completion of words and sentences that were written in a hurry and did not make much sense to an independent reader, as well as explanations. These explanations referred to descriptions of games played in the lessons which were simply named in the field notes but, again, would not be understood by an independent reader unless briefly described and explained. One example of additions and one of explanations are provided below (see Appendix 2 & 4):

Original observation field notes: *Stretching, children on the lines*
Addition: The children are standing on the lines of the yard and they start stretching.

Original observation field notes: The teams are going to the right positions to play ‘mantilaki’.

Explanation: She watches the first pair playing ‘mantilaki’. [It is a game where the two teams are lining one opposite the other and they are given numbers, so that one number belongs to one child of every team. When each number is called the two children run from opposite sides towards the centre and try to grab a scarf or a ball and return to their line without getting caught by their opponent].

These explanations rendered richer data and allowed for a better quality of analysis. Finally, two of the observations were also translated in English. Translating two of them in English, as I did with the interviews, allowed me both to seek advice whenever needed by my supervisors, but also to not lose the richness of the raw data by translating expressions which cannot be translated very accurately in English. As described below the first level of coding was conducted in English for all interviews and observations; because of its descriptive nature this allowed both me to translate the important information in my own words and my supervisors to have an accurate understanding of the data (see Figure 4).

The second step involved me reading through the whole database in order to get a sense of it (Creswell, 2013). Braun and Clarke (2006), for example, suggest that, as a researcher, you should “immerse yourself in the data to the extent that you are familiar with the depth and breadth of the content” (p. 87). Such immersion involves ‘repeated reading’ and note taking regarding initial ideas of analysis or coding (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 87; Creswell, 2013). For the present study, I read through all the data from both interviews and observations and noted initial thoughts and broad ideas about possible categories and themes.

Creswell’s (2013) third step refers to “Describing, Classifying, and Interpreting Data into Codes and Themes” (p. 184). During this step, a researcher tries to form
[...] codes or categories … build detailed descriptions, develop themes or dimensions, and provide an interpretation in light of their own views or views of perspectives in the literature (Creswell, 2013, p. 184).

These codes identify interesting features of the data and refer to the “most basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon” (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 63).

It is also suggested that descriptive coding is “a good place to start in a qualitative study” (Creswell, 2013, p. 184). Additionally, coding might be ‘data-driven’ or ‘theory driven’.

In the former, themes will depend on the data, but in the latter, you [the researcher] might approach the data with specific questions in mind that you wish to code around (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 89).

The present study’s data analysis was both data and theory driven. Specifically, coding the interview data was entirely data driven. For example, the following quotation extracted from one of the interviews shows how different levels of data driven codes were produced - from more descriptive to more abstract (table 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>1st Level code</th>
<th>2nd Level code</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If someone from ‘above’ has good intentions why not? Why not? To bring us a special PE teacher especially for these children; why not? The issue is probably financial</td>
<td>PE teacher says that there are political and financial reasons involved in getting a specialised teacher in the school.</td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Data driven codes generation process

In coding the observations, however, I tried to identify possible teaching styles from the Spectrum of Teaching Styles for PE. As a result, some of the coding of the observations was theory driven. The example below (table 11) shows the way which, although the first level code was descriptive, focused on what I had
set as prompt for the identification of teaching styles from the Mosston Spectrum (see table 6). Based on these prompts and also on detailed descriptions of each teaching style of the Spectrum, theory driven codes such as these were produced for the observation data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>1st Level code</th>
<th>2nd Level code</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE teacher asks children to remain at the same teams and start playing 'datsball'.</td>
<td>PE teachers decides how teams are separated, what students are playing and when they are playing.</td>
<td>Teacher decisions</td>
<td>Command style</td>
<td>Teaching styles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Theory driven codes generation process

At the end of this process, themes should emerge. According to Creswell (2013), themes “are broad units of information that consist of several codes aggregated to form a common idea” (p. 186).

The data analysis of the present study involved both thematic analysis and the process of using the constant comparative method. Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest that “thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (p. 79). The constant comparative method with an ultimate goal of ‘eliciting themes’ is defined

“[…]by the simplest principle of going through the data again and again (this is the constant bit), comparing each element – phrase, sentence or paragraph – with all of the other elements (this is the comparative bit)” (Thomas, 2011, p. 171).

Having repeatedly read and noted initial ideas about categorisation of the data, I started the process of coding. A first level of coding emerged through detailed reading of the interviews and observations. This first level of coding appeared in the form of comments on the side of the Word documents (see Appendix 5). This level was both descriptive and summative of the information given in the interviews and the field notes. It was also, as mentioned earlier, written in English for both English and Greek transcriptions. Having gone through this first level, a decision was made to use Excel as the main tool to continue the analysis. For this, all the raw information and its respective comments was copied and pasted in cells side by side, creating two columns; one with the raw
data from the interviews and observations and another with the first level codes. This process, although time consuming, allowed me to delve deeper into the data. A second level of analysis followed after all the interviews and observations were copied into Excel. This second level produced second level codes, which provided condensed information based on the first level codes and were then added in another column next to the first level codes (see figure 4 and tables 10 and 11). This condensed information was also more abstract. While working at this level of coding, I went back and forth among the interviews and the observations, identified similar patterns, repeatedly changed the names of the second level codes to suitably express the patterns and coded individual extracts of raw data in multiple different second level codes as is seemed relevant. In doing that, I was careful and meticulous in order for the initial meaning of the raw data to remain authentic. The advice of Braun and Clarke (2006) for these stages of coding proved valuable and guided my coding process:

“(a) code for as many potential themes/patterns as possible (time permitting) – you never know what might be interesting later; (b) code extracts of data inclusively – i.e., keep little of the surrounding data if relevant …; and (c) remember that you can code individual extracts of data in as many different ‘themes’ as they fit into – so an extract may be uncoded, coded once, or coded many times, as relevant” (p. 89).

Some of the information in the second level codes, however, could not represent the information in the data that I found necessary in their entirety. For this reason, another column was added next to the second level codes, which included this information. This column indicated categories within the second level codes and it was thus named ‘Categories’ (see figure 4 and tables 10 and 11 earlier).
Interview | Line no | Quotations | 1st level | 2nd level | Categories | Themes
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
P1 | 121-123 | This class [the inclusive class] was made with an initiative of a mother that had a child with a severe case of autism. And she did and she run to the ministries etc and we brought here a teacher for this reason. | The inclusive class was created with a mother's initiative to introduce to the school | Parent initiative | Environment
P1 | 126-130 | because this little child that we were talking about before, many times inside a classroom he starts shouting, he doesn't want to sit anywhere, he wants to leave, he has to see his mother for a bit, he gets calm, he comes back inside. ... The teacher at some point cannot do anything. I mean, that is what I think, that they cannot do anything. | PE teacher describes the behaviour of a student with SEN in the class. | Student behaviour/characteristics | Student with SEN | Student
P1 | 128-130 | The teacher at some point cannot do anything. I mean, that is what I think, that they cannot do anything. | PE teacher believes that the teacher of the class of a student with SEN cannot do anything more for a student with SEN | Teacher feelings | Helpless teacher | Teacher
P1 | 150-153 | The difficulty is conducting the lesson for the other children but for Helen as well, for example, since we mentioned her name, I can't do the lesson the way I want it, so that the children will be happy along with the child with SEN. | Having a student with SEN in the lesson and having to motivate her is not an advantage for the PE lesson | Disadvantage of inclusion | Inclusion
P1 | 140-142 | something happens and the very good [students] react [badly]... if those are physically active etc and they are doing very well in the lesson, and what we are going to do is not going to be enough for them. To the other children the same thing will be difficult and they won't manage. I don't think that... that's why I'm saying that she needs something different. | PE teacher says that good students don't like it when the level of the lesson is not satisfactory for them | Disadvantage of inclusion | Inclusion
P1 | 150-153 | the lesson is usually prepared. There is weekly programming and annual. But we always have deviations [from the programme], depending on what might happen, weather condition or things that happen in the school, that will happen at that moment. But there is a general plan. | PE teacher says that he prepares annual and weekly plan for the lesson | Lesson planning/preparation | Lesson
P1 | 155-160 | these things are difficult unless children have worked home with their parents. | PE teacher says that for year 1 and 2 the purpose of the lesson involves learning basic and fundamental movements. | Subject matter | Lesson
P1 | 159-162 | the purpose of the lesson is different every time, of course there are general guidelines... we might want... at the younger classes we want to make the children to... what I was saying before 'catch the ball throw the ball'... with fundamental basic movements the a human does, to run, to jump, to throw, to catch... this is year one and year 2... for these things are difficult unless children have worked home with their parents. | PE teacher says that if a child has learnt to play with his parents it is more ready to do more difficult things than its classmates at the beginning | Student progress | Student experience | Student
P1 | 162-164 | PE teacher says that gradually as students grow up the purpose of the lesson becomes more specialised towards sports.
consider how different codes may combine to form an overarching theme” (p. 89).

Having used Excel, and with no need to ‘collate’ any coded data, I studied the data and added another level of code in a column which was named ‘Themes’ (see figure 4). The use of the Excel ‘Filter’ tool allowed me to compare the codes under each possible theme once more, re-place the data in suitable or additional themes, and rename the codes when necessary. A review of the emerged themes followed. At this stage, Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest that the researchers realise that

“Some of the candidate themes are not really themes (e.g. … there are not enough data to support them, or the data are too diverse), while others might collapse into each other (e.g., two apparently separate themes might form one theme)” (p. 91).

This was definitely the case for the emerged candidate themes of my study. As a result, I reviewed the themes, the codes under each theme and the raw data and, in several cases, I renamed them once more, replaced them, deleted them or united them under a different name until all codes and themes represented their particular meaning. The end of this process resulted in the emergence of eight different themes from the data as well as several second level codes.

Before presenting the findings and in order to add depth to the analysis, the second level codes of each theme were organised under several subtheme titles (see Appendix 6).

In addition to the process which concluded with theme creation and involved all the interviews and observations collectively (cross-case analysis), I also wrote individual accounts regarding each PE teacher. These accounts were produced after careful and repeated reading of the interview and observation(s) of each PE teacher separately and as a unit. The aim of this process was to present each PE teacher separately, focus on their words, their practice and their comparisons. These individual accounts, which served as profiles of each PE teacher, are presented in the findings chapter (see section 4.1) and provided an additional deeper level of analysis for each PE teacher. Additionally, a table with the basic characteristics of each PE teacher was also created and presented
earlier in this chapter (see table 5). Summing up a good “single case with embedded units analysis”, Baxter and Jack (2008) suggest:

“The ability to look at sub-units that are situated within a larger case is powerful when you consider that data can be analysed within the subunits separately (within case analysis), between the different subunits (between case analysis), or across all of the subunits (cross-case analysis). The ability to engage in such analysis only serves to better illuminate the case” (p. 550).

Having completed the thematic analysis of my data and produced PE teachers’ profiles, I then returned to Creswell’s (2013) fourth and fifth steps regarding ‘Interpreting the Data’ and ‘Representing and Visualizing the Data’ (p. 187). The fourth step involves the researcher going back to the data and codes and themes and linking the data and interpreting them through the “larger research literature developed by others” (Creswell, 2013, p. 187). Since this is an essential step in a qualitative study, in the present research, the links between and interpretations of data and literature are discussed in the Discussion chapter (Chapter 5). As far as the fifth step is concerned, it referred to data representation in “a comparison table or a matrix” (Creswell, 2013, p. 187). The data of this study are presented in the Findings chapter (Chapter 4) in two ways. Firstly, they were presented according to the themes which emerged from the interviews and the observations and secondly, they were presented according to each PE teacher. The second representation offered a more cohesive view of each participant. In addition, the data were categorised in clusters according to relevance, in order to show how they answer each research question (see Table 12, Chapter 5). This representation was also helpful in order to discuss the findings and connect them with theory and relevant literature.

3.4 Quality of the study

The aim of this study is not to generalise the findings but to illuminate the issues under study. As researcher, I tried to ensure that the voices of the participants were heard and reported and not mine. For this reason, I tried to be as unbiased as possible. From an interpretivist point of view, however, being unbiased in a qualitative study is impossible (see section 3.1.1). Being aware of
this I tried to interpret teachers’ views and actions in relation to their background (educational context), experiences (information provided by them) and relevant literature. I also tried to ensure that the collected data were not contaminated by my ideas and expectations. However, there was a level of interactions with the participants in the form of observations and interviews and these interactions cannot but reflect on the research findings. Additionally, the findings analysis was conducted in a way that took into consideration previous literature on the issues under investigation. For this reason, Robson (2002) suggests that there is an issue in applying the idea of trustworthiness in interpretive, flexible, research designs as the one in the present study. Shenton (2004) and Robson (2002), however, believe that there are ways in which qualitative researchers can address issues of trustworthiness through addressing issues of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of a study.

In addressing the credibility of a qualitative study, researchers try to ensure that “they have accurately recorded the phenomena under scrutiny” (Shenton, 2004, p. 64). This can be achieved in multiple ways. For the present study, I had a good level of familiarity with the culture of the participating organisations (primary schools in Greece). Having worked for three years in primary schools in Greece as a PE teacher, I am confident of my understanding of the ways that schools function in the area of Greece that the study was conducted. I am also confident that, although the sample of participants was not random (as is suggested for credibility reasons) but purposive, the centralised nature of the educational system in Greece allows for a deduction to be made; the structure and way of function of almost all mainstream primary schools in Greece is similar in its essence. This way a purposive sampling for reasons of convenience and for the study’s fulfilment criteria could be considered ‘random’ enough. In this sense, although I approached the schools I did for reasons of convenience I did not know beforehand which ones from a long list (74 schools) and a quite extended area (city and surrounding villages) would accept me. This is not to say that the results of this study can be generalised, but merely that they could be similar if the study was to be conducted in a different area of Greece. Another strategy used to ensure credibility was the use of different well established methods for data collection (i.e. observations and interviews). Additionally, while conducting the analysis, I regularly sought the advice of my
two supervisors. Specifically, I often asked them for their opinion regarding pieces of analysis in interviews and observations that were already analysed and pieces of interviews and observations that had not yet been processed. This was done in an effort to ensure that all the essential parts of data were analysed and coded and that the codes which emerged were clear and reflected the raw data. Eventually, the framework of data analysis proved to have internal consistency since the themes that emerged from the analysis could be applied in the majority of the interviews and/or observations (see Appendix 7). According to Robson (2002) internal consistency, although associated with a tendency to discount unusual information, should be sought since it forces the qualitative researcher to be explicit about thoughts, processes and categorisations during the analysis. This helps to show that textual evidence (in this case interview transcriptions and observation field notes) are consistent with the interpretation (Weber, 1990).

In addressing the transferability of a qualitative study, it is suggested that “since the findings of a qualitative project are specific to a small number of particular environment and individuals, it is impossible to demonstrate that the findings and conclusions are applicable to other situations and populations” (Shenton, 2004, p. 69). It is suggested that ‘practitioners’ who believe that their situations are similar to the ones described in a study “may relate the findings to their own positions” (Shenton, 2004, p. 69). Having the theoretical framework, participants, settings and methods of the present study in detail in earlier sections, it is up to future practitioners and researchers to decide whether these findings can be compared to their own conditions (Robson, 2002; Shenton, 2004). One should not mistake transferability with generalisability, however, since this is a possible limitation of the present study.

In addressing dependability, qualitative researchers address the equivalent issue of reliability in quantitate studies (Robson, 2002; Shenton, 2004). One way to achieve this is by employing ‘overlapping methods’ of investigation (Shenton, 2004, p. 73). In my study, I employed interviews which were informed by the lesson observations in order to explore and understand PE teachers’ beliefs, understanding and practice. Additionally, I have provided a detailed account of the research design, research methods and data collection
procedures so that readers can assess the research practice or imitate the present project (Robson, 2002; Shenton, 2004).

Finally, an effort was made for the present study to address the issue of confirmability. Confirmability is the equivalent of objectivity for quantitative studies (Robson, 2002; Shenton, 2004). As mentioned earlier, in this section I tried to remain unbiased so that the voices of the participants could be heard. The interaction among the researcher and the participants arguably reflects on the data. In order to address confirmability, the use of multiple methods was chosen. In addition, studying 15 participants through observations and interviews regarding the same issues provided a large database, which then provided me the opportunity to compare findings among the participants (Shenton, 2004). As a result, triangulation at two levels (methods and number of participants) occurred which provides the present study with a good level of confirmability.

3.5 Ethical considerations

Prior to the beginning of the study, I pursued and obtained official ethical clearance from the University of Exeter’s Ethics Committee (Appendix 8). Furthermore, I pursued and obtained an ethical clearance and permission from the Pedagogical Institute in Greece, which was necessary for the research to be conducted in public school settings (Appendix 9). After the approvals were granted, all the PE teachers and the head-teachers of each target sample school were contacted in order to invite their participation and to reassure them of the confidentiality of the procedures and the anonymity of both schools and PE teachers. The information gathered during the interviews and the observations was stored in a safe locked place until the start of the analysis.

I followed the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011) guidelines regarding anonymity and confidentiality. A system of codes was used instead of PE teachers’ names during the findings presentation and data analysis. Specifically, all PE teachers were coded as P followed by a number (e.g., P1, P2, P3 … P15). The letter O referred to the observations, however, in order to distinguish each one of the twenty-eight observations, the corresponding number of each PE teacher was added this letter (e.g., O1, O2 … O15). Also, because I observed two lessons with most of the 15 PE teachers, I added the
letters a and b to distinguish between each observation (e.g., O1a, O1b, O2a, O2b … O15a, O15b). Finally, I did not mention the names of any school but just referred to each of them as ‘school’.

An important ethical consideration involves the presence of students in the lesson observations. Although, children were not the focus of my study they were still mentioned in the interviews and the field notes in order to discuss and describe the results of teachers’ actions. A growing concern over children’s rights in research has focused on their involvement in decision making during research (Kirk, 2007). Children’s rights were also my concern in planning and organising this study. For this reason, when approached out of curiosity by some of them (see section 4.3.8), I answered all of their questions in as friendly a way as possible with an emphasis given to the observation of their teacher and the lesson. In addition, I used pseudonyms for any students mentioned in direct quotations from field notes or interviews. I also made sure to always phrase discussions throughout the thesis in such a way for the focus to always remain the teacher and their actions, according to the research questions, and not deviate from this course.

Once the final sample of 15 PE teachers was selected and had agreed to be part of the study, written formal consent was sought. The head-teachers were also asked to provide informed consent. Examples of one PE teacher form and one head-teacher form are provided in Appendix 10. The informed consent form provided sufficient information about the study, explaining the following items: the purpose of the study, its significance, the individuals who would have access to the transcripts, audio-recordings, field notes, confidentiality, as well as anonymity issues. The participants were also made aware that they could withdraw from the study at any time. None of them wanted to make use of this right at any stage of the study. Before the beginning of the interviews, consent for the audio recording from the PE teachers was sought and all participants agreed to be audio recorded. At the end of the interviews, participants were encouraged to contact the researcher if they had any questions or they changed their mind regarding their participation in the study. None of them sought such contact.
Although, none of the teachers made use of their explicitly explained right to withdraw from the research, there is a chance that some of them might have felt judged and/or intimidated during the interview process (see section 3.2.6.1). They might have also felt anxiety during the observations; this would explain their efforts to start chatting with me during their lessons (see section 3.2.6.1). Power relations should be considered in cases like this especially in centralised educational systems like the Greek one. In an educational system where (as in Greece) teacher assessment does not occur teachers are probably not used to being asked about their practice during lesson. The power element in the present study lies with the researcher who determines ‘the topics to be discussed, controls the interview guide, and decides when to terminate the conversation’ (Karnieli-Miller et al., 2009, p. 283). However, as Karnieli-Miller et al. (2009) suggest, the idea that the interviewer holds the sole power in an interview is only ‘partially true’, since the interviewees can either not provide the information asked for by not sharing their story or by terminating the interview. In order to overcome the issue of power in this study, I gave examples when necessary of possible interview questions to be asked prior to the beginning of the interview. This seemed to have a calming and reassuring effect on some of the teachers since they did not seem to think of these questions as ‘difficult’ or judgemental.

However, until this happened and during the observations there was an obvious effect of my presence on what happened in class (i.e. both teachers and students approached me in order to chat or to just observe me). There is also a possibility that teachers changed their practice because of my presence. These issues have been taken into consideration and are limitations of the present study. However, the use of an additional methodological tool – the interview - was in place to ensure that the effect of such behaviours in the study was minimised (Cohen et al., 2007).
4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS CHAPTER

In this chapter the findings of the study are presented. The presentation of themes that emerged and guide this presentation are presented below.

Seven themes emerged from the analysis of the 15 PE teachers' interviews: ‘Environment’; ‘Inclusion’; ‘Lesson’; ‘School provision’; ‘Student’; ‘Teacher’, and ‘Teaching styles’ (Appendix 7). All seven themes were present in 13 of the interviews, whereas two of the interviews presented six of them. More specifically, the theme ‘student’ did not emerge from the interview with the eighth PE teacher (P8) and the theme ‘Environment’ did not emerge from the interview of the 12th PE teacher (P12) (Appendix 7).

The themes that emerged from the analysis of the lesson observations of the 15 PE teachers are also presented in appendix 7. The ninth (P9) and 14th (P14) of the PE teachers were observed only once since the second observation was not possible due to unforeseen circumstances. Eight themes in total emerged from the observations, which are, in alphabetical order: ‘Environment’; ‘Inclusion’; ‘Lesson’; ‘Role of the researcher’; ‘School provision’; ‘Student’; ‘Teacher’, and ‘Teaching styles’. As Appendix 7 shows, however, not all of the eight themes were present in all of the observations.

Finally, a brief comparison among the interview and the observation themes shows that all of the themes that emerged from the interviews also emerged in the observations. The theme ‘Role of the researcher’, however, was an additional theme that only derived from the observations due to interactions that occurred between the researcher/observer with the PE teachers or/and some of the students during the lesson observations.

In the following sections the findings are presented in three parts. Firstly, each PE teacher is presented separately according to the data collected from both their interview and observations, in order to provide a holistic view of each participant. Following this, the second and third part present the findings analytically the interviews and the observations respectively. In these parts the findings are presented using the themes and sub-themes as guides. In addition, the second level codes are used as subheadings (in italics) within each
subtheme. Interview findings are presented first as information from the interviews supports understanding of the findings from the observations.

4.1 Individual PE teacher presentation

In this section, each PE teacher is presented separately according to the information that emerged from both the interviews and the observations with each of them. As mentioned earlier, the teachers had between 10 and 27 years of teaching experience, while 11 of them were men and 4 were women (see table 5, Methodology chapter).

PE teacher 1 (P1)

P1’s way of teaching was relaxed but also organised. He was definitely the leader of the lessons and he was often instructing students on what to do and how to do it. He had no memory or knowledge of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. He mostly used the Command style and also a variation of the Practice style on various occasions when he let his students take partial initiative, either by allowing them to choose or organise a game.

Three students with SEN attended the two observed lessons (two in the first and one in the second). Although I had identified one of the two students with SEN during the first observation, the second student was only identified because the teacher took the initiative to inform me. The third student with SEN was picked up by his mother very early in the lesson and for this reason he did not participate at all. During his interview, P1 admitted that he had not managed to include this student in his lesson. He also mentioned that the teacher of the inclusive class brought students with SEN into the PE lesson when she wanted them to attend it, otherwise they did not attend PE. Also, the teacher stated that it was usually the student’s mood that affected students’ with SEN participating in the lesson: *It is because of his mood that sometimes he doesn’t want to do [PE], I don’t know…* (P1). He also believed that inclusion meant for all students to play together, co-exist and accept each other. He also stated that in order to include students with SEN, he might risk undermining some students in order to give more opportunities for students with SEN to succeed. During his lessons, P1 prompted and encouraged; however, he also asked his students to perform a series of tests which proved difficult for one of his students with SEN.
PE teacher 2 (P2)

P2 was one of the female PE teachers. Her style of teaching was calm and relaxed and during the observed lessons she managed to maintain a friendly and communicative environment, not only among the students but also between herself and her students. She was friendly and playful and chatted with the students throughout the lesson. From the data analysis it became obvious that she mostly used the Command style, which made her the ‘leader’ of the lesson. Occasionally and for brief periods, she also, used the Practice style, which allowed students to take the initiative and decide what was going to happen next. Furthermore, despite the fact that the students with SEN in her lessons seemed well adjusted, a large number of the games played in both lessons were competitive. She did seem, however, to have managed to create a very friendly and accepting environment among the students, with a special focus on acceptance of difference.

She believed that inclusion meant a more personalised approach to each student’s needs and emphasised that differentiation of the lesson was a necessity given the right conditions. Although she had very little training in teaching students with special educational needs, she stated that she made a constant effort to learn more about it by observing the students, asking other educators, and by studying relevant material. She too believed that additional practical training would make a huge difference to inclusion in PE lessons. Her main concern for the lessons was for the students to walk out of it firstly safe, and secondly, happy. Given this priority, she stated that she did not care whether a class fell behind on a particular subject matter if it was because a single student needed help. She seemed to try to create a friendly and thus inclusive environment during the lesson, despite her belief that Greek society was indifferent and even hostile towards the inclusion of people with SEN. As far as her lessons were concerned, she did not prepare them in detail beforehand, since her experience meant she knew what needed to be taught to the students throughout the academic year. She stated that she kept notes when necessary after the end of the lesson, however.
Generally, the interview and the observations were quite consistent and there were no significant discrepancies between expressed opinions (interview) and actions (lessons).

PE teacher 3 (P3)

P3 often chatted with her students, maintaining a positive atmosphere during the lesson (O3a). In her effort to give meaning to the term ‘inclusion’ she took into consideration the meaning of the equivalent Greek word itself, which according to her explanation, implied the existence of a problem within the individual who is meant to be included (P3). In her interview, however, she also said that she was trying not to treat the student with SEN differently by comparing to the rest of the students, but she did give him more opportunities instead of telling him off on the first mistake (P3). She was therefore observed to make efforts to ensure all students could participate equally in the games (O3a). As far as the student with SEN in this class was concerned, she would praise him, intervene so that his participation would be easier, and she would show more patience towards him, even when he was not complying with her instructions in the same way as the rest of students (O3a, O3b).

When asked about the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles during the interview, P3 admitted no memory of them. She also recognised the use of instructions as a main part of her teaching. During the observations, she was the leader of the lesson, either by giving continuous commands and instructions or by suggesting types of play to the students where her presence would be necessary for its conduct. The Command style was the most prevalent teaching style used throughout the observed lessons.

PE teacher 4 (P4)

P4 stated in her interview that she considers that she includes students with SEN in her lesson in her way. She also believed that inclusion was about making efforts to help students with SEN to adjust smoothly and eventually integrate in the community.

During the first observation, P4 was occupied with a student with SEN for quite a lot of her time. The student did not participate in the lesson and she tried numerous times to persuade him to participate, which was mostly unsuccessful.
During the second observation, P4 was more relaxed, since she allowed a lot of time for team games. Boys’ and girls’ teams were organised and played their own games, with the teacher mostly observing and intervening, primarily to place a student with SEN in the goalkeeper position in the boys’ football game.

Although most of the time she seemed to use the Command style, P4 did not give a clear answer as to whether she remembered or knew any of the teaching styles. She also suggested that she usually preferred to teach her students without stating to them what exactly it is that she was teaching them. Finally, the Practice style seemed to be used in one of her lessons, since she let her students organise and play their own games while she assumed an observational role.

It is important to note here that although she suggested that inclusion is about the help given to students with SEN in order to adjust, the only help that was observed was her intervention in order to change the position of one of the students with SEN in the game.

**PE teacher 5 (P5)**

P5’s lessons stood out because of the use of a little drum (tambourine) that he used on various occasions, mostly in order to set the pace for the performance of exercises (such as psychomotor exercises). Additionally, the variety of exercises was quite unusual, especially compared to the exercises and games in the other observed lessons. After the initial warm up in one of the lessons, for example the exercises varied from dribbling exercises to the creation of a ‘human chain’ with the students forming links after having walked in a particular way next to the previous link. Students in both classes seemed happy to participate in the lesson and the teacher specifically prompted a student with SEN during an exercise. During O5a, a girl with Down syndrome participated like all the other students.

For P5, inclusion was the adjustment of students with SEN to their environment and of their environment (i.e. their peers) to them. Although he stated that he supported inclusion, he believed that it should benefit both students with and without SEN; at the time the conditions in the school were not beneficial for students without SEN. It is worth mentioning here that P5 was the only
participant who had attended specific training regarding SEN while undertaking his specialty year at university (Adapted Physical Education).

The teacher also vaguely remembered being taught the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. He believed that he was using them without realising it; in fact, the observation notes revealed that he mostly used the Command style, since the teacher was on top of every decision and controlled the students in both lessons at all times.

**PE teacher 6 (P6)**

In both observed lessons P6 spent a lot of the time just observing the students and sometimes he resolved disputes among students in the games. Although he was relaxed, he did not communicate much with his students. He allowed them to choose and play some of the games they liked, usually after playing some competitive and high energy games according to his instructions.

For P6, inclusion was the acceptance of students with SEN by their peers, but also their inclusion and integration with other children during lessons, break times, and game playing. He also stated that people and children with SEN are better off living in urban environments, since people in those environments know more about people with SEN than those in semi urban environments.

As far as the teaching styles were concerned, P6 only named the child-centred and teacher-centred methods of teaching. During his lessons, he mostly used the Command style and also on some occasions the Practice style, especially when he let his students organise and play their games without intervening.

**PE teacher 7 (P7)**

P7 was a very organised and energetic teacher. She seemed to communicate well with her students and they seemed to comply with instructions and enjoy the lessons. Her lessons included a variety of creative exercises, rehearsals, and well-organised play time. P7 provided feedback to all students and gave many instructions. A student with SEN was participating in both lessons and gave extra prompts for motivation. Although the aforementioned student with SEN was participating almost at all times in the observed lessons, however, P7 mentioned in the interview that there was another student with
SEN that she had not managed to include in her lessons, since this student could not be helped with the existing infrastructure of her school.

P7 understood inclusion as the socialisation of students with SEN in the class and their participation in the lessons they have for each school hour. Indeed, the student with SEN in her lessons seemed well adjusted and participated almost all the time.

Finally, P7 vaguely remembered being taught the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. The analysis of the observations revealed that she was using the Command style in both lessons.

**PE teacher 8 (P8)**

P8 was a PE teacher with 27 years of teaching experience. He believed that inclusion was a class that tried to integrate students with SEN in the mainstream school context. This confusion concerning the word ‘inclusion’ and its meaning in the Greek educational context was confirmed by yet another statement, where P8 argued that inclusion worked in their school because the inclusive class teacher was working very hard under difficult conditions.

Regarding the placement of students with SEN, P8 believed that a school with an inclusive class could only help students with:

> [...] learning difficulties either in maths or writing or reading. Now, students with serious problems cannot be covered by the inclusion class that we have at school.

P8 was a strict PE teacher who wanted his students to listen to him at all times. His lessons included warm up, stretching and strengthening exercises, practicing dribbling for basketball, relay races, and some free time where students could choose whether to play basketball, football or volleyball. All the exercises and games were performed under the supervision of the teacher.

During O8a, P8 informed me that one of the girls was a student with SEN. I would not have realised it if I had not been informed, since she participated in the lesson almost like every other student. In the same lesson, one boy spent almost all the time of the lesson just staring outside the school fence (O8a).
P8 did not seem to know or remember the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. He complained about lack of training and knowledge regarding teaching students with SEN. The analysis of the observation notes revealed that P8 mostly used the Command style and the Practice style when he gave students the initiative to organise their own game.

**PE teacher 9 (P9)**

P9 believed that inclusion was for someone to be able to function in a team like everybody else; “to be able to do the things that the other children do”. He also stated that one of the disadvantages of inclusion was the fact that to be able to spend more time with a student with SEN, a teacher had to neglect the rest of the students.

There was only one lesson observed with this teacher, as the second observation was cancelled. In this lesson, P9 was very organised. He explained and prepared the exercises for the students and every student knew what they were doing at all times. Throughout the lesson, P9 kept prompting and praising his student with SEN who was happily participating in the game most of the time.

P9 remembered being taught the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles during university training. He also mentioned that he used the Command style as his guide. In fact, the observation notes revealed that he mostly used the Command style, apart from some occasions when he asked his students to demonstrate exercises and set the pace, which were categorised under the Practice style.

**PE teacher 10 (P10)**

P10 also seemed to an organised and energetic teacher. He believed that inclusion related to “children that have a problem and [that] this class [inclusive class] helps them to overcome it and integrate with the other children”. He also believed that Greek schools were not ready to include students with SEN.

In his lessons, he was careful to give feedback, advice and clarification to all students. He made use of a lot of the existing sports equipment in the school and he also demonstrated exercises whenever necessary so that students
would follow his example. Students participated in the lesson did not complain and were always kept occupied.

In terms of P10’s knowledge of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles, he did not mention any of them by name, but he described techniques that are used in some of them. He also stated that he remembered the teaching styles because he had studied them while preparing for the ASEP national exams PE teachers, through which he was then hired in public schools. Finally, although P10 mentioned that he was not using the teaching styles because the lesson conditions were not right, the analysis of the observations revealed that he used the Command style throughout his teaching.

**PE teacher 11 (P11)**

P11 believed that inclusion was the effort of an organised society to include students with SEN as equal members through schooling. He considered the efforts made at training through seminars provided for the teachers to be superficial and stated that he was tired of teaching in primary education.

He was a relaxed teacher who chatted with his students and joked with them. After the initial warm up, the lessons consisted mostly of play time, in which students participated enthusiastically. He cooperated with his fellow PE teacher in both lessons; in the first lesson, he had to share a small room with another class that was doing PE due to the rainy weather and in the second lesson he chose to cooperate with the other PE teacher so that the students in the two classes could play one of their favourite games together. On both occasions, the cooperation of both students and teachers was smooth and the teachers managed to maintain a pleasant atmosphere throughout the lesson.

P11 did not remember the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles, although the analysis of the observations revealed that he used the Command style.

**PE teacher 12 (P12)**

This teacher’s opinion regarding inclusion was interesting, since he initially separated PE lessons from the ‘inclusion’ (the inclusive class) of the school. Like other interviewees, he associated inclusion with the inclusive class. He continued by stating that inclusion for him was to actually have a student with
SEN in the class, however. He explained that if he, as a teacher, could not exclude a student with SEN by placing him outside of the class, then this student would be included whether or not he/she could manage to do what the other students were doing.

P12 made a conscious effort not to let his student with SEN wander away and get distracted by calling him and prompting him frequently. He included a variety of competitive games in his lessons and he gave a lot of instructions and clarification. He was a strict teacher and he punished unacceptable behaviour by temporarily excluding students from the lesson.

He believed that it would be a mistake to decide which teaching method to follow before the lesson, because as he put it, this would limit his flexibility during the lesson. He also mentioned that he was using different teaching methods according to the classes he was teaching (i.e. different age groups). The observation notes revealed that during the two observed lessons he used the Command style and that he always was in control of his students.

**PE teacher 13 (P13)**

P13 seemed to be relaxed and comfortable during the two observed lessons, both with conducting the lesson and with his students. In each one of the observed lessons there was one student with SEN. In both lessons, P13 tried to motivate his students with SEN without pressuring them. He was allowing them to not participate in some lesson activities when it seemed that they did not want to and especially when one of them did not participate in a high energy game because of fear, as he put it. As a result, he did not seem to differentiate enough so that all children would have equal opportunities, although during his interview he said that inclusion was “for the school to try and give students all the skills that will help them go out in society; to include them in social community, to include them later in life” (P13).

The lessons in general had a flow that is quite common in Greek PE lessons; warm up, stretching, main part, end. The whole atmosphere of the lesson was positive. The teacher was friendly and tried to keep a rhythm to the lessons. He was making jokes and was interacting with the children in a humorous way. Children seemed to trust him and accept his authority; he was trying to ensure
that all of the children participated, apart from when he did not try to include one of the students with SEN in the last game (O13a). He was making all the necessary clarifications for all children to understand him and all of the children seemed to feel welcome and included.

He mostly used the Command style during his lessons, however, in the first observed lesson there were occasions that he also used the Practice style, since he let students organise their own game.

**PE teacher 14 (P14)**

P14 believed that inclusion was the process of helping students with SEN to overcome their “problem” and “become one” with the rest of the students while helping them to be happy.

There was only one observation opportunity with this teacher because of unforeseen circumstances. This lesson started with a warm up, which involved jogging, a lot of running exercises, and stretching. During the main part of the lesson, students played football while the teacher observed them. Most students participated in all of the exercises, however, it was observed that some students were taking opportunities to not participate in all of the activities. Also, while observing the students playing football, P14 approached me and started talking to me but said he did not want what he was saying at the time to be noted.

P14 stated that he did not remember the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. The observation notes analysis revealed that he used the Command style throughout his lessons.

**PE teacher 15 (P15)**

P15 believed that inclusion was about students who are in need of special treatment and well-informed teachers who can help them.

P15 was organised and students performed a variety of exercises in pairs or in small groups throughout his lessons. He gave instructions, detailed explanations, and feedback to all students. On some occasions, some of the students complained about their peers with SEN and some of the students with SEN seem to be having difficulties in performing some exercises or finding a
pair. P15 intervened so the student with SEN would have a pair while running and performing some of the exercises. In one of the lessons he also asked his students to not put pressure on their peer with SEN and to pass him the ball, although some of them were clearly expressing that he could participate equally in their game.

P15 was in control of his students in both lessons and the observation notes revealed that he used the Command style. During the interview, he said that he had heard of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles but he did not provide any more information about it.

4.2 Interview findings

This part presents the data as it emerged from the seven interview themes. The order of the themes has been chosen according to the importance of the information and its relevance to the research questions.

4.2.1 Inclusion

This section presents the subthemes that emerged from the interviews in relation to the tem inclusion and issues around it. The subthemes and second level codes from which they emerged are presented analytically in Appendix 6.

➢ Understanding of Inclusion

Understanding of inclusion

Within the subtheme ‘Understanding of inclusion’, teachers’ responses mostly referred to the ideas of acceptance and integration of students with SEN, the adjustment of practice, and to the inclusive class.

For P1, inclusion was about children playing together, coexisting and accepting each other. Similarly, P5 described inclusion as the way that students with SEN can adjust to their environment and how the students without SEN can adjust to them “meaning how they can adjust, co-operate and co-exist” (P5). P7 referred to the socialisation of students with SEN in their class and their participation in the lesson. For P4 inclusion was about finding a way “…that the children that have a special… a difference let’s say, to adjust slowly, slowly and integrate into the ensemble” (P4). This was echoed by P6, who indicated that inclusion is the
acceptance of students with SEN by their peers during lesson and break time and their participation in more complicated games over time. For P9:

\[\text{[...]} \text{inclusion is \ldots a process [of participating] widely in the social community \ldots To be able to do the same things as the other children or adults.}\]

A similar idea was expressed by P11:

\[\text{[...]} \text{inclusion is the effort of an organised society to include, through school, students with SEN in the social environment in order to be accepted as equal members.}\]

P13 described inclusion as “the effort of making a person a member of the community”.

Others referred to the use of various, possibly special and personalised ways to include a child in the school in order to describe inclusion.

Two of the teachers understood inclusion exclusively as the role of the inclusive class of the school with one of them describing it very clearly: “it is about a class that helps some students to overcome their problems and integrate with the rest of the students” (P10). Similarly, P12 distinguished ‘inclusion’ from the PE lesson, since he associated it with the lessons children attended in the inclusive class.

Finally, one of the teachers suggested that inclusion “means for someone to be able to function like the rest of a team” (P9).

**Formation of understanding of inclusion**

When asked how her opinion concerning inclusion had been formed, P3 and P6 suggested that it came from watching students with SEN and their needs as they expressed them during the lesson. For P13, there was another reason influencing her understanding:

\[\text{[Such ideas have] been formed by the society who surely still looks down on these children \ldots And it is the state that eventually offers half solutions; a bit of this, a bit of that \ldots there is not something complete (P13).}\]
Problem from within the child

Some teachers gave an insight into their understanding of inclusion by referring to Special Educational needs as a set of problems which come from within the child. The mood of the students with SEN was identified as a common factor that teachers could not control during the lesson. As P14 puts it:

there are times that [students with SEN] withdraw… but you can’t understand their psychological state; you do something at the moment, I let them [the students with SEN], I am watching them discretely. Do they have extreme emotional reactions because they understand that they become a burden? I can’t [understand them]; it is their own internal matter; I can’t read them.

Sometimes students did not cooperate with their teachers. As P15 suggested, no matter how much effort he put in giving “special attention’ to his student with SEN, after some time he could not do anything more; the student should be able to do the rest or “help himself” as he suggested.

➢ Implementation of inclusion

Teachers’ experiences regarding the implementation of inclusion in their school and in Greece in general were also addressed in the interviews. Their ideas concerning suitable improvements in the inclusion process, their understanding of the function of the inclusive class and their opinions on a suitable placement of students with SEN are presented below.

Inclusion implementation

For P1, the inclusion of a student with SEN in the PE lesson was not entirely his decision, since the teacher of the inclusive class in the school could decide whether the student would participate in the PE lesson or not. On the other hand, P13 believed that it was up to each individual teacher to implement inclusion. P7 doubted whether inclusion was implemented properly:

normally inclusion … should help children who have some learning or behavioural problems to be included along with the rest [of the children] and into society … now if this is done or not it is another matter (P7).
P11 stated that the way in which the school programme was structured, with students with SEN attending literacy lessons separately and then returning to the class to attend the rest of the lessons “is not inclusion”. He added: “to function like that, with love or [by saying] come on let’s take this child on, I don’t see it as inclusion … we don’t do charity” (P11).

As far as inclusion in Greece is concerned, some teachers had almost identical ideas about the organisational and training issues:

I believe it doesn’t fulfil its purpose ... yet there is some effort. It’s like everything in Greece, the impression that something exists just to exist...this is not acceptable. I don’t think it fulfils its purpose as much. There should be better infrastructure, better teacher training and constant support (P10).

I believe that in our country we are at an infant stage; we are not match to other countries’ [inclusion] models and we cannot stand beside them. We need to do lots of work and we don’t have neither the organisation nor the programme… we don’t have suitable infrastructure and devotion to organise something like that (P15).

**Desired route to inclusion**

A few teachers expressed their understanding of an ideal and desired route to inclusion. P3 said that in order for a student with SEN to be included successfully, the student needs to be ready for it. Consequently, a gradual inclusion in the class would be ideal in order for inclusion to work, starting from one hour per day. That would translate into the student with SEN attending lessons in the ‘inclusi

ve class’ the rest of the school day. P11 believed that because some students with SEN cannot attend the PE lesson at all, they should initially be taught separately from the rest of the class. After a period of 3-4 months, he would then include the students in the lesson, but with parallel support (P11). He later explained:

[I would like for] the inclusive class to function for certain amount of time for the little children that come to school for the first time, in a seven-hour base... And after that we would go from this transitional stage to what we want with the inclusive class, meaning the child to attend literacy lessons
with its teacher [special education teacher] and then back again to the class as the programme is implemented now. But I would like for this transitional stage to exist (P11).

P13 felt that students with SEN should initially attend special schools and learn some skills as later it would be easier to include them in the mainstream school. He added:

\[I \text{ think that initially these children should attend special schools in order for their families to accept it as well. Because we have examples [of parents] that want to take them [their children] to normal [mainstream school] from the nursery, from year one. (P13).}\]

Finally, P14 would ideally teach students with SEN in small groups of maybe three students, or even one-to-one.

**Inclusive class**

Four of the teachers expressed opinions on the function and consequences of the existence of an inclusive class in their school. Three of them were disappointed with the way it functioned with one of them distinctively saying: “\[I think that the inclusive class at the moment functions at the expense of the school\]” (P5). P3 suggested that herself and her colleagues were initially caught by surprise when they realised that an inclusive class accommodated students with SEN only for a couple of hours per day while the rest of the day they attended their mainstream classes. For P5, this was the main reason the inclusive class, and consequently inclusion, was not working properly in his school. P3 said that an inclusive class was created so that:

\[\text{[…]it will help these children not to stand out as much, not to appear different [from the rest of the children] and most of all it is an opportunity for them to feel that they can be with the other children; meaning we don’t isolate them. (P3).}\]

P3 also suggested that ‘inclusion’ was not working, since students with SEN did not show signs of improvement, was used to offer relief to the parents and was used by some teachers who wanted to teach in classes with very few students.
**Placement of students with SEN**

Teachers’ opinions concerning the placement of students with SEN varied from favouring special schools to mainstream schools under certain conditions. P1 was quite precise when he said that students with SEN “can be here [mainstream school] but they need something additional”. P3 was more elaborate:

*there are mild cases who would definitely could be accommodated here. There are cases though that cannot be accommodated, because there is no space, there are time issues, the teacher in the special school who might have done a super master’s degree…and have new methods to help; you can’t find these things here.*

Some teachers put first the needs of the students when talking about SEN students’ placement. P8 specifically said:

*[…] these little children…they don’t gain something [in a mainstream school]. They need special teachers, special facilities, special… here we find it difficult, us and them.*

Finally, P9 believed that students with SEN should exclusively attend the inclusive class lessons and only have their break times together with the rest of the students.

➢ **Advantages and disadvantages of inclusion**

This subtheme presents the second level codes: ‘Barriers to inclusion’; ‘Advantages of inclusion’; ‘Disadvantages of inclusion’ (Appendix 6). These codes were clustered under this subtheme since they provide an insight on what teachers thought regarding the results of inclusion in their lessons.

**Barriers to inclusion**

Various difficulties were categorised under the code ‘barriers to inclusion’. A frequent occurrence among teachers’ interviews was that the presence of students with SEN in their lesson did not allow them to give their undivided attention to the rest of the class. The large number of students in the classes added an additional concern:
any teacher, even the most specialised one cannot have double roles. Meaning they cannot teach math, literacy, history and at the same time have a child [with SEN] and be able to help this child. Because how can they have time for the other 20 children in the class? (P3).

P4 also expressed these difficulties:

[...] if you have them [the student with SEN] all the time, if you occupy yourself with them, you don’t pay attention to the rest [of the students] and you neglect them a bit.

P8 further suggested that it would be easier for a specialised teacher to teach 2-3 children with SEN than include one student with SEN in a class of 20-25 students.

Other issues mentioned by teachers included difficulties in communication and students with SEN refusing to participate in the activities. For P1, changes in the mood of his student with SEN would cause the student to leave the lesson, no matter what he did. P5 faced a difficulty which he described as follows:

A child might have motor deficiency and sometimes he might not want to participate, he might find something very difficult. You adjust the activities, but when you go into a game and there is competition and intensity then the child understands that he is disadvantaged and sometimes he might give up (P5).

On the other hand, P6 and P14 had communication issues of a more literal nature, since they had difficulties in communicating with their deaf students because they did not know Greek sign language.

Another difficulty identified by P7 was parents’ denial of their child’s SEN. As a result, the school was not always informed by the parents and the school staff thus could not provide specialised help to the student. P7 tried consequently to gain information from the parents concerning their child’s SEN, but could not persist when the parents denied the existence of any problems. P12 complained about a similar difficulty:

We Greeks unfortunately hide from the society. I know cases that go to doctors and they don’t say that their child is epileptic so that it won’t show
to the PE teacher that the child is epileptic… But we have to know…It would be good to know everything about the little children and the parents should help the teachers know that this child has a problem…

P9 focused on the headteacher and the teachers themselves as being obstacles to inclusion:

[…] When the first aim is the image of the school and [the last one] how you are going to improve the last pupil in the class, then I think that you’ve missed the forest, meaning your goal as an educator. Yes, from the school leaders to the teachers the attitude is often not the right one.

For P15, however, the administration of the school was not an issue. For him the difficulty in implementing inclusion was an issue of consistency and continuity:

I don’t have a permanent position in one school, this is a bad thing because [I don’t know] what the previous colleague has done at that school, I don’t know how the schools works, and everybody works differently.

Advantages of inclusion

When asked directly about what could be an advantage and/or disadvantage of having a student/students with SEN in their lesson, teachers gave several examples of both, although a lot more disadvantages than advantages were mentioned.

One almost unanimous advantage mentioned by many teachers was that students learn about acceptance, cooperation, patience, and solidarity because of having to co-exist with students with SEN. As P3 specifically mentioned:

The non-SEN children learn how to accept different people, because life is not easy for everyone. A message passes that they could have a brother in the same position or their own child in the future, and to coexist with such a child is a life lesson. Meaning they learn to love, to accept, to cooperate and see, let’s say, another dimension…
Being practical, P13 mentioned that the advantage for him was that “you revise, you repeat some things again and again” which is good for learning.

**Disadvantages of inclusion**

The most common disadvantage seemed to be that the presence of students with SEN tended to delay and disorganise the lesson, and reduce other students’ learning and game/play opportunities, causing them annoyance and dissatisfaction. P2 specified: “when I have a child or two in the class that they can’t reach one level higher, we necessarily stay all a bit behind, all of us”.

Talking about lesson delays, another teacher said:

> When the rest of the students for example - because I announce them roughly what we are going to do – expect something and they don’t do it, there is a bad reaction and this is a disadvantage, there is nervousness on behalf of the students because I don’t complete the plan as I had told them, or there might be less time left for the 10 minute game we play at the end, we might only have 5 minutes left… (P5).

P8 summarised all the disadvantages he could think of in one sentence:

> the disadvantage is that the students are distracted, you can’t put them in order, you can’t teach the subject matter you want, you have to be there all the time, you get distracted, you tell them off [the student with SEN], you put them back in order, the flow of the lesson is missing.

Other disadvantages included the energy and time spent to ‘activate’, attend to, encourage, and give feedback or find lost students with SEN, which caused the lesson for the rest of the students to be delayed or remain incomplete. Also, the constant repetition of the exercises was something that P6 and P12 had to do in order for their students with SEN to understand their instructions:

> [...] because they don’t understand immediately; I might say something two and three times, not [something] complicated but something simple, for example come here and bring me the ball. (P6).

For P6 another disadvantage was that during game students with SEN:
[...] come close to the other students, take the ball...Many times they take the ball and they don’t know what to do with it, and they ruin the game and they think that this way they participate in the game.

Finally, for P9 “the rules, the discipline and calmness in the class cannot be achieved” because of the student with SEN and the ‘assisting’ roles given to them in order to include them in the lesson.

➢ PE lesson

The ‘nature of the PE lesson’ was a second level code that emerged after various teachers mentioned special characteristics that could only apply to this particular lesson (Appendix 6).

P2 and P4, for example, did not find it worrying that they might not manage to teach all the subject matter included in the curriculum, just because of the nature of the lesson.

For P8 and P10, PE was an ideal and easy lesson for students with SEN to attend:

Students are included easier [in PE] than in the rest of the lessons because … it’s easier through game, they like it, you don’t have to motivate them. (P10).

This opinion was supported by P11, who believed that PE is a lesson that students want to attend in order to unwind. As a result, he suggested that the two single hours of PE per week for each class should amalgamate into one big lesson (P11). P9 suggested an increase of the PE lesson hours per week for all the classes and an upgrade of the role of PE with better structure to the lessons, which would take under consideration the existing equipment or provide suitable equipment.

➢ Inclusive approach

This subtheme includes a cluster of second level codes that are presented together, because in their entirety and according to inclusive practice indicators (see Table 7, Section 3.2.3), they show whether a lesson was approached in an ‘inclusion-friendly way’ by the teachers (Appendix 6).
Inclusive approaches

Teachers often talked to their students about their peers with SEN in an effort “to make them all feel that we are the same in the lesson” (P2). P3 treated her student with SEN like the rest of his students:

*I make sure to tell the rest [of the students] that, ok, Jim is a child with a bit of a difference, so you will treat him without showing him that he has a problem [and that] he is like all the other children.*

P7 initiated discussion with his students when he heard them making bad comments concerning some of their peers with SEN in an effort to raise awareness among them. P5 reported that he encouraged parents to approach and greet students with SEN and their parents in order to help them realise that difference is not necessarily ‘bad’.

Some teachers used personalised teaching when spending time with the students with SEN exclusively during the PE lesson or when giving them personal instructions for an exercise. P5 used exercises where students could practice in small groups:

*I use some techniques, I create helping teams … I say to two girls today you will be with this child [with SEN] as helpers; so when he won’t manage to catch the ball with his hands, or is late to catch it, you will catch it and give to him or pass it to him in a way different than when you pass it to the rest of your peers… with less power, closer. I create these teams and I think that I include them.*

P7 also used paired exercises while giving clear instructions in order for the students with SEN to understand the exercise by imitating their pair. P14 took special care of his deaf students in the lesson, for example:

*[…] we place the students in such a position in the PE lesson so that we can communicate, because we might not be able to communicate verbally but we can pass on the concept; so they can see, they can have visual contact with what is happening.*

Another teacher tried “to treat [the student with SEN] like the rest. I don’t show that he is the one with the problem or … I don’t reprimand him with the first
mistake” (P3). Finally, P7 and P15 tried to include students with SEN in the games students played during the lesson whether students liked it or not and by giving them specific instructions:

I adjust the game. I will tell you a simple example. No matter what group game we play, [the ball] will go to John. You will give him the ball and no one will steal his ball. It will pass from his hands...we adjust our game; we adjust it so that he [John] will be included in the lesson the best way we can (P15).

Teacher/student relationships

Having good relationships with their students was of special importance for some of the teachers. For P4 her good relationships with her students, during the lesson and also during the breaks, was what helped her successfully include them in her lesson. P6 referred to a particular student with SEN:

This girl was in Year 3 and she was fond of me, and I was the only one who could get her out of the rain, or take her by the hand so she won’t get lost; she was always coming next to me.

Another teacher thought that showing students love and acceptance would help them resolve issues faster (P14).

Student participation

Student participation, especially in terms of students with SEN, was mentioned in a few interviews. Tiredness was perceived as an issue affecting the participation of students with SEN:

We are very close I and the children and we don’t feel that Maria [the student with SEN] is a child with SEN. If you saw Maria was participating normally, she might get more easily tired that the rest or she might want sometimes to be alone but generally she participates in everything (P7).

For P1, students with mild learning difficulties or “some neurological problems [that] they somehow manage to do [PE] together [with the rest of the class]”. P13 admitted that his student with SEN was sometimes afraid of some games that the students played:
[...] you saw that when we played a difficult game, datchball, she [the student with SEN] is afraid of the ball/ when the ball comes. For example, when the [other] students throw it with power, she is afraid. So she doesn’t participate. She may play for a minute but then she leaves. In other games that are more [calm] she participates.

He also explained that his students with SEN are afraid of games that require speed and strength (P13). Additionally, P15 felt that mood changes within students with SEN sometimes make them fight with their peers and withdraw from the lesson.

**Peer acceptance**

The code ‘peer acceptance’ refers to findings around the level of acceptance of students with SEN by their peers.

Most of the teachers mentioned good levels of acceptance by their students. Some of the teachers attributed this to familiarity:

> Many children that grow up year by year with children like that [with SEN] in their classes, they don’t have a problem, they accept them and they even help them (P1).

P8 stated that he and his colleagues were impressed by their students:

> They have embraced them, they don’t see them as different, they help them, they love them. We have discussed this all the colleagues, we have been impressed, because we expect that they would be affected, they would cause…they would make fun of, you understand; but they have embraced them like siblings, like they are normal children and this is what impresses us.

P10 believed that older students (who are thus more mature) could more easily care for and accommodate their peers with SEN. Younger students could also be accepting and accommodating, as long as the students with SEN did not ruin their games (P10). This kind of ‘conditional acceptance’ was also mentioned by other teachers. Wanting to play an uninterrupted game was the main reason P3’s students sometimes got angry with their peer with SEN. P15 admitted that one of his students with SEN was not well accepted by his peers:
No, unfortunately Peter… sometimes special cases are not accepted by the other children; sometimes children are cruel with some cases of students that need special attention.

**Praise**

P2 found that praising her student with SEN along with his peers was a way to make him happy:

"Yes, I am doing this many times, or we will congratulate him, or we will say high five, either me or the children. They will do it easily [without my encouragement]."

**Positive environment**

P2 also talked about how she created a light and happy environment during the lesson:

"We are 20 children in the class with the door open, we talk, we make fun for some things, we talk about the lesson without me ever [raising my voice] … I don’t think that much noise does them good; children don’t want noise. They need calmness; that’s when they have a better time."

P7 also referred to the significance of a positive environment in the lesson by mentioning that she was being sensitive no matter whether there was a student with SEN in the lesson or not in an effort to make all students to feel safe.

**Trust**

Trust also added to a positive lesson environment, according to P13. In his opinion, trust was very important for his young students: “to make students trust you [is very important]. In other words, to inspire them that you will do this [conduct a lesson they like]” (P13).

**Teacher acceptance**

Teacher acceptance was mentioned by some of the teachers when talking more generally about their colleagues in their school. For P1 and P11, their colleagues were positive in including students with SEN in their school, whereas P7 was not so sure: “sometimes some teachers don’t accept easily these
children or they are resentful”. P5 was pro-inclusion of students with SEN, but as long it did not interfere with the pace of learning of his class. For P12, inclusion entailed just a ‘bit more effort’:

there are children who are dyslexic, but in PE they are like the rest of the children. There are children that are dyslexic or I don’t know, they are from the inclusive class, and they need a little bit more effort; … [just] a little help.

➢ Inclusion in action

This cluster of second level codes was grouped together because teachers talked about several cases of students with SEN that had been either successfully or unsuccessfully included at the time of the interviews or in the past, either in their lessons or more generally within their schools. The severity of the SEN of their students was frequently mentioned and connected to whether or not teachers thought they could include students with SEN.

Successful inclusion

Reflecting on a successful inclusion case, P3 said that she was happy having a particular student with SEN in her lesson since she could predict all his reactions and as a result she was not getting stressed. P6 believed that he had managed to include his students with SEN in the lesson since they participated in the games and were accepted by their peers: “they have become acceptable from [sic] the children. That for me is the most important [thing], to become accepted by your peers”. P9 believed that for the students, acceptance level and effort were attributes of successful inclusion and he cited how students in his class helped the students with SEN. P7 attributed successful inclusion partly to the students’ good behaviour, but also partly to the class teacher and herself [the PE teacher]:

I don’t know if the children are behaving good or Anna [the student with SEN] co-operates or the class teacher that tries, possibly all of these, but the students and I have connected very well and we don’t feel that Anna is a child with special needs.
P8 mentioned that the reason that inclusion worked in his school was because the ‘inclusive class’ teacher was working very hard under difficult conditions. For P14, inclusion was a successful process in his school and as he suggested:

In my school I see that [inclusion] works. In other schools I don’t know; I hear negative things and severe cases where the teachers are in panic, not knowing how to deal with the situation. I haven’t been in such a position. These cases [of students with SEN] in my school have been dealt ideally.

**Natural inclusion**

Two of teachers talked about inclusion cases that fell under the second level code ‘natural inclusion’. One of them mentioned that there were no special adjustments in her lesson for the student with SEN, since the subject matter of the lesson meant that she was included perfectly (P7). The subject matter that day was a choreography rehearsal and the student liked it very much (P7). Another case of ‘natural inclusion’ was mentioned when one teacher talked about his understanding of inclusion:

having them [the student with SEN] in my class is inclusion. But if the child is already in [the class] I don’t take it out, I don’t differentiate him from the rest [of the students]. That’s why I can’t understand inclusion...I’ll tell you something else, if I have a child weighing 80kg and he/she can’t do not even one ab will I leave him out? Will I tell him don’t do it? No, we are going to do it together. So, if we do something together, we are doing it together. This is inclusion (P12).

**Unsuccessful inclusion**

Several teachers felt that it was difficult, if not impossible, to include students with SEN in their lessons. One of them mentioned that one student with severe learning difficulties was not included in his lesson for the simple reason that this student attended lessons in the inclusive class during PE (P1). Unsuitable sport equipment and visual impairment were reasons that another teacher felt that he could not include successfully his student with SEN in his lesson:
[This student] is 80% to 90% blind…she is afraid of the ball, because she said that she was hit by one in the past, it makes sense because she cannot see. She was hit by a ball; we could have had a ball with a bell in it, it could be really simple…we don’t have anything. No infrastructure at all (P7).

In order to prove that inclusion was very difficult, if not impossible, P3 shared the story of another teacher who was crying every day due to the unbearable difficulties she was facing every day in the classroom. For P9, inclusion was very difficult because even when teachers try their best, the participation of students with SEN in a lesson is a forced situation which is bound to fail. Finally, P11 simply felt unable to include students with SEN.

**Severity of SEN**

Only two teachers did not refer to the severity of the SEN as a condition for inclusion. Most of the rest agreed that it was easier to include students with mild learning difficulties in the lesson in comparison to students with more severe learning difficulties. One of them went as far as to say the smarter the children, the easier her lesson as far as understanding exercises was concerned (P6). For P7:

> It is according to what each child has. Now the autistic children, of course the autistic spectrum is big, but there are some autistic children that are very difficult to include in the class compared to other students that might have a motor problem or a learning difficulty.

Furthermore, teachers’ understanding of mild and severe SEN varied, with one teacher mentioning that students who cannot run fast or stand up for themselves in a confrontation are difficult to include (P6). On the contrary, one of them emphasised that his students with SEN did not affect him in the PE lesson (P10).

➢ **Use of language**

The subtheme ‘use of language’ emerged from the confusion that seemed to be common in many teachers when asked about inclusion. The word ‘inclusion’ in Greek schools is mostly used to refer to the ‘inclusive class’. As a result, various
interviews demonstrated this confusion (P1, P2, P3, P8). One of the teachers, when asked about what inclusion is in her opinion, requested an explanation by saying “Do you mean the goal of the inclusive class or what we mean in general?” (P2). Similarly, when P3 was questioned about the possible difficulties he faced in order to implement inclusion asked “what do you mean ‘difficulty’? You mean if the inclusive class has the necessary [equipment] to function for example?”.

In addition, the code ‘use of language’ was used when many teachers described their students with SEN and the nature of their SEN. Phrases such as “not normal” and “if the child is educable” (P14) were used to describe students with SEN. The word ‘problem’ was usually used to describe the SEN themselves. For example:

\[\text{He is not in [a] position to do what the rest of the children do that is to play a group game, to cooperate. Because even if he does, at some point something will come up… the good part does not last long. The problem will come to the surface again} (P3).\]

\[\text{Certainly if a child has a small problem it could probably be closer to the intellectually normal children.} (P9)\]

**Legislation**

Some teachers mentioned that a law was about to come into effect which would force all special schools to close. The prospect was described as “ominous” by P9:

P4 expressed his doubts, as shown in the following dialogue from the interview:

\[\text{P4: How will it work? How will you face them? Now you have 2-3 cases in each class, in three primary school classes. [What will happen when] they will come [students with SEN] and they will be 16?}\]

\[\text{Interviewer: yes. So, what is it that you are saying?}\]

\[\text{P4: Either the teachers that will be in the class and they will not know or the person in the inclusive class. What will they do first? It will be from}\]
bad to worse. That’s what I think; if we stay with this as a fact [the new law] it will be from bad to worse.

P9 stresses a similar opinion by saying:

Instead of giving more attention to the problems of people with disabilities or intellectual disabilities the opposite happens. If special schools close it will be a huge crime and I believe that it needs to be avoided even at the last minute.

Another existing law concerning the national day school parades was also mentioned by P11. According to the teacher’s description of the law, all students that take part in the parade have to be around the same height and walk in order. A student with SEN in his class was not only extremely tall, but also the teacher knew that he would not follow the rest of the students. As a result, he decided not to include him in the parade. Although that was a decision the teacher later regretted, he also felt that his actions were legal (P11).

4.2.2 Teaching styles

The present theme provides evidence of the teachers’ depth of knowledge of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles or other teaching methods. The subthemes and second level codes are presented in Appendix 6.

➢ Knowledge of teaching styles

This subtheme refers exclusively to the teachers’ knowledge and memory of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles.

Only two of the teachers remembered being taught the teaching styles at university. P10 was quite specific when he described methods that matched some of the teaching styles on the Spectrum. Two of the teachers denied any memory of the Spectrum (P1, P3), but the majority did not give a clear answer on whether they remembered them or not. More specifically, some of the teachers asked to be reminded of the names of the teaching styles and admitted that this brought back some memories. Apart from P5, P6 and P9, who remembered being taught these teaching styles during their bachelor studies or had studied them while preparing for the ASEP national teacher exams, however, no one else offered any more detailed descriptions of what exactly
they remembered or what the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles meant for them.

➢ **Use of teaching styles**

Many of the teachers described the way they used teaching styles (or teaching methods, as they usually referred to them). They also expressed their opinions about using any type of teaching methods in the lesson.

P1, for example, said that he used different methods of teaching according to the age of his students. In some occasions, he allowed students to demonstrate exercises:

> I simply let them take initiative. I prefer not to show them [the execution of an exercise], I will ask someone [a student] to show them, today you, tomorrow somebody else. I mean they will learn what I [usually] say… so they can try it themselves. I can't always show them [how to do the exercise]. I want to put them in a state of mind to watch with more attention what we are going to do.

Similarly, P6 and P13 also used demonstration by the students:

> […] the methods I use at the beginning are… initially I present the subject matter and then I try to do it child centred; to do the teaching child centred, meaning to use a student. If you saw yesterday I asked a student to show the warm up; so that they learn faster the exercises.

(P13).

P5 did not always organise the lesson according to the “teaching methods” but was aware of alternating between “creative methods” and more “teacher centred methods” according to the difficulty and the goal of the exercises and the level of safety he wanted to achieve. For P7, “the Command method in particular is a method that I use as a guide from the beginning of the year”. Other teachers went off the beaten track by saying that they use other less popular teaching methods. P10 asked his students questions in order to motivate them find the answers to practical problems. P12, apart from using the more traditional command method, said that he allowed his students periodically to “become the teachers” and create their own lesson. P8 also let
his students to create their own teams when playing games. Finally, P7 said that she differentiated her lessons according to students’ abilities as well as using traditional teaching methods:

[…] so we start doing all together some activities and maybe at the end of the hour…or at the end of the school day we separate and those [students] who can do something more I ask them to do one more activity. Maria [student with SEN] might participate in the same activity and not be able to perform equally but this doesn’t affect us, or she might be with some other children that they are also not so developed kinetically…they might do something less [difficult], so that they feel they achieve, but still something less, a lower goal (P7).

4.2.3 Teacher

All types of teacher training, experience, knowledge, cooperation, and expressions of the inner world of the PE lesson were noted under the theme ‘Teacher’. The goal of this theme was to gather and underline an understanding of the basic human sources behind this study. The subthemes and second level codes are presented in Appendix 6.

➢ Experience

Teaching experience

All of the teachers who took part in the present research had been employed in public education for more than 10 years (10-27 years). Their years of experience did not necessarily mean experience in teaching students with SEN, however. P8, for example, with 27 years of experience, had only taught students with SEN for the last two years before the interview took place. Another teacher with 17 years of experience had only taught students with SEN for the last three years; he had, however, worked with students with SEN in the past in the private sector (P13). Four of the teachers had been teaching students with SEN for all or almost all of their careers.

Experience affected most teachers’ practice over time. For P1, his experience helped him find solutions in the lesson:
I can easily, no matter what happens, find a solution; meaning an accident or even change of lesson, change of plans … I will find a solution immediately and I will be able to get organised fast. I handle the children much better from the first two years for example (P1).

Experience helped some other teachers better understand their students and offer them better quality lessons and a more personalised approach according to their needs:

As the years are passing, I know now how to treat children, I understand better their needs, I can help them when they have a problem and in general I am closer to them in a way that I couldn't in the past (P3).

Others have learned to be less stressed and more patient: “I am calmer, more soft, I have more patience and I accept a lot more things than I did the old days” (P11). P5 had lowered his expectations from the students and P4 had stopped being perfectionist. Finally, P10 said that many parts of teaching became automatic over time:

[…] of course over the years these changes…because the whole thing with the children becomes more automatic, you can focus; but at the beginning you have a problem because you have to learn to handle the rest of the students and [the student with SEN] has also to be included.

➢ Training

When talking about their training regarding SEN, most of the teachers were not satisfied. Many of them had not received any training during their bachelor degree; some others had only attended a quick ‘non-compulsory module’ concerning SEN and only one teacher had specialised in SEN while attending the specialty modules. After being hired in public primary schools, some teachers had attended seminars concerning SEN. These teachers thought, however, that the seminars were not helpful, since they only presented theory and not suggestions or advice for practical issues they would face in their teaching reality. Highlighting the generic character of such seminars, P4 said:

[…] but they don’t tell you, they don’t tell you something specific…We go there, we discuss, [we say] I face this issue, I face that [issue], but I don’t
take something [substantial] in order to find a solution to the issue the next day.

Another PE teacher seemed to be annoyed:

They drive us mad with talking too much… they take information from Scandinavia, from countries where they have closed [indoor] gyms, with swimming pools… and they are trying to apply this to me, to fill my head… [whereas what I want is to] be advised about what to do with two balls or with three torn balls and a ripped mattress [that is the existing sport equipment] (P8).

P11 described his experience of attending a seminar where colleagues from special schools talked with PE teachers from mainstream schools. On this occasion, his complaint was:

the only problem was that these colleagues … were people who undoubtedly had the necessary knowledge and secondly, they were only working in special schools… But [a PE teacher in a special school] only has to do with children like that [with SEN]; you have nothing to do with a mixed environment which is completely different.

➢ Knowledge

Lack of knowledge

Many teachers discussed what they considered their lack of knowledge concerning SEN. P7 said that he was afraid of teaching students with SEN because he did not know how to treat them or what to do. P10 stressed that schools were not ready for inclusion, since there were no suitable teachers to teach students with SEN. A lack of specialised teachers in SEN was also noted by P15. According to another teacher’s opinion, information concerning SEN was scarce, since very few seminars concerning SEN were conducted.

Desired training

The teachers had several ideas concerning their ideal training for SEN. Apart from regular updates and seminars on SEN-related issues (P1, P2), many specific ways of training were suggested. P2 suggested, for example, that her
ideal training would involve “practical” information, such as observation of exemplary lessons, since theoretical information was easy to acquire. P3 wished to have a detailed description of activities (not just for students with SEN) that would take into consideration the existing school sport equipment. P4 wanted to know how to treat and motivate each student with SEN individually; he brought up the example of his student with SEN who wanted to wander around the yard, whereas another teacher was interested in knowing more ways to keep all of the students happy, safe and adjusted (P2). Finally, a couple of teachers suggested that they would like a specialist to observe their lessons and advise them on what they did right or wrong and how to improve their lessons (P2, P8, P10).

➢ Educator

Teachers’ understanding of their role as educators and PE teachers in particular was shown clearly in this subtheme.

P9 believed that even without suitable equipment, the teacher ought to teach students all the knowledge necessary for the body to function properly. P15 said: “we shouldn’t be discouraged; we should try and find ways so that we can do our job seriously. It’s our duty I believe, the educators’ [duty]”. He added:

There are always difficulties even in the best countries with [good] organisation. We should overcome the difficulties, we shouldn’t be there and say ‘oh, we are missing this, we don’t have that’. We must find something in order our lesson to be more attractive, more interesting, we must find ways, which is our responsibility.

Another teacher believed that an educator should be prepared to teach everybody ‘good’ or ‘bad’ (P8) whereas P5 recognised that the role of an educator is difficult and inevitably mistakes will occur. Finally, one of the PE teachers underlined the tensions between teachers (i.e. literacy teachers) and PE teachers regarding their roles:

When we came [in primary education] teachers got afraid. They said ‘who are they who came from secondary [education]? But this –hands up and down – I can do it by myself’. They couldn’t understand the pedagogic part of the issue ‘how to train a child’; and physical education is not just
running, it is motor education, motor and music education, dance, coordination (P6).

➢ Cooperation

This subtheme came to light when discussing cooperation among the educators in a school, as described by the PE teachers.

Teachers mostly referred to cooperation during incidents involving their students with SEN. The first example came from a number of teachers, who mentioned that they had sought advice on how to treat and motivate their students with SEN from the teacher of the inclusive class, even if they themselves were not specialised in SEN. Other teachers asked for the help of their colleagues who were free at the time, even the headteacher, in order to keep an eye on students with SEN who wandered away from the PE lesson (P11, P13). Additionally, some of the teachers discussed the issues they faced during lesson with their colleagues in order to get some help (P8, P13) whereas others discussed issues with the teachers of each class in order to have a better understanding of the behaviour of their SEN students (P5, P6).

➢ Feelings and reflection

While describing their experiences, many teachers expressed their feelings about a variety of situations in school. They also reflected on past actions and shared their thought processes.

For one teacher, the presence of an unattended student with SEN in the yard during the PE lesson had caused a great deal of stress (P3). P3 reported that his concern for the student’s wellbeing, as well as the fact that he wanted to play with the class that had their PE lesson at that moment despite not being officially in that class, had been difficult for her to deal with. The same teacher had also felt judged by the parents of her students because of the presence of students with SEN in the lessons (P3). P7 also described what for her was a scary situation:
Last year a child [with SEN] did not have an [assistant]. The parents didn’t have [the money] to pay [the assistant]. [the child with SEN] stayed without an assistant for a month and I am telling you it was scary.

This teacher (P7) felt that she had to choose between the student with SEN, who was constantly leaving because he wanted to be alone, and the rest of the students. P11 said that there was a psychological cost in teaching many different age groups in one day. He also mentioned the lesson conditions:

The very bad lesson conditions, the heat of the sun, the coexistence of two people [PE teachers] with two different classes in one gym…this has tired me (P11).

P13 said that the results of the financial crisis had a psychological impact on the students, as well as on him and his colleagues.

Additionally, a few of the teachers reflected on their past actions. P5 mentioned that the mistakes teachers make can cost students dearly. He became more specific, saying:

I have felt that I’ve been unfair to a child during assessment; I have felt that I was extreme in my reactions…that I was too harsh with my punishment. I have felt that I had low expectations from a child (P5).

Finally, one of the teachers became very emotional during the interview when reflecting on his past actions towards two different students with SEN, one in his school and the other in the private traditional classes he had held in the past (P11).

4.2.4 Lesson

This theme presents actions, incidents and choices that teachers made during lessons according to their own accounts. Appendix 6 presents all the subthemes and second level codes (presented here in italics) that led to the creation of the theme ‘Lesson’ from the interviews.
Preparation

Lesson planning/preparation

When asked about whether they planned their lessons, most teachers answered that they made one, two or more of the following plans: daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly or annually. P3 had an approximate knowledge of what she would teach every day; however, for P3, preparation was meaningless:

*There is no meaning in preparing; to say: I will do this for 5 minutes, the other for 10...I think that this is in vain; because children are like a torrent. They come down [to the yard] and they tell you, we want to play. Their first word is: won't we play? When you try to put in many stereotypes [organise a lot] you lose the magic of the game which is the aim.*

Some teachers’ lesson planning was affected by the weather conditions. As a result, P10, for example, chose three activities for each semester, e.g. basketball, dance, and volleyball, and according to the weather or other conditions he would alternate between them. Many of the teachers relied on their experience in order to conduct their lessons. P4 mentioned:

*I’ve learnt it all by heart. After 21 years I know what every class needs, what I need to do, what I shouldn’t do, how much to pressure them [the students], if I shouldn’t pressure them. The subject matter, you know it, whatever you will do in the lesson. I am not sitting down thinking I will do this exercise or that exercise etc.*

Other teachers kept notes, usually after the lesson, to help themselves remember what they had taught so far.

Lesson structure

Finally, many teachers mentioned that they followed a fairly standard structure for Physical Education lessons, including a warm up, main lesson, and final cool-down.
Subject matter

Curriculum

The use of the Greek national curriculum for Physical Education was also discussed. Many of the teachers followed the national curriculum to a certain degree, since as they said it “makes [their] life easier” (P7). None of them implemented it as suggested, however. The reason for that for one teacher was that the ideal circumstances to be able to implement it exactly rarely occurred:

*Ideal circumstances… you have to know that you will come in time, all the children will ideally be set up, I won’t make a programme for the 3-4 months when it rains. How am I going to do my lesson, if it will be slippery outside or if it will be a bit sunny, or if there will be puddles of water, because I'll have to change [the lesson] in order to do it in half the yard which will be dry…most classes have children that go to the inclusive class. So, then I cannot follow the national curriculum of a normal school (P2).*

For other teachers, the reason for not adhering to the curriculum was that the sport equipment was inadequate in order to conduct a lesson to its standards. As P4 put it:

*We don’t have anything. What are you talking about? We don’t have balls…with what? How can I use the curriculum? The only use of the curriculum is for basketball and volleyball. Everything else that is written in there, do this, do that, do the other, how can you do them?*

There were, however, a few teachers who stated that they adjusted the national curriculum to the existing equipment and needs and another teacher who suggested that he introduced more sports to the students than the curriculum suggested (P12).

Game playing

Play seemed to be an important part of PE lessons. For P3, play was necessary to help students unwind, so there was always time left for play during the lesson (P3). The same teacher also suggested that in primary school, the PE lesson is mostly about playing and not about learning sport techniques (P3). For P5 it
was important to keep a balance: “I am trying to use competitive games and other types of physical education like psychomotor and music motor education equally”. Similarly, P14, in an effort to reduce competition, was trying to transform classic competitive games to non-competitive games, e.g. by not counting the goals in basketball or football and by applauding the students’ efforts towards achieving goals.

➢ Differentiation

Lesson differentiation according to students’ needs was mentioned by some teachers during their interviews. For P2, for example, changes in the lesson according to students’ abilities were often necessary:

*You need to make changes; I mean if you say that I am going to do the same lesson for 3 days, there is no chance, no matter how many times you think about it; so, from the 20 children that a class might have…you need to find almost 20 different ways to pass the time and do the lesson in a right way. I cannot find one way for 20 children.*

P3 also tried to encourage some students to become more empathetic towards some of their peers by pairing them together, while others differentiated the difficulty of each lesson or each exercise according to the level of each class or to different student needs. For P12, a student with SEN would not necessarily face difficulties in the PE lesson, but it would depend on the nature of those SEN. When his students with SEN did face difficulties, however, he said he:

*Lower[s] the level of difficulty and tension of the lesson in order to adjust to every child [students with SEN]; but this will not happen all the time. There will be a time that George and every other student [with SEN] will come and will be included and will be at the same level as the rest of the children; and they will achieve the same level. (P12).*

➢ Priorities

‘Lesson priorities’, ‘lesson goals’, and ‘discipline’ were the second level codes. These are presented together, since they show how teachers are guided towards their ways of conducting everyday lessons.
Lesson priorities and lesson goals

When asked about their goals and priorities in the lesson, the teachers gave a plethora of different answers and interpretations. The safety of the students was a big concern for many of them and they showed that they worried considerably about it. Creating an environment where students could have fun, feel joy and happiness, diffuse, and forge relationships with each other during lessons were some of the teachers’ other priorities. Student participation in the lesson was a priority for P11, P14 and P15. Many teachers were concerned with the process of learning itself and achieving the goal of the lesson through sporting activities, such as strengthening, physical fitness, motor skill development, learning about a particular sport, and other “interesting activities”. Using age-appropriate exercises and teaching methods were key goals for P6, P7, P9 and P11. Others included in their priorities the creation of “good people”, and to teach students to behave properly and follow the school rules (P6, P14). Finally, for P12, achieving an undisrupted lesson through assigning responsibilities to students with SEN was a priority.

Discipline

Teachers stated that student misbehaviour needed to be addressed in their everyday routine. For that reason, setting rules, either at the beginning of the school year or throughout the lessons, was something that many teachers mentioned they were doing. P4 explained that once the rules were set, she was constantly trying to remind the students of them, but “in many occasions [students] set the rules to their peers”. Constant misbehaviour, however, called for punishment. P12 implemented discipline using increasing consequences according to the level of ‘naughtiness’. The final stage of P12’s method involved the whole class being punished (doing exercises instead of playing) instead of the ‘naughty’ student (who was nonetheless being punished psychologically).

P13 expected students to understand the reason why he was telling them off, since he expected them to know when they broke the rules.

Lesson conditions

A common factor affecting PE lessons that was mentioned by many PE teachers was the weather conditions. Teachers suggested that lesson plans
were often postponed due to bad weather conditions or lessons were planned according to expected bad or good weather. P11 expressed this thus:

*The whole November and December [there is bad weather] …and from middle [of] March until July we have the sun on our head, there is no shade for the children to do PE.*

### 4.2.5 Environment

The theme Environment includes elements from the interviews that related to factors affecting inclusion originating from outside the school grounds. Appendix 6 presents the subthemes and second level codes that emerged from the data.

➢ **Society**

Some teachers talked about the role of society in inclusion. The majority of their opinions were not positive.

A general idea from one of the teachers was that most people were not informed and were quick to judge and gossip about people with SEN (P2). She also said:

*When people in general cannot face a problem, at some point they will be negative towards it. Because they might not know how to face [difference], and they are often a bit absolute... People can be absolute, cruel, abrupt and absolute. Because they don’t know, because in general, society in our country doesn’t come face to face with different needs, different from the normal, depending on how you think about it* (P2).

P3 and his colleagues experienced having students with SEN in their school as additional ‘trouble’. Another teacher located the problem of social inclusion within the living environments of students with SEN (P6). According to him, students with SEN are better off in an urban environment where people are more familiar with people with SEN than in semi-urban environments where people are less positive about difference, usually out of ignorance (P6). P10 was absolute: “when society is negative in any sort of inclusion in school as well there cannot be inclusion”.

P5, however, expressed the opposite:
People speak to these children [students with SEN] and greet them and embrace them; [people] are generally positive. They only complain about the state…

Similarly, P15 believed that Greek society had slowly moved forward in accepting people with SEN and mostly in a neighbourhood level which he thought was ideal. Also, positive was P7:

I think that [society] has progressed since a few years ago. They accept them more [students with SEN], they are not afraid to show these children; because I remember they used to keep them in their houses, the children didn’t do anything, they were not going anywhere, no activity or school, or special school. Now they accept them …

➢ Parents

‘Parent acceptance’ is a subtheme that was frequently mentioned during the interviews. Many teachers suggested that parents of students with SEN were not accepting of their child’s SEN. P1 stated:

We should start [looking for the root of the problem] from the parents that many times do not accept them and they don’t even want for their child to be assessed and to see what they have and move on.

For another teacher, the fact that the parents of a student with SEN did not talk about it made inclusion of the student more difficult (P4). Moreover, parent acceptance was also mentioned in terms of parents whose negativity towards students with SEN affected the behaviour of their non-SEN children. For P5 there were parents that “delay to adjust [sic] and sometimes bring their hostile behaviour into their house”. Not only that, two teachers mentioned cases of parents objecting to their children having peers with SEN in their class. The story that P5 shared was somewhat representative of this:

A few years ago, we had a child with autism, a severe case of autism; his class was emptied from children, because their parents took them and left [the school]. Of course, we had discussions with the parents [of the student with SEN] that the child is a severe case and that he needs a special school. The child could not be included in the class; he was a
very severe case. His parents indeed took him to a special school, but so many students left from his class that all the other students of the same year group merged and became one class when initially there were two...

Finally, the teachers described parent initiative as being “impressive” on two occasions. Describing how the inclusive class was introduced in his school, P1 said:

*This class [the inclusive class] was made as an initiative of a mother that had a child with a severe case of autism. And she did [everything] and she appealed to the ministry etc. and a teacher was brought here for this reason.*

The other case was a parent who paid a woman to act as a teaching assistant (TA) and help her child in the class, since there are no TAs in the Greek mainstream educational system (P7).

➢ **State**

This quote from P4 seems to be the most representative of the sentiments expressed by the teachers concerning the Greek state and its organisation:

*Whatever you hear [happening/ initiating] from the ministry and the organisations, it’s just done for show, to say something is being done. Then it is forgotten and we start all over again.*

Some of the teachers believed that inclusion in Greece was not being implemented properly, since the state was not providing people and services with the necessary equipment and training to accommodate the needs of people with SEN. Comparing the all-day school programme with the inclusive class, P13 suggested that innovative ideas such as all-day schools are left unsupported and it was up to the goodwill of teachers to run the programme as best as they could. A brief comparison between Greek schools and foreign schools (in France, Spain, Italy, and Portugal) was made by another teacher, who suggested that there was a huge difference between the infrastructure provided to schools in other countries and in schools in Greece (P11). Finally, P7 stated: “*if some people think seriously that these children [students with SEN] need to be in mainstream schools, then they should do some changes*.”
Financing

Greek schools are financed equally by the local authorities on behalf of the state, according to the size of each school. The interviews revealed, however, that parents were also a source of financial support for the schools, mostly because of the financial crisis, which had prohibited the state from providing adequately for schools. As P1 put it:

Financially-wise [sic], schools are a mess for a long time now. The [school’s] parent association is helping us at this school; that is for balls and sport material that is needed, funding came from them. In the older days, they were coming from [the ministry of education]; from time to time the ministry sends sport material to me [to the allocated PE teacher of the school].

For P8, however, asking for money for sport equipment from the parents’ association was prohibited. The headteacher did allocate some money for sport equipment, but it was usually not enough, so the teacher frequently bought whatever was necessary at his own expense (P8). Comparing the current situation with the past, P13 said that the only sport material given to him from the state for the year was a basketball, a volleyball and a sport mattress. P10 could only buy the sport equipment he needed if the school had money for it.

4.2.6 School provision

The theme ‘school provision’ refers to everything that teachers mentioned concerning current SEN provision, human support, and infrastructure within their schools. The subthemes that emerged were: ‘Support’; ‘Issues relating to the diagnostic process’; ‘Infrastructure’ (Appendix 6).

Support

Teachers referred to ‘support’ as the existing support systems that PE teachers have or do not have during their lesson, the support they would like to have, and specific SEN support systems that the schools might (or might not) have.

When asked about whether they needed some kind of support, there was an overwhelmingly large number of teachers that expressed their need for support during the lesson. The reasons for that varied. Most of them admitted that they
did not have the support they needed. P5 specifically suggested that support “is something that is considered luxury in today’s school. There are not even enough teachers; it is considered luxury, but it is a necessity”. P8 focused on the role of the school adviser:

Once the school adviser was here, [who] specialised in special education and I asked him about this particular child who has Down Syndrome: “How am I covered, that I don’t have a specialisation [in special educational needs] and I am not an expert” and they answered ok we can cover for you, he can do PE…meaning superficial. They did not give an answer.

Some other teachers suggested that students with SEN should be taught by specialised teachers:

I think that a school with a class of deaf students or an inclusive class for children with any kind of problem needs an appropriate colleague who will have the knowledge to face the problems of these children only (P9).

P3 described an obvious case of lack of support. A student with SEN was wandering unattended almost constantly at the yard while he should have been in his class attending lessons. His presence was a cause of stress and concern for the PE teacher, who thought that:

There is no solution for this. I have really been very patient on this matter. And I don’t have …support on this [matter]. Meaning, I referred to the head teacher, to the teacher; the answers I had was “Find a way to remove him” (P3).

Some teachers referred to occasions where they had support while teaching. P7, however, added: “this [escort/assistant] was a parent initiative because the school cannot bring expert people for all these children so that they can help them”, revealing that in this case, support had come from outside the school. Finally, some teachers suggested that they had no need for additional support in their lessons. Some reasons for this were explained by P1 and P12:

My lesson cannot be supported by some other colleague, meaning from a teacher. I am here as an educator with specialty [physical education].
Everybody else here is not relevant to my subject, they cannot help or intervene (P1).

I think I can make it on my own. I don’t need someone; because I have seen from a previous case that a teacher comes … and takes him [the student with SEN] and has him with her. And she watches him. This is not PE for the child. He is just watching the rest [of the students]. (P12).

The teachers made a number of suggestions concerning their ideal versions of support. One of the suggestions was regular meetings with other schools with students with SEN, so that students both with and without SEN would learn to socialise more and become more accepting (P1). A few teachers suggested personal teaching for students with SEN (P1, P3) while others insisted that the best option would be for students with SEN to be taught specifically by teachers who specialised in SEN (P1, P3, P9). Others said they would like to have practical and not just theoretical knowledge on how to teach students with SEN (P2), co-teaching, mostly for safety reasons (P5, P11, P13), curriculum adjustment to current circumstances (P8), a school support mechanism consisting of a child psychologist, school advisor, and/or social worker (P5), more and suitable sport equipment (P10) and more tolerance from colleagues who get annoyed by the noises from PE lessons in the yard (P11).

➢ Issues relating to the diagnostic process

The role of the diagnostic body was described by P8 as follows: “we cooperate with KEDDY many times but their job is just diagnostic, they don’t come to help you, to tell you a few things”. Most teachers that referred to the diagnostic process or body were quite disappointed and described a dysfunctional system that did not allow them to understand the conditions of their students with SEN or did not work properly (P4, P7, P8). As a result, one of them said they were not even informed about the existence of a student with SEN:

[...]and I started to understand that there is something wrong, I started looking for the health statement, I started asking the teacher; the teacher was not informed either (P7).

Parents/guardians were also sometimes described negatively:
From the moment that the parent does not accept their child’s condition and thinks that they can live normally or read normally or…it is on their own hands; we can’t do anything; the law covers them. No matter how severe the problem is, if the parent wants their child to be in a mainstream school, in a normal school… we can’t do anything (P8).

On a similar note, P7 mentioned: “we are not informed and most importantly the parent doesn’t inform us so that we know”.

➢ Infrastructure

**Sport equipment and Sport/School facilities**

14 out of 15 teachers referred to the suitability, quantity, and quality of school sport facilities and sport equipment. P5 was quite satisfied with the sport equipment that was provided for his lesson. Many of the others, however, mentioned insufficient and unsuitable sport equipment, both for students with and without SEN. There were also complaints regarding the unsuitability of school facilities, which were considered dangerous in some cases both for students with and without SEN. Finally, many of the PE teachers mentioned a major lack of sheltered spaces or closed rooms that would be suitable for a safe and creative PE lesson.

4.2.7 Student

This theme aims to reach an understanding of the students that the interviewees were teaching through their descriptions. It also enhances the understanding of the other themes. The subthemes presented here are: ‘Behaviour’ and ‘Student progress’ (Appendix 6).

➢ Behaviour

The teachers described the behaviour and reactions of the students during PE lessons. Most of this was presented in a negative light and tended to show the difficulties they faced from having student/s with SEN in their lessons. Situations where SEN students had left the lesson without permission, hidden, or not participated at all were often described. As P3 put it:

*He is not in position to do what the rest of the children do; that is to play in a group game, to cooperate, because even if he does it at some point he*
will withdraw again. The good part doesn’t last long. The problem will come to the surface again.

Another student needed constant invitations to participate in the lesson:

He won’t come on his own to participate in the lesson. You need to call him for example and you have to let him free, relaxed. If you push him a bit he reacts [badly]. The first word he says is ‘no’ but then little by little, if you call him again ‘come, come’ he will come. But then he will leave again. So, you will have to tell him when to come and what to do. On his own he won’t become part of the whole (P4).

Some teachers also stated that some students with SEN became aggressive and possibly dangerous to others and themselves, shouted, had extreme reactions, got distracted easily, and did not comply with instructions. Some students, however, were described as “well-behaved” and adjusted well to the lessons:

I don’t know if she likes it more because its singing and dancing. Maria [student with SEN] caught up with the movements faster than some other little children that didn’t have any problem; because the other might have been bored, or not pay attention. (P7).

P10 described another type of student:

I have faced a situation where the child didn’t have any problem; he/she [the child] didn’t want to be included. He was thinking that all this was not for him [PE lesson], he wanted to do something different all the time; meaning if you told him we will play with a volleyball he would have said football. If you said football he would have wanted volleyball. Something different from everybody else.

Interestingly, P12 described that it was often the popular students who caused problems in lessons, since they have strong characters and are more likely to defy the teacher’s instructions. Finally, other teachers highlighted that the more competitive students could create rivalries over a game.
Student progress

Students’ progress over time or under certain circumstances was also mentioned by some of the teachers. P1, for example, believed that out-of-school sport activities did not help students with SEN improve much. More importantly he believed that mutual parent-child activities affected all students’ performance in PE:

*These things [fundamental movement such as jump, run throw, catch] are difficult unless children have worked at home with their parents. I mean that if a parent plays a bit with the child, sports, movements etc., then the child …we such children here. The child is in position to hear [and do] something more difficult from me* (P1).

P6 and P11 had seen great improvements from their students with SEN in their lessons over the school year, since they had managed, for example, to stay in the lesson or they played simple games with their peers. Although initially, P9 was happy with the improvement of a student with SEN and his performance, later on, however, “things were completely different, we had backslidden”.

4.3 Observation findings

Findings from the lesson observations are presented according to eight emerged themes and their subthemes in the following order: Inclusion, Teaching styles, Lesson, School provision, Students, Teacher, Environment and Role of the researcher (Appendix 6). Each observation in this section is represented with the letter O followed by the teachers number in this study and the letters a or b which represent the first or second observed lesson. O1a is the first observation of the first PE teacher (P1), for example (see section 3.5).

4.3.1 Inclusion

The observations sheet used for the field notes in this study was specially designed to remind the researcher to focus on indicators of inclusive practice as well as indicators of the use of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles (Tables 6 and 7, section 3.2.3). Under the theme ‘inclusion’ the observations presented the subthemes and second level codes that emerged during the analysis of the field notes and showed how students with or without SEN were included in the
lessons (Appendix 6). The names of the students, as mentioned below, are pseudonyms.

➢ **Inclusive approach**

A cluster of second level codes emerged from the analysis and are categorised under this subtheme in order to show the variety of approaches that indicated inclusion during the lessons (Table 7, Section 3.2.3).

**Inclusive approaches**

The theme ‘Inclusive approaches’ categorised the actions of the teachers which were aimed towards the inclusion of students (with or without SEN) in the lesson. A number of PE teachers spent time bringing students back to the lesson in order for them to participate or just waited for them to be ready to participate, for example. At the beginning of O1b, while most students were playing, I noted:

*PE teacher is leaving [the students] and goes to find a child that stands away from the rest of the class and has not come to the gathering.*

Similarly, in O4a, *the students start playing immediately while the PE teacher approaches again Kostas and sends him to the court where the other students are playing*.

In lessons O10a and O15a, the PE teachers waited for the students who were late to the lesson and for the student with SEN who was late after going to drink some water to come back before they began the lesson and explained the exercise. Another PE teacher expressed concern about why one of his students with SEN sat out of the game:

*Initially everybody is participating but after a while Leo is sitting away. The PE teacher asks him “aren’t you going to play? Do you want water?” He receives negative answers to both* (O13b).

Additionally, during a speed test in O1a, the student with SEN who was performing it *loses her way. The PE teacher is guiding and prompting her and she [the student with SEN] reaches the cone.*
On other occasions, teachers intervened so that a student with SEN would be included in the lesson. In O2a, during an exercise/game which involved shooting a basketball into the basket, the teacher of the class intervened so that the student with SEN would have a second chance to score, but this was not her reaction when other students failed to score. In an effort to keep a student with SEN in the game the PE teacher in O4a intervened: The PE teacher is watching and at this point asks a girl that holds the ball at that moment to pass it to Kostas, who is not yet very far from the court. The same teacher in another observed lesson asked her students to give their peer with SEN the goalkeeper position in their football game in order for him to participate (O4b). Another teacher asked one of her students to lower his back in order for the student with SEN to be able to pass above him: When it is Anna’s turn to play, the PE teacher who is watching asks the child who pretends to be a rock to duck so that Anna will be able to pass above him (O7a).

P13 and P15 assigned pairs to their students with SEN who had difficulties finding a pair among their peers. P13 also decided which team would be the one to include the student with SEN (O13a). Additionally, P11 and P13 devoted time to explaining explicitly some of the games to their students with SEN.

One of the teachers intervened to help a student with SEN as follows: After a while he stops the game and says to his students “don’t put a lot of pressure on Kostas and give him the ball” (O15b). Finally, an interesting approach to a game was observed during O7a. P7 differentiated a popular game in such a way that even when students lost, they would not be excluded from the game, but they would continue playing on the opposing side, as a result always being included in the game (O7a).

Some of the teachers made sure their students had understood their instructions and/or that they listened to them. They achieved this with a variety of ways. From O3a:

*The game starts and when Kostas’ [student with SEN] turn comes, [the teacher] helps him understand what to do and guides him by saying his name so that he will pay attention to her. “Kostas give the ball to someone who hasn’t got it yet”. He gives it. [She says] “Bravo. Run”.*
During O15a, the PE teacher gives separate instructions to the pair [of students] that Kostas [student with SEN] is grouped with. In O7a, the PE teacher moved the students that did not follow the movements she demonstrated correctly to the front so that they would be able to see her better and learn.

Teachers often tried to motivate their students to participate in the lesson and behave properly. A simple prompt to participate or motivate students often appeared in the field notes of many observed lessons. For example:

*Initially Giorgos is doing the exercises, but after a while he stops and just looks around. The PE teacher prompts him again to do the exercise and he does it* (O9a).

**Prompt**

In O2a, the teacher asked her students to encourage one of their peers: *When it’s his turn again the PE teacher prompts him [student with SEN] and she also says to the other children to shout encouragingly to him.* During O4a, the teacher encouraged a student who had wandered away to come to the circle that the rest of the students had created and took him by the hand in order to convince him. In O7a and O13b, the teachers used prompt and practiced their motivational skills in a different way:

*At the next round of the game, however, the PE teacher comes and pulls Faith from the hand and says to her “Come. Katerina is waiting. Come so she won’t be on her own”. Faith answers positively and goes to play* (O7a).

**Positive atmosphere**

One factor that contributes to an inclusive lesson approach is a positive atmosphere in a lesson. This section presents lesson events that are categorised under the second level code ‘Positive atmosphere’.

Some of these events were initiated by the teachers, some by students. During O1a, for example, the PE teacher is calm and prompts students and they chat, laugh and follow their own pace. During O2b, the teacher chatted and teased the students a little during a game. In O4b *all the children are doing the exercises while at the same time they chat with the PE teacher.* P6 and P7 gave
clear instructions and explanations to their students and managed to create a cheerful environment. In O5a, the teacher chose to intervene to maintain a positive atmosphere: the PE teacher whistles and tells off a girl by calling her name in order for her to pass the ball more frequently and the game continues for some time. P11 and P13 chose to make jokes and joke around with their students. Students’ reactions when they had a good time also contributed to a positive lesson atmosphere. During O3a, for example, Kostas [student with SEN] moves further inside the circle away from his position and jumps up and down with enthusiasm. Often when their teams won, students cheered with enthusiasm. Other times students cheered for their teammates, even when on some occasions they had lost the game and they were outside watching. Finally, in O11b, students laugh all together when the ball almost hits accidentally the PE teachers who stand and watch the game while chatting.

**Praise**

Another factor contributing to an inclusive approach of the lesson seemed to be praise on behalf of the teachers. Usual vocabulary used for praise was “Bravo”, “Nice” or “Very nice”, “Beautiful[ly done]”. One teacher at the end of the lesson said: “Today I am pleased with you” (O9a).

**Student participation**

Another indicator of inclusive practice was the participation of the students in the lesson. The participation of students with and without SEN was often noted in the field notes. In O1a, for example, Maria who the whole time that the girls were playing volleyball seemed to be wandering around the yard approaches the girls and participates in the [new] improvised game. In O3a, the teacher tried to convince her student with SEN to share the ball so that every student participated by saying to him “Kostas, give the ball to someone who hasn’t had it yet”. In O5a, a student with Down syndrome participated and ran along with the rest of the students. During O9a, one student with SEN acted as follows: when the children start playing around the cones he stops playing by himself and he is joining them. In O13a, one girl with Down syndrome runs in front of the line of all the other children while participating in the warm up. Notes of the same type and frequency can be found throughout the observations regarding students without SEN: Everyone participates although they look tired from the
sun (O10a), ‘All the children are participating, they know the game’ (O13a). Not all of the students participated in the lessons at all times, however. Sometimes they stopped participating due to the rules of the game. In O10a, the teacher *whistles when someone loses. After whistling he shouts: “Ben, out”*. Students *that lose sit on the bench and chat*. Some of the students with SEN just chose to not participate on various occasions: *Maria chooses to stand on the side* (O1a); *everybody participates at the beginning but after a while Leo withdraws* (O13b). The same happened with students without SEN, however: *two girls are sitting on the tier steps for no obvious reason* (O6b); *the boy that was watching before while sitting keeps watching but this time he is standing* (O12b).

**Peer interaction**

Students interacted with each other on many occasions throughout the lessons. Some of these interactions were noted in the field notes. Most of the noted interactions were positive. On one occasion, a Year 6 student was playing with a much younger student with SEN: *Leo continues playing with Jack from year 6. Leo unties [Jack’s] shoelaces and Jack ties them back* (O11b). During a game in O12a: *they are sitting and they chat. The boys that go out of the game [they lose] also sit at the shade and chat.*

One of the noted interactions, however, was not so positive. During O6a, some of the girls had a disagreement: *the rest of the girls that were playing with the hula hoops are now watching the football game because they had a fight and they abandoned their game.*

**Peer acceptance**

Finally, acceptance was an important factor in inclusive practice and some aspects of it were revealed through the analysis of the field notes. During O2a, for example, students showed their acceptance of their peer with SEN *when he [student with SEN] misses the shooting she [PE teacher] gives him a second chance, and the children don’t complain*. Later in the same lesson *it is Andy’s [student with SEN] turn again, he begins the exercise, he is shooting successfully and the children cheer and continue* (O2a). In O13a *The children don’t seem to mind her [student with SEN] although she might be annoying to them [because of the shouting]*. Not all students were always patient, however.
During O5a someone takes the ball from her [student with SEN] and throws it away; another girl catches it and gives it back to her. Also, in O15a the following incident took place:

Then they start the exercise. The child who is paired with Paul [student with SEN] is complaining that Paul is not throwing the ball properly by saying to the PE teacher “Sir, Paul can’t do it”.

Teacher acceptance

Teacher acceptance was demonstrated in simple ways on occasions. During O3a, the PE teacher saw that John was not in the right position but she did not tell him off. In O7a, when a student with SEN withdrew the PE teacher sees it immediately and she asks, “Helen why are you there?” Helen answers: “I’m tired”. PE teacher: “Do you want to rest?” Helen: “Yes”. PE teacher: “Stay and rest”. Finally, during O2b the PE teacher showed her acceptance like this: she divides her attention equally to all the children without her to seeming to distinguish some of them for any reason.

➢ Inclusion in action

Non inclusion

Situations where inclusion did not seem to take place were also noted in the field notes. The most obvious occasion was one where a student with SEN did not get chosen by their peers as a member of a team:

Each child that is chosen stands behind the leader of the team. Maria stays last. PE teacher tells her to go to the team of one of the leaders “Julie, go to Koni’s team” (O13a).

On another occasion, one student could simply not find a peer to pair with easily (O15a). During O4b the rest of the children are playing while Paul is wandering at the end of the yard and the PE teacher is watching him and the rest of the class (O4b). In another lesson there was a noted incident including a student without SEN: a petite girl – in comparison with the rest – is asking for a pass and does not take any’ (O5b). Also, during O9a Jack continues to be a member of one of the circles and watches. They don’t give him the ball easily but he does not leave.
**Student difficulties**

Additionally, some students seemed to find the exercises in their lessons difficult: *a boy seems to find difficult the new exercise but he continues undaunted* (O15b); *Paul [student with SEN] finds it difficult but he tries* (O15b).

### 4.3.2 Teaching styles

The theme ‘teaching styles’ was created in order to capture all the possible demonstrations of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles that occurred during the observed lessons. It seemed that the teachers mostly used the Command style (style A) but there were also some indications of use of the Practice style (style B).

- **Command style**

During the observations, PE teachers seemed to have a leading role in the lessons they conducted. The elements of their teaching which reflected the Command style are shown in this section. The second level codes constituting this subtheme are: ‘Announcement’; ‘Instruction indication’; ‘Instructions’; ‘Explanations’; ‘Clarifications and Clarifying questions’; ‘PE teacher decision’, ‘PE teacher leader’; ‘Pace setting’; ‘Demonstration’; ‘Observatory role’; ‘Reproduction’; ‘Student compliance’; Partial initiative to/from students (Appendix 6).

- **Announcement**

On various occasions, teachers announced the content or end of a lesson, the beginning of another game, the end of one or the winners of a game. During O11b, for example, the following took place at the beginning of the lesson: *Student gathering and announcement from the PE teacher of what they are going to play (bowling) and how the teams are going to be divided.* During O1b when the children return, [the PE teacher] announces them that will play handball for 10 minutes and then they will rehearse. In the same lesson: *after about 10 minutes, he tells them that the game is over and to take their position for the rehearsal* (O1b). During O2a and O2b, the teacher announced the winners of a game and later on during O2a there was a *change of game after PE teacher’s announcement.* Also, during lessons O8a and O10a, the teachers announced the final score of the game and the winner respectively. P11
announced the conditions under which a team could win the game: *When the end of the hour is approaching, the PE teacher of year 2 class announces that the team who will reach first 25 points will win* (O11b). Also, during O8a the PE teacher shouts the end of the game. *The children gather at the shade and the PE teacher asks them to gather the balls. Some of the children run to bring them.*

**Instruction indication**

In order to announce the end of the lesson, some of the other teachers used means than their voice. Some teachers used a whistle, for example in O13b: *The PE teacher whistles the end of the lesson and tells the children to gather their hats and return to their class.*

Some other instructions were implied through prompts or even given through whistles or playing musical instruments (tambourine). Prompts to do as instructed were given in several occasions to many students. During O2b, the teacher *prompts whoever forgets to start the exercises.* During O8b, the PE teacher *tells the students to try continuously and watches them to perform the exercises.* Also, during O13a, *children take their time to divide the teams and the PE teacher prompts them “choose a little bit faster”, [humourous].* Whistling was another way to impose instructions. During O3b *the children are shouting and laughing and the PE teacher asks them to be serious and whistles to keep order.* The same teacher used a whistle to instruct students as follows: *she whistles so the next student in line will [know when to] start running* (O3b). Also, during O5b:

*When there was a goal scored at the handball game the PE teacher whistled so that the teams of boys and girls would exchange their activities. The boys’ teams practiced at passes and [the] girls played handball.*

Alternatively, one of the teachers used clapping: *he tells them to start walking without talking. He tells them “let’s go”, he claps and [students] start running* (O9a). Finally, another teacher used a tambourine: *when and after the PE teacher starts hitting the tambourine the [students] start moving from the beginning and exchange passes* (O5b).
Instructions

As mentioned previously, all of the teachers gave instructions to their students during their lessons. As did many other teachers, P1 gave detailed instructions concerning where students would perform their exercises:

*The PE teacher gives directions for warming up. He explains to them [students] how exactly he wants them to run in space and how many rounds they should do to the basketball court (O1a).*

Similarly, concerning the teacher in O2a, *after the initial conversation she asks from the children to line up and start warming up by running around the peripheral lines of the basketball court.* During O2b:

*The PE teacher gives instruction … to [start] playing the game with the hula hoops. They start with her [instruction] ‘go’ and she prompts them and watches them to slide the hula hoops freely in the space.*

Also, during O12a, after instructing the students to change games, the teacher *tells them where to stand on the court keeping the two teams the same as the initial ones. Initially, the teams stand at opposite sides of the court.*

Other types of instructions regarding a change in game or exercise occurred quite often during all the PE lessons observed. During O2b:

*The PE teacher gives instruction for a change in game, to play the game with the hula hoops. They start with her [instruction] “go” and she prompts them and watches them to slide the hula hoops freely in the space.*

Also, during O3a *when everybody has played [the PE teacher] gives instruction for a change of game, but [asks students] to stay where they are and stand up.*

There were plenty of instructions given regarding how to correctly perform exercised. P1, for example *gives directions for a correct performance of the stretching exercises (O1a).* During an exercise in O7a *the instructions are clear and specific. He tells them to keep their legs open and to be careful not to hit each other’s head.* During rehearsals:
With a whistle some children start walking. She [the PE teacher] gives them explicit instructions regarding which lines of students should wait, when to start, how to walk and how to stand (O7b).

P8 gave his students clear instructions on how to perform dribbling correctly with a basketball (O8a). He also talks slowly during the exercises like he is dictating instructions (O8b). P14 is making individual remarks to correct the performance of his students (O14a). Similarly, P15 sometimes he stops/freezes the game and makes individual remarks and instructions to some of the children (O15a).

Explanations, Clarifications and Clarifying questions

Some of the instructions given by teachers contained a lot of detail, precision and clarity. During O4a, for example, the PE teacher explains to the children what is the next game and gives clear rules. During O3a the PE teacher asks the students to squat and sit in a circle and explains analytically the new game. The following observation concerns the same teacher during O3b: after the song finishes the PE teacher explains to the class what she didn’t like from the way the dance was performed. Sometimes, instead of telling students what they were doing wrong, P5 asked them guiding questions: instead of remarks sometimes he asks questions, e.g. ‘which way did we shoot?’ he also makes individual remarks and corrections (O5b). P8 explains the game that will follow and its rules with great detail. He explains who wins and when with detail. He repeats when children don’t understand (O8b). P10 also explained to his students that it was not important who finished last in the endurance test (O10b). P9:

[...] asks two children to bring specific [sports] material from the store room. He explains exercises. He clarifies with detail as they wait for the rest of the [sports] material. The children with the cones arrive (O9a).

P13 clarifies instructions and gives feedback: “nice” or “hands higher”. He tells off some children: “who’s talking over there?” (O13a). Finally, P14 used clarifying questions:

He asks questions for the three levels that the exercise is performed. They respond [with] high middle and low and he gives the rhythm and
instructions regarding the performance of the exercises at the three levels’ (O14a).

**PE teacher decisions and PE teacher leadership**

The analysis of the field notes revealed a large number of teacher decisions and situations in which teachers acted as leaders of the game or the lesson. In many lessons, it was observed that the PE teachers chose to divide their students into teams. As a result, field notes like the following appeared frequently:

*He shares jerseys green and red, dividing this way the children in two teams of greens and two teams of red jerseys. The teams consist either of three or four members (O5b)*

*The PE teacher after having positioned the cones in two circles, places children in front of them. One child stands in front of each cone and there are two circles (O9a)*

One of the teachers decided which team would include a student with SEN when she was left out: *Helen stays last. The PE teacher tells her to go to the team of one of the leaders: “Helen go to Koni’s team” (O13a).* Also, during games involving chase, some teachers decided who the catcher/s would be. They also organised and chose games: *the PE teacher organises five children that want to play basketball, and the rest six play football (O6a).* Additionally, they took decisions concerning the beginning, the end, or changes in exercises and games: *when he tells them to stop, he [also] tells them “change” so that they will change direction (O2b); after some running the PE teacher stops the students (O6a).*

On some other occasions, the teachers’ behaviour and participation revealed that their role was essential either for the game or the lesson. During O2b, the teacher’s role was essential to play a game: *With the PE teacher’s whistling the children must rush to step into one of the hula hoops.* In another lesson, *the ‘painters’ [hunters] are chasing the ‘colours’ [other students] that the PE teacher shouts so that they enter the game area (O13b).* The teacher’s leadership and decision-making role became obvious in this example: *In the meantime the children of the class start gathering. They [students] ask her [PE teacher]: “Ms*
shall we play football?" The PE teacher answers: “No” (O3a). Additionally, during game play, the PE teacher calls a number, gives an instruction and the performance of the instruction from the particular number [represented by students] of each team follows (O11a).

**Pace setting**

The pace and duration of the exercises and games was usually controlled by the PE teachers, which was another way of demonstrating leadership. P3 sets the pace with small and rhythmic whistles (O3b). While whistling was a popular way to pace set, other PE teachers used their voice or clapping: the PE teacher talks loudly keeping the pace: “1-2-3 expand, 1-2-3 uplift” (O13b). In O9a when it is necessary he [the PE teacher] also sets a faster or slower pace (by talking loudly or by clapping). Lastly, in both observed lessons, P5 often set the pace with a tambourine:

> Then he sets the pace with a tambourine. When the tambourine goes slowly, the children go slowly, when it goes fast, they run. Sudden stop and ‘freezing’ in one position (O5a).

**Demonstration**

Demonstration of the exercises that students should perform or even the game to be played was often a part of many lessons. The purpose of demonstration was to clarify the instructions on the performance of each exercise or game and it was performed either by the teacher or a chosen student. During O3a, for example, the PE teacher:

> Gives instructions for the performance of strengthening and stretching exercises and shows some of them. The rest are known to the children who perform them.

Similarly, in O10a the PE teacher explains to them [students] the exercise with the balls and simultaneously he shows them.

Instead of showing the students himself, the teacher of lesson O15b explains analytically and demonstrates using the help of one of the students. He asks his students to look [at their peer] carefully. The same method was used by the teacher of O13b:
One student is moving to the centre of the group of the children after PE teacher’s instruction. The PE teacher names the exercises, the child who is at the centre of the group shows the exercise and the rest of the students follow [perform].

P12 used the help of two of his students to show the choreography to the rest of the students (O12b). Finally, during O15a, the teacher participates as well for a while by playing with one of the teams [in order] to demonstrate.

**Observatory role**

After delivering their instructions or in between them many PE teachers resumed a role of observer of the game or the exercise being performed. Some examples of this are as follows:

*He returns close to the children and observes until they finish the four rounds he instructed* (O1a),

*In the meantime, the PE teacher observes the children playing football until the end’* (O14a). P3 ‘when she does not provide clarification [to the students] he watches from the side sitting on a chair behind the children’ (O3b).

Lastly, this example concerns P12 during O12b:

*The next song starts and the children are performing the movements of the song. The PE teacher this time watches them and when the song ends he tells them: “Beautiful”.*

**Feedback**

Teachers also gave feedback to their students about their performance. During O1b, for example, the PE teacher gave group and individual feedback to the students during choreography rehearsals. Similarly, in O7b *the PE teacher who observes them explains to them, when the music stops, what to pay attention to and what to change.*

Feedback was not only given when choreography was performed. P8 and P10 gave their students feedback regarding their performance of exercises (O8a,
O10a): *he gives individual feedback to some of the children that did not previously perform the exercise correctly* (O10a).

**Reproduction and student compliance**

Lessons where the command style was used in the ways in which it has been described so far have as their ultimate goal uniformity of reproduction and student compliance. As a result, this behaviour was noted in most of the field notes of the observed lessons. Numerous occasions of students complying with their PE teachers’ instructions were noted. Some examples of this are as follows:

- *Students follow her [PE teacher’s] example* (O4b)

- *He [the PE teacher] asks two children to move the goalposts and take them at the end of the court. The children do it and return* (O5b)

- *The song and the dance finishes and the PE teacher asks them [students] to stand in a line. The children do it* (O12b)

As mentioned previously, students either reproduced the exercises according to the instructions or demonstrations of the teachers or practiced them on their own, since they remembered them by their name.

**Partial initiative to/from students**

In the Command style, all the decisions are taken by the teacher. On some occasions (which are nonetheless still categorised under command style), however, partial initiative was given to students. The reason for this categorisation is that the decisions the students were allowed to take were not considered enough for them to fit under another teaching style. Also, it seemed the teachers had particular expectations of the performances of their students. Decisions like this are presented here: *For the handball game he [the PE teacher] assigns two students as leaders and they chose the players of their teams* (O1b). During O2a *one of the students asks her [the PE teacher] to be the ‘hunter’ and she accepts.*
At the beginning of another game in O13b the students were named with a colour of their choice. Also, when presented with a choice, students chose to play football during O14a.

➢ **Practice style**

The Practice style is described as a style where the PE teacher takes decisions concerning the subject matter and the logistics of the lesson. The students are then called to make decisions concerning aspects such as the location of the task at hand, starting time, pace setting, stop time, break time (break from task), posture, when to ask clarifying questions, and appearance. This subtheme presents observed situations where some of the above-mentioned characteristics appeared during the lesson, making the teaching style less of the Command style and more in the Practice style.

**Partial initiative delegated to students and student initiative**

During O1a, while performing exercises as instructed, the students followed their own pace. Also, in the same lesson, while waiting for the speed test to finish:

> Some of the students ask for balls from the PE teacher and they play football or volleyball at a space aside which is indicated by the PE teacher until everybody finishes the test. Thereafter the boys divide themselves [in teams] in order to play football and the girls ask from the PE teacher a different ball in order to play volleyball. He gives them a suitable ball and the girls are forming teams by themselves (O1a).

After some time the girls linger but after a while they continue playing improvised games which relate to volleyball (O1a). During lesson O4b, students also took initiative: the boys in the meantime create goalposts using the cones in the basketball court and start playing football.

Also, in O6a some children (4) are taking 3 hula hoops [end?] and are going under a small shed where it is shady to play with them…The children set their own pace and play on their own. Later on, with the same children: the rest of the girls who were playing with the hula hoops are watching the football game because they fought with each other and abandoned the game (O6a). In O13a
during the division of two teams; the PE teacher designates two girls as leaders of the two teams and they start choosing the members for their teams. Also, a little later, the students organised the game they played on their own since they knew it (O13a). Finally, some students during lessons O5a and O8b made their own suggestions to their teachers concerning their choice of games.

**Demonstration**

Sometimes during the lessons, some of the teachers used their students as examples for correct exercise performance. Although the generic task was decided by the PE teachers e.g. stretching exercises, the order and the pace of performance was decided by the student whose example the rest had followed. During O9a, the teacher asks one [student] if she remembers them all [the exercises] and puts her in front of everybody to show and give the pace. Also, during O13a:

*The PE teacher prompts one of the girls (A) to start saying loudly “1-2-3 stretch” [exercise that includes hand stretching according to PE teacher’s instructions]. Children are following the rhythm of the girl.*

Lastly, during O5b, the teacher asked one of his students to show his/her peers what he had instructed them to do.

**Observational role and Minimal teacher involvement**

The teachers were also observed playing an observational role in some lessons. Teachers often tended to assume this role when games were being played. Additionally, during O13a, the teacher asked his students to solve a dispute and in this way he maintained minimum involvement in the game.

**4.3.3 Lesson**

This theme presents data that shows how the lessons were conducted and have to do with its structure, the subject matter, possible differentiation, safety, logistics and discipline, as well as peacemaking and group division. This theme, the mentioned subthemes and the second level codes from which they emerged are presented in Appendix 6.
Subject matter

A variety of subject matter have been described in the field notes. At the beginning of the lesson O1a the teacher announced the researcher that it was a test day and continued to perform speed tests with the students. Also, tests were conducted during the lesson O10b, where the teacher of the lesson performed stamina tests, not only with his students but the students of two more classes, since their teachers joined in and cooperated for the tests. Another common aspect found in some of the lessons was choreography rehearsals for the preparation of the end of school year celebrations. Rehearsals were sometimes the only focus the lesson, whereas in other occasions it was only a part. Learning directions was part of another lesson:

The reason [the students] are being confused is that learning orientation directions is part of the pedagogical process for this age group and this is the way of learning in physical education (O2b).

During O5a and O5b, the teacher was teaching his students to dribble with the basketball and shoot with it. Dribbling was also being taught during O8a. During O14a, students were learning the levels at which a movement could be performed. P15 and P9 were teaching their students to pass the ball to each other (O15a, O9a).

Game playing

Playing games was a vital part of most of the observed lessons. It was the part that students seemed to enjoy the most and asked for frequently. A number of the games observed during lessons were competitive. Variations of relay races were played during some lessons. Some other lessons included variations of chase. In O2a, students competed over who was going to roll their hula hoops the furthest. On other occasions, teams of students were competing against each other: it's a game with passes [of the ball]. The team with the more continuous passes among the players wins a point in every round (O9a). Other team games included variations of ‘mantilaki’, ‘datchball’, ‘mila’ (apples) and bowling. Some interesting non-competitive games/exercises were noticed.
during O5a and O7a. During O5a, students made a chain by touching parts of their bodies when ‘freezing’ in a posture:

> With every hit of the tambourine one child starts dancing and ‘freezes’ next to the PE teacher. They ‘freeze’ in one position until the last child comes and joins the chain.

In O7a the teacher asked her students to walk in a ‘funny’ way before they heard the whistle and stand by the ‘plates’ (sport equipment to show a spot on the ground). Then:

> [...] the game starts and she gives an instruction of ‘walking like a robot’. Whistling follows and she [the teacher] tells them to stand by the plates. After a few seconds, she gives another instruction. “Walk on your toes”; “walk like giants” …”Walk like dwarves, we bend the knees”…”walk like we are sad” (O7a).

Another game in O7a, although competitive, included a ‘play’ element:

> Every line [student from the line] will run around a ‘tree’, under a ‘bridge’, over a ‘rock’ and under a ‘bridge’ [again]’. The trees, the bridges, the rocks are made of children, with their bodies. All the children are playing simultaneously and are trying to run around over and under the obstacles.

Finally, during O12a, the students competed against a peer they were paired with and the goal was to push them out of their hula hoops.

**Rules of the game and Structure of the game**

Before and/or during the games the rules were set and/or imposed by the teachers. During O2a, the PE teacher says to the children who lose (when hit by the ball) to go out from the play area and at the same time she tells them where to wait. Later, in another game in the same lesson, it was made clear that when five goals are achieved the game finishes (O2a). In O2b, clear rules were also set:
The first players of each team ought to run to a predefined line of the court and return running, deliver the ballot to the next first player and go to the end of the line of their team.

During O5b:

*With the tambourine, the PE teacher sets the rhythm and the duration of the running while he shouts who are to start running every time (the boys or the girls); the rest stand where they are.*

As a result of the rules, most of these games had a structure which led many students out of the game when they lost. On some occasions, however, they did not necessarily have to wait until the game finished. In one game:

*The children who lose go out of the game and stand waiting for another child to catch an ‘apple’ [the ball] and choose them in order to go back into the game (O11a).*

On another occasion, the game simply did not last long, so the students did not have to wait much (O13a).

➢ **Differentiation**

**Differentiation and Flexibility**

Signs of differentiation were noted in some observations. During O5a, for example, the teacher *gives a student with SEN her own ball*. He also explained to an injured girl that *she shouldn’t play ball now and agreed to play [exchange] passes with her* (O5a). Later on in the lesson the teacher:

* [...] is occupied helping Niki [student with SEN]. He sets a distance among them [injured student and student with SEN] and they start exchanging passes and he also plays with them (O5a).*

Another teacher created a differentiated version of a competitive game so that students would not have to wait ‘out’ of the game when they lost.

Notes were also made concerning the flexibility that teachers showed on some occasions. During O7a the teacher asked one of her students with SEN who sat out “Are you tired?” *Helen answers yes and she [the PE teacher] tells her to*
rest. P13 chatted with a student with SEN while the rest of the students played and did not instruct him to join the game (O13b). Finally, during O13b, P13 showed flexibility when he managed to persuade his students to play a different game than the one they wanted:

*The PE teacher initially makes a joke and then he tells them “we had promised Chris that we will play ‘mantilaki’”. The children are convinced and are divided in teams by the PE teacher.*

➢ **Discipline**

Teachers set rules during the lesson and they expected their students to acknowledge them. This subtheme presents incidents when teachers tried to show their students what was expected of them. During O3a, for example, some of the girls had gone to the toilet:

*She [teacher] is waiting for the rest of the girls to come back and when a few seconds pass without them showing up she sends another girl to call them back. When the girls show up she tells them off for being late.*

In O5b *the girls start playing again and the PE teacher is heading towards the boys to put them in order since they don’t practice passing [the ball]. P13 counts to five [for children] to get into their line and the children do it (O13b). Also, during O15a and while they were waiting for the last students to come back from having some water: in the meantime, the PE teacher explains the rules of [good] behaviour of the class.*

Some of the teachers showed their students the implications of unwanted behaviour. During O8b the teacher says to a boy to go out and sit on a bench. *He tells him “do you think that I will occupy myself with you?”*. Lastly, during O12a the teacher acted as follows:

*At some point, he is telling off one of the children and for punishment he puts him to sit in the shade out of the game. After a while however he changes his mind and he asks him [the student] to go and gather the hula hoops from the court and take them to the store room.*
➢ Safety

The safety of the students seemed to concern most of the teachers during the observed lessons. Their main concern was to keep students hydrated, since the lessons were carried out under the sun and heat in summer. As a result, teachers were giving their students frequent breaks to drink water.

The field notes from O9a provide a better understanding of the weather conditions: they go again for water. It is very hot and they play in the sun. Teachers frequently sent their students to drink some water before, after, and even during their games or exercises. They also tried to give students time to rest and sit under the shade. During O4b, for example, the teacher gives the boys guidance and tells them that if they get tired they should go out of the game and go sit in the shade.

Additionally, teachers attended to their students’ safety in different ways. During O1a the PE teacher says to a girl, “come Maria, would you like to tie your shoelace?” Similarly, in O8a the PE teacher is telling them off [some students] for the shoes they wear since they are not suitable for the PE lesson and shows them which are the right shoes for the lesson.

Two of the teachers did not seem to worry much about their students’ safety, however. In O4b the teacher doesn’t have visual contact with the girls but she doesn’t seem to worry. Also, P1 left the yard for some time leaving the students by themselves (O1b).

➢ Logistics

Logistics

During the lessons, teachers often devoted time to set up the sports equipment in order for the students to perform the exercises and/or play. As a result, there are many field notes that show them taking on these tasks. In O2b during the break (3-4 minutes) the children sit on the ground to rest and the PE teacher brings from the side of the court the hula hoops, the cones and the small balls. In addition, in O5b the PE teacher stretches out the dishes (plastic sign poles of dish shape) to create different spaces in the court.
Task delegation

Although the teachers tried to prepare all the material necessary for their lessons, they also tried to involve the students in the process. P3, for example, sends one of the children to bring a ball and two cones from the side of the court (O3b). P8 sends a child to bring the cones from the store room (O8b). Similarly, P9 sent two of his students to bring sports equipment from the store room (O9a). Finally, during O9a and O12a, both teachers asked their students to gather all the sports equipment at the end of the lesson and return it to the store room.

➢ Peace-making

Another issue faced by teachers during their lessons was student animosity. Students often antagonised each other and fought during the lesson and the teachers were usually there to help resolve the situation. During O3a the teacher resolves possible disputes among students by asking them questions and waiting for answers that will help shed light on the situation. Similarly, during O4b the teacher prompts students to play well and solves issues that come up during the game. Finally, during O11a, the teachers observing the game being played at the moment interfere only when the children cannot find a solution on their own.

➢ Structure of the lesson

Most of the observed lessons followed a more or less similar basic structure. At the beginning of the lesson and after students gathered for the lesson there was an initial part that could be characterised as ‘warm up’. During this part, most of the teachers chose to instruct their students to jog in lines, usually around the periphery of the court or the yard, or to perform exercises involving jogging or running:

The bell is ringing and the students are coming slowly towards the basketball court where the PE teacher is (O10a);

The PE teacher asks the students to create lines at the yard and he shows them where [exactly] (O8b);

The students start running around the basketball court (O11a).
Following jogging were the stretching and/or strengthening exercises:

_Then he asks them to spread out in the space at the back of the court where there is shade and starts showing them stretching exercises_ (O1a); 

_She [PE teacher] gives instruction for the performance of stretching and strengthening exercises_ (O3a); 

After stretching exercises had been performed the main part of the lesson followed. This usually involved learning or practicing a skill through exercises or play and games. The final part was usually called ‘cooling down’ and involved lower energy activities, stretching, and sometimes a brief summary of the learning subject of the day by the teacher:

_They are sitting all together and they are doing the cooling down part in a circle according to the instructions of the PE teacher: Inhaling, exhaling, standing, stretching … “We take our bottles and [we go] to class”_ (O5a); 

_The PE teacher is gathering all the children close to him. He sums up what they did today and why. Where is this useful? In basketball, in handball, everywhere?_ (O9a). 

This part did not appear in most teachers’ lessons, however. In fact, most of them were either sending and/or escorting the students to their next class or sending them to have their break as soon as it was time for the PE lesson to end:

_The PE teacher after a while announces the end of the lesson. She tells the children to drink water and go for a break_ (O3a); 

_End of the lesson and the children return the balls to the PE teacher and go for their break_ (O8b); 

**4.3.4 School provision**

This theme presents data that shows the existing provisions in the schools. The findings in this theme are presented according to the subthemes: school facilities; sport equipment; unattended students, and number of students (Appendix 6).
➢ **School facilities**

A number of observation notes referred to the locations where the lessons were conducted. Most lessons were conducted in the school yard. In some of these yards there were basketball poles and/or volleyball nets, but not in all of them. On one occasion one of the observed teachers, who was sharing the yard with another teacher, moved his students to a different space so that the other class would have space as well (O10b).

As observed in O1a and O4b, teachers used a tree shadow as a space for rest and stationary exercises in an effort to protect students from the sun. A few lessons were conducted indoors in rooms especially designed for school celebrations (events hall). The event hall was obviously unsuitable for a PE lesson since it was full of chairs and tables (O12b).

➢ **Sports equipment**

A shortage of sports equipment was observed in many lessons. One teacher was quite protective of it, since she warned students playing with some balls not to lose them because they would need to fundraise to replace them if something like that happened (O3a). Another teacher used sport equipment which was torn or broken (O5b) and others improvised, using outdoor big plastic cones and some volleyballs as material for indoor bowling on a rainy day (O11b).

➢ **Unattended students**

One unattended student with SEN was observed in three of the PE lessons, conducted by two teachers working in the same school. This student was wandering in the yard (O3b), watching the lesson (O3b, O10a) or seeking attention from the PE teacher (O3b).

During O3a, the teacher had to attend to some other students that should not have been in the yard at that moment:

> At this moment there are in the yard space children from another class without teacher supervision. They play with a school ball and because the PE teacher sees the danger of the ball going out of the school fence, shouts at them to draw attention to them so that they won't lose the ball.
➢ Number of students

During the observations notes were taken regarding the number of students present in each lesson. One lesson had 11 students present and another 25. In the majority of the lessons observed the number students attending the lesson was between 14 and 18. Finally, there were two lessons in which the students were more than 30 or 40, since two or three classes were performing choreography rehearsals together.

4.3.5 Students

This section provides an account of the students’ behaviour and feelings as they were being observed during the PE lessons. The subthemes and second level codes of this theme are presented in Appendix 6.

➢ Student behaviour

Student behaviour is presented in two parts. The first part involves the behaviour of students without SEN and the second part the behaviour of students with SEN during lessons.

Students without SEN were sometimes observed trying to avoid an activity during the lesson. Field notes of lesson O3b include the following: \textit{all students play apart from 2 who hide in order to avoid the game}. During performing stationary exercises in O7a:

\[\text{[...]one boy named Theo is walking in front of everybody and looks bored. “Come here Theo” the teacher tells him. He walks away but he returns immediately when the exercise finishes.}\]

Later in the same lesson something similar was observed:

\[\text{One little child is standing with his ‘plate’ [sport equipment] behind the basketball poll and seems to be hiding. I am not sure for how long it’s been there (O7a).}\]

Another girl during O1b participated in a game until she walked away and sat down watching it. Some students seemed to attempt to trick their teachers (O11a, O14a). One student during O14a, for example, was procrastinating on her way to the toilet. In O4b, a student seemed to find it difficult to keep up with
his peers’ pace of running, while in O14a another student looked distracted and he performed some of the exercises but not all of them. Finally, one boy is out of the game (after having lost) and looks distractedly at the hula hoops (O2a).

When it came to students with SEN, a few of them were observed wandering away or getting distracted by their surroundings. During O4a, for example, one of the students is wandering outside his position and walks back and forth. He seems to be talking to himself. Another student with SEN was observed during O9a:

*While the rest of the children are helping and chatting Ben is alone in the little garden … after a while he starts playing chase with a boy.*

In O12b, the student with SEN was observed looking distractedly at maps hanging at the walls of the room where the lesson was conducted. Also, in O3a and O3b, one student with SEN was observed not following instructions in the way the rest of the students were or even bending them: Dean keeps standing up and changing positions. He is not sitting on the floor like the rest of the children (O3b). The same student was observed doing a completely different activity: 12:10. One of the boys is leaving to go to the toilet but returns holding a fairy tale book. 12:13 (O3b). He later played in a game holding this book or sitting on the floor looking at it without paying attention to the game being played (O3b). Others participated in the games and exercises in their own way. Some students were observed to run slower than their peers and be out of line while running, while others were passive during games. Another student with SEN appeared indifferent: one boy is walking behind everybody else, at the end. He doesn’t seem to care to follow (O13b).

#### Student feelings

Under this subtheme, a variety of student reactions to various situations are presented.

Firstly, many students were observed expressing confusion while learning orienteering in one of the exercises during O2b. A whole class showed their excitement with shouts while taking positions in order to start playing a game during O11a. A student with SEN hugged her peer while rehearsing: Helen is doing the same [dancing] and she occasionally hugs her partner out of
enthusiasm (O7b). Similar feelings seemed to be present in another student with SEN in O12b:

Nikos seems to have fun. He stands on the line along with the rest of the students and looks at his peers in order to do the right movements since he doesn’t seem to remember which movements follow next.

Another student with SEN in O9a showed his happiness by laughing while passing the ball and participating in an exercise. Finally, in O13a, a girl with SEN showed happiness when she won during a game.

4.3.6 Teacher

During the observations, teachers and PE teachers cooperated with each other. Furthermore, many interactions with their students appeared in the observation notes and were categorised under the subtheme ‘teacher/student interaction’. The subthemes and second level codes under the theme ‘Teacher’ are presented in Appendix 6.

➢ Teacher interaction and cooperation

Simple cases of teacher interaction were noticed in some of the lessons. In O3b, for example, when students played, the PE teacher momentarily chatted with the class teacher. In O10b, the PE teacher of the lesson under observation was having separate and small conversations with the two other PE teachers in the school who were conducting their lessons in the yard at the same time. On other occasions PE teachers cooperated with their colleagues. The observation notes from O4a show such an occasion:

In this lesson the PE teacher cooperates with the teacher of the class in order to turn a fairy tale into a children’s play and present it at the end of the year in front of the whole school.

During O10b, two PE teachers in the school decided to cooperate with the third PE teacher who was teaching the observed lesson and performed the same tests with their students while assisting him. On a rainy day, two PE teachers in another school decided to cooperate in order to effectively fit their students in the small room they were in:
In the meantime, Year 2 enters the small gym accompanied by the other PE teacher of the school. Students [of Year 6] stop running and all students from both Year 2 and Year 6 are divided by the PE teachers into two mixed teams with children from both classes (O11b).

Finally, in O9a the PE teacher:

leaves for a while the students alone in order to go to the other side of the court to help the other PE teacher who asked for his assistance.

➢ Teacher/student interaction

The teacher/student interaction events that were included in the observation notes are not that many, especially considering the number of the observations that took place in this study (28). They were noticed and noted by the researcher, however, and they indicate how and why students and teachers interact with each other.

During a speed test in O1a at the end of the route the PE teacher keeps notes and discusses briefly with each child their results. The teacher in O2a tied the shoelaces of some of the children that asked her to. In O3b, students with and without SEN asked their teacher repeatedly during a game to choose the number they represented during play. In O3b and O6a, the teachers took care of and comforted students who fell and got injured. In O8a and O11a, teachers asked their students the reason why they did not participate in the lesson and chose to sit out. During O11b, the two PE teachers who shared a room for their lessons cooperated due to its small size. A large number of students also cooperated to keep all of their students busy and happy, including a student with SEN: the PE teachers are watching the game and keep Leo busy; he at the moment is holding and playing with a bead necklace that was given to him.

4.3.7 Environment

This theme was created to include situations that affected the lesson and/or originated from external factors to a usual PE lesson. The subthemes and second level codes which emerged from the findings and have been categorised under this theme are presented in Appendix 6.
➢ Parent interference

In O1b, the PE teacher informed me that the child with SEN that was away during the student gathering had been taken home by his mother before the school day ended, at her own initiative. A second similar incident involved the father of one student with SEN who approached the fence of the school yard during the PE lesson and started chatting with his son, who had also approached the fence because of the presence of his father (O13b).

➢ Weather conditions

A common note made in a few observations was that the weather conditions seemed to affect the students and the decisions that teachers made concerning their safety. During O4b:

*The PE teacher approaches me [the researcher] and talks to me regarding the difficult conditions under which the lesson is conducted in the sun and heat.*

Notes from other lessons included the following:

*They are going again for water. It’s very hot and they play in the sun* (O9a), ‘

*Everybody participates although they seem tired by the sun* (O10a),

4.3.8 Role of the researcher

This theme was created to capture a variety of interactions I as the researcher had with the PE teachers and students. The subtheme and second level codes are presented in Appendix 6.

➢ PE teacher/researcher interaction

In a number of observations some of the participant teachers approached me and described to me either their lesson and incidents within it or their students with SEN behaviour. The following observation notes are representative:

*The PE teacher cannot be seen from the yard; he returns and tells me that the child he was trying to find, was picked up by his mother. The child is identified with SEN* (O1b)
As the children regroup at the end of the game, the PE teacher comes to me and starts describing Natalie to me: “She participates, it didn’t take her long time to do all these [exercises, games], she is only afraid of playing some of the games” (O13a).

Additionally, two of the PE teachers that approached me and started talking to me later asked me not to disclose what was discussed at the time (O1b, O14a).

➢ Student/researcher interaction

One of the teachers announced the researcher’s presence to the students as a visitor observing the lesson at the beginning of the lesson. Lastly, a number of students mostly with SEN approached the researcher out of curiosity to ask questions or observe her closely.
5. DISCUSSION CHAPTER

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter set out the findings of the study. This chapter discusses aspects of the research findings in relation to relevant theory and research. Findings have been summarised and categorised in clusters which serve as main points of discussion under each research question. The following table (Table 12) illustrates the connections between the research questions and the discussion topics and gives an outline of the main discussion sections to follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Main topics of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion? (Section 5.2)</td>
<td>• Ways of understanding inclusion (section 5.2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of language related to SEN (section 5.2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What influences Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion? (Section 5.3)</td>
<td>• Kinds, challenges and suggestions regarding inclusion implementation and SEN provision. (section 5.2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student-related drawbacks and benefits of inclusion (section 5.3.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher related factors affecting perceptions and challenges to inclusion (section 5.3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reported challenges to inclusion in the educational environment (section 5.3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The nature of the PE lesson (section 5.3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What inclusive practices are implemented in the PE lesson? (Section 5.4)</td>
<td>• Inclusive practice (section 5.4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the teaching styles that Greek PE teachers use during lesson? (Section 5.5)</td>
<td>• Knowledge and use of teaching styles (section 5.5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the connections between the use of teaching styles and understandings of inclusion? (Section 5.6)</td>
<td>• Connections between the use of teaching styles and understandings of inclusion/ inclusive practice (section 5.6.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Main topics of discussion according to research question.

A summary of related findings is therefore presented at the beginning of each of the following sections before proceeding to further detailed discussion.

5.2 What are Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?

Findings relating to the first research question are summarised below under separate clusters of interest.

- **Ways of understanding inclusion**
  
  Teachers understood inclusion as:
• A slow process.
• “the effort of an organised society” (P11).
• Social participation.
• Peer acceptance.
• Students with SEN being able to do the same things as their peers.
• Adjustment of practice.
• The ‘inclusive class’ (a class in a Greek mainstream school which students with SEN can attend with a suitable group and/or personalised curriculum for no more than 15 school hours per week).

• Use of language related to SEN
While talking about their understandings of inclusion, many teachers talked about students with SEN using the words:
• ‘Normal’ (with reference to their perceived norm)
• ‘Educable’ (in comparison to the rest of the students) and
• ‘Problem’ (to refer to special educational needs).

• Kinds, challenges and suggestions regarding inclusion, implementation, and SEN provision.
Teachers reported that responsibility to implement inclusion lay with:
• The teacher of the ‘inclusive class’.
• Each teacher according to their willingness.

Teachers’ views of current inclusion implementation:
• Inclusion does not fulfil its (perceived) purpose in the way it is implemented in Greece.
• Inclusion is not implemented effectively.
• Teaching students with SEN in a separate class cannot be considered inclusion.
• ‘Inclusive classes’ function at the expense of the schools they are part of.

Teachers’ suggestions regarding their ideal ways of implementing inclusion:
Students with SEN should attend special schools to learn some skills before going to mainstream schools.

Students with SEN should be taught PE separately and then attend the mainstream lesson with parallel (human) support.

Students with SEN should be taught in very small groups of students or one-to-one.

Students with SEN to attend the ‘inclusive classes’ for the majority of the school day initially and gradually attend the mainstream class.

Suggestions regarding SEN provision:

- Students with mild learning difficulties could attend mainstream schools.
- Students with severe learning difficulties should only attend special schools or the ‘inclusive classes’.

The three clusters of findings are discussed below in the light of the first research question and in relation with relevant literature.

5.2.1 Ways of understanding inclusion

It is well established in the literature that there are different interpretations of the concept and term ‘inclusion’ and that this lack of consistency is a source of confusion for practitioners (Florian, 2014; Göransson and Nilholm, 2014; Norwich, 2013; Paliokosta and Blandford, 2010). This section discusses in detail the seven different ways that inclusion was understood by the Greek PE teachers in this study.

In this study, teachers understood inclusion as:

1. A slow process:

Commentators often suggest that inclusion is a process rather than a state (Corbett, 2001; Koutrouba et al., 2008; Morley et al., 2005; Pirrie and Head, 2007; Zoniou-Sideri and Vlachou, 2006). Corbett (2001), especially, discusses inclusion as an “active” process (p. 55). She suggested that an “effective inclusive school” involves:
a shared vision by the school team (teachers, LSAs, governors and parents); enthusiastic leadership by committed, experienced and skilled senior teachers; appropriate levels of resourcing; and an open receptivity to learning new skills and trying out whatever strategies seem to be useful (Corbett, 2001, p. 58).

Indeed, the PE teachers in this study suggested that a number of factors affected the implementation of inclusion in their schools, ranging from headteachers’ awareness and determination, their knowledge and training, the equipment provided for PE, and the Greek state and its legislation. Since the definition of ‘process’ involves actions or steps taken in order to achieve something, in this case inclusion, teachers essentially identified some of these steps. PE teachers, therefore, seemed to understand that inclusion requires the involvement of many parties both inside and outside the school environment. It therefore seems reasonable to argue that inclusion cannot be anything other than a process, since achieving inclusion requires time, multiple parties, and collective effort.


P11 described inclusion as the collective effort of an organised society. In the Greek context, the education system is centralised, with all levels of education falling under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, Research and Religious Affairs. As a result, all schools act and are expected to perform according to the legislation relevant to each type of school. If legislation requires changes to how ‘inclusive classes’ operate, for example, all mainstream schools with inclusive classes are expected to implement these changes. Additionally, although teacher training is provided at local authority level, it is governed centrally. Finally, school equipment is provided by the state, which means that financial issues at state level are reflected sooner or later in schools’ infrastructure and equipment. Schools’ prosperity thus depends solely upon the state and its legislation.

Regarding inclusion and its implementation in Greece, concerns have been expressed over the years by a number of Greek authors. Although the legislation regarding inclusion is supportive, the fact that as criticised is not ‘straightforward’ is reflected in practice (Fyssa et al., 2014, p. 224). Fyssa et al.
suggest, for example, that the most recent legislation on Special Education (Law 3699/2008) reflects “a narrow deficit-oriented perspective that emphasises individual deficits and the need for their remediation, thus obstructing the institutional restructuring needed for genuine inclusion” (p. 224). Even before the implementation of this latest legislation, concerns had been expressed over the categorisation of children with disabilities and how this might hinder inclusion (Zoniou-Sideri and Vlachou, 2006). Teachers of this study repeatedly expressed their disapproval of the way SEN provision operates in Greece, with P13 highlighting that the “half measures” employed by the Greek state would lead to incomplete provision. It therefore seems that an organised society and especially an organised state affect inclusion. Inclusion in Greece, it seems, would benefit from clearer legislation (which would then be reflected in the curriculum, school policies and organisation, teacher training and infrastructure).

3. Social participation:
The understanding of inclusion as ‘being part of society’ included a variety of social contexts, but more commonly it referred to the school environment (students cooperating, playing with each other, and participating in lessons). As Vlachou and Fyssa (2016) suggest, “inclusion supports the right of every child, regardless of ability, to participate as a full and equal member in a broad range of activities” (p. 1). For Grenier (2010), inclusion is about the “active participation of all students in the school culture” (p. 388). Indeed, teachers suggested that cooperation between and participation of students in play and their socialisation were important factors for inclusion. Also, during many of the PE lessons, students with and without SEN were observed socialising and cooperating with each other. On the other hand, a lack of socialisation and cooperation was often observed to have a negative effect on students’ participation in lessons.

Social participation relates to the ‘social model of disability’ in that societal understandings of disability can affect social participation. Social model understandings have been criticised for not accepting the notion that it is not just society’s understandings of disability that affect social participation but also an individual’s impairment in itself (Koch, 2001). On the other hand, advocates of the medical model tend to deny the social factors that affect disability (Koch,
This is the so called ‘disability paradox’ which highlights a separation in the understandings between the terms ‘disability’ and ‘impairment’ (Koch, 2001). A newer model of disability, the ‘bio-psycho-social model’ offers a different perspective in the understanding of these terms (Norwich, 2010). According to this model, social participation depends on a combination of social and individual factors. As a result, students’ with SEN participation in school (and thus in the PE lesson, which according to PE teachers involves cooperation and play with their peers and participation in the lessons) depends on how their peers and teachers view and/or accommodate them and also on the ways in which their impairment/s affects their participation.

4. Peer acceptance

The findings showed that the teachers recognised peer acceptance as an important factor affecting inclusion. On a few occasions, teachers discussed how students embraced their peers with SEN (although some did so reluctantly at the beginning) but there were also teachers who suggested that peer acceptance was sometimes conditional.

Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012) suggest that “positive peer relationship[s]” can be essential to fostering an inclusive pedagogical approach (p. 579). They demonstrate that such positive peer relationships should be encouraged by teachers while organising group collaboration assignments. Other literature also suggests that "successful integration of children with disabilities into mainstream classes depends on peer acceptance and on positive interactions between the children and their classmates" (Laws et al., 2012, p. 74; Soulis et al., 2016). In mentioning the acceptance of students with SEN by their peers as one of their understandings of inclusion, teachers therefore seem to have pinpointed one of its important parameters. Peer acceptance as an understanding of inclusion strongly relates to the understanding of inclusion as social participation. Social participation, however, depends at least partially upon peer acceptance.

Symes and Humphrey (2010) explored peer rejection and found that students with autistic spectrum disorders (ASD) are more likely to experience exclusion from peers than students with dyslexia or without SEN. Similarly, Laws et al. (2012) found in their study that peer rejection was more common for students with ASD than students with language difficulties. The main factor was that
students with ASD often lack the ability to socialise. Furthermore, some
behavioural difficulties in students with ASD hindered their acceptance by their
peers. Laws et al. (2012) also suggested that placing students with SEN into
mainstream classes instead of language resource bases (LRBs) was somewhat
beneficial in terms of peer acceptance. It seems that peer acceptance and
social interaction are major factors in successful inclusive practice for students
with SEN (McAllister and Hadjri, 2013). It would seem, however, that more
attention should be paid to the potential tensions which may result from placing
students with SEN in mainstream environments, since a simple geographical
placement might not have the desired outcomes (McAllister and Hadjri, 2013).
After all one aspect of ‘genuine inclusion’ as suggested by Vehmas (2010)
involves:

(1he) interpersonal inclusion in social life which means being included in
concrete events and contexts of interaction though the attitudes or
attention by relevant others who also partakers in them – that is, to be
respected, valued and loved by other people (p. 95).

5. Students with SEN being able to do the same things as their peers
Mackay suggests that one of the reasons that disability can be “removed
unhelpfully from [the] educational debate” is the notion that “everyone can be
cured” (2002, p. 159 & 162). This notion relates to the understandings of the
medical model of disability, which suggest that “disability can be taken away”
(MacKay, 2002, p. 162) and also to the understandings of the teachers in this
study, which assumed that all students can - eventually – do the same things in
a lesson, perform the same and play the same without any difficulties. Such an
assumption does not take into consideration students’ differences, however,
especially since not all types of disabilities or impairments allow students with
SEN to act and/or behave exactly like their peers. The types of interactions that
are required from students, especially in PE lessons, might make different types
of disability more visible compared to other school subjects. A student with a
hearing impairment might face different challenges in the PE lesson compared
to a literacy lesson, for example.

The recognition of difference in students with SEN is accompanied by
complexities, however. P13, for example, suggested that one of his students
with SEN was not participating in a game because of her fear of a speeding ball. Also, for P6 and P14 some of their students with SEN who had hearing impairments caused communication difficulties. The visibility of the disability (or not) can be a reason for complexity; in school and in PE lessons in particular, certain types of disability can become more obvious. As Davis (2005) suggests, individuals with ‘visible’ types of disability are more likely to be stigmatised. Yet for Davis (2005), even when disability is not visible and thus not obvious through casual social interaction, individuals “are subjects to forms of rejections, humiliation, and social disapproval that are importantly similar” to stigmatisation (p. 154). The recognition of difference in a positive, non-demeaning way can secure access to educational provision, however. As a result, failing to recognise disability and difference as part of a school’s diverse population might lead to limiting the educational opportunities open to students with SEN (MacKay, 2002; Norwich, 2008a). In an attempt to balance the danger of stigmatisation, MacKay (2002) suggests: “Our job is not to make disability go away, nor pretend that it is not there. Instead, it is to respect its complexity, and respond to it with honesty, vision and intelligence” (p. 162). This reflects a ‘bio-psycho-social model of disability’ approach.

6. Adjustment of practice
Although some of the teachers in this study suggested that they did not change their lessons, plans, and practice in general because of teaching students with SEN, others suggested that inclusion is about adjustment of practice. Teachers were actually observed occasionally adjusting their practice, for example one of the students’ favourite games, in order to become more inclusive.

Teachers’ understanding of inclusion as adjustment of practice is often reflected in the literature (Florian, 2014; Paliokosta and Blandford, 2010; Frederickson and Cline, 2009). Florian (2014) suggests that an inclusive environment should be able to provide choices to all students through differentiation. Additionally, Frederickson and Cline (2009) place the goal of differentiation, which is described as “delivery of the curriculum [according] to the needs of each pupil”, alongside the process of inclusion (p. 140). Paliokosta and Blandford (2010) argue, however, that differentiation should not be considered just in terms of addressing SEN. They suggest that teachers’ good subject knowledge, school resources, relevant material, and lesson planning are essential for meeting the
needs of all students (Paliokosta and Blandford, 2010). The teachers in this study indeed suggested that a lack of suitable equipment and infrastructure due to financial hardship in their schools had caused them difficulties in their lessons. Also, their cautious use of the national curriculum in their lesson planning revealed another layer of difficulties relating to state-level organisation. According to teachers, the national curriculum is unrealistic considering the current state of the nation’s schools. However, had teachers engaged with their guide books (‘Teacher’s books’, see section 2.2.1) more actively, I believe they would have given themselves more options regarding the implementation of successful inclusive lessons (further discussion on this matter is included in section 5.3.4). After all, some ‘guidance for students with SEN’ was given in these books along with options for differentiation, for example ‘personalised exercises’ according to students’ abilities (Digellidis et al., 2006; Mpournelli et al., 2006a; Mpourneli et al., 2006b).

Differentiation of the lesson is also considered one of the goals of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles specifically through the use of the Inclusion Style. Findings of this study, though, revealed that this style was not used in the observed lessons since an occasional adjustment of one game in a lesson does not allow for such a conclusion to be drawn. Teachers who adjusted their practice, however, did comply with two of the subject matter objectives of the Inclusion Style. These are “to accommodate individual performance differences” and “to increase the quality time-on-task” (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 156). However, inclusion in PE according to Mosston and Ashworth (2002) can be achieved only when “frequent successful participation of every student” is achieved “by creating conditions for multiple entry points” in the lesson (p. 165).

Finally, P3 revealed that on one occasion a student with SEN, who was not supposed to be there, came into her class. This caused her difficulties and disrupted the lesson, since she did not know who was responsible for the safety and wellbeing of this child. Referring to the issues of responsibilities of teachers as a parameter of differentiation, Paliokosta and Blandford (2010) suggest that “ineffective communication between adults can be a serious barrier to the development of inclusive cultures” (p. 183).
7. The ‘inclusive class’ (a class in a mainstream school which students with SEN can attend with a suitable group and/or personalised curriculum for no more than 15 school hours per week).

During the interviews, many teachers suggested that inclusion is the ‘inclusive class’ itself and described its function. P10, for example, described it as the class where students go in order to “overcome their problem”. PE lessons in Greece are not, however, usually located in a classroom and definitely not in an ‘inclusive class’ space.

The teachers are obviously confused here. In Greek, the ‘inclusive class’ is called ‘τάξη ένταξης’, which if translated word by word means ‘class of inclusion’. The name itself, combined with “conflicting and contradictory policies and practices that hinder…inclusion” (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006, p. 289), seems to be the main cause of this confusion, even before the latest legislation was introduced regarding special education (Law 3699, Greek Government, 2008). The teachers in this study seem to have been receiving contradictory or insufficient information and training for years. It is not surprising that a recent study by Fyssa et al (2014) in Greece revealed that a significant percentage of the teachers considered withdrawal programmes (to an ‘inclusive class’) to be an effective and appropriate form of inclusion of students with SEN. The overall confusion highlights an outdated fear expressed by Zoniou-Sideri et al. in 2006: “the official policy of ‘inclusion’ that characterizes Greek education during the last 20 years or so is translated into a steady expansion of special provision” (p. 285). Given that the PE teachers in this study understood inclusion as being the ‘inclusive class’, it seems that the Greek educational system has not eliminated the ‘discontinuities’ of legislation and inclusion implementation previously mentioned by Zoniou-Sideri et al. (2006). As a result and given the centralised educational system, efforts should focus on clarifying not only the term ‘inclusion’ but also the legislation of the Greek educational system.

In conclusion, the teachers of this study understood inclusion in ways that agree with international literature on the subject, but also in ways that are unique to the educational context of this study. All of the ways in which the term ‘inclusion’ was understood, however, shed light on current comprehensions of it and point to possible connections with the educational practice of inclusion.
5.2.2 Use of language related to SEN

During the interviews, many teachers talked about students with SEN using the words ‘normal’ (with reference to their perceived norm), ‘educable’ (in comparison to the rest of the students), and ‘problem’ (to refer to special educational needs).

Brisenden (1986) suggests that “the language used and the situation in which it is expressed will determine the message that goes out to those listening” (p. 174). Labels regarding SEN therefore usually express stereotypical ideas of disability which usually stem from the medical model. Norwich (1999) suggests labels have a variety of uses which can only be examined through “their histories and their contexts” (p. 179). When P14 discussed his student with SEN using the phrase “if the child is educable”, this showed a medical model-based understanding. The inherent assumptions in this model of disability could lead someone to the conclusion that an individual with SEN might not be able to participate in education for reasons that relate to the individual and the individual only. Additionally, the word ‘normal’ in education has been associated with ‘unproblematic’ situations (McDonnell, 2000). McDonnell suggests, however, that societies should not overlook the fact that the interpretations and the meanings of “normal are usually controlled and imposed by ‘powerful social groups’” (p. 22). As a result, this type of talk can be associated with negative connotations and can stigmatise individuals with SEN.

On the other hand, labelling has also been associated with additional knowledge regarding SEN and better access to provision (Norwich, 2008a). Additionally, labelling can contribute to an individual’s identity formation. Stets and Burke (2000) suggest that “through a social comparison process, persons who are similar to the self are categorized with the self and are labelled the in-group; persons who differ from the self are categorized as the out-group” (p. 225). An illuminating example as to that is provided from the ‘deaf communities’; deaf individuals, with the help of the educational systems in some countries, recognise ‘deafness’ as a status acquired because of this particular disability (Hyde and Power, 2006, p. 56). As a result schooling might be partially segregated for many deaf students, but by their own choice, not because they are being excluded (Hyde and Power, 2006).
The aforementioned terms used by teachers of this study along with their understanding of inclusion as the ‘inclusive class’ indicate that their general understanding tends to come from the medical model of disability. Such understandings in Greece derive from unfocused legislation regarding the educational system, which leaves teachers uninformed and possibly confused. As mentioned in the literature review (section 2.1.3), Greek legislation regarding special education has been heavily criticised as ineffective and inadequate (Fyssa et al., 2014; Vlachou, 2006; Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005; Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006). Although Greece is one of the countries considering inclusion as a basic educational goal, successive laws contradict one another or introduce new terminology without explanations on its specific use and purpose (Zoniou-Sideri et al. 2005). New terminology without explanations, followed by non-existent or at least not communicated change (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005) may lead to confusion as observed in the present study (see section 5.2.3 below). However, unexplained terminology from legislation is not the only factor contributing to ‘outdated’ teachers’ notions in this study. Practical factors relate to teachers’ training and continuous professional development (CPD). On a legislative level the school consultants responsible for teachers’ CPD are often allocated with such a large number of schools that CPD is not achievable (Salmond and Gioka, 2013). In addition a lack of school consultants’ assessment of performance by the state (Salmond and Gioka, 2013) probably gives them the freedom to act on their own initiative and priorities. Whether, such an allocation is due to legislator’s lack of thoughtfulness and/or due to the country’s current financial state are questions which could be explored in another study. Regarding teachers’ training, however, PE teachers in Greece are required by law to have higher education degrees in PE from one of the five Schools of Physical Education and Sport Science in Greece. It could be argued that the majority of Greek PE teachers have a lack of training regarding issues related to inclusion, partially attributed to legislative ineffectiveness/indifference, since only three of the above mentioned Schools provide compulsory modules relating to adapted PE, with a clear focus on the pathology of special educational needs instead of inclusive teaching. (Further issues regarding teachers’ training are discussed in section 5.3.2). Teachers could benefit from terminology clarifications and parallel and consistent organisational changes,
which would be reflected in initial PE teacher training, CPD, then practice and thus in everyday implementation of inclusion.

5.2.3 Kinds, challenges and suggestions regarding inclusion implementation and SEN provision

Teachers of this study suggested that inclusion was either dependent on the teacher of the ‘inclusive class’ or on each teacher’s “goodwill”. In 2000, Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris wrote about the education of students with SEN in Greece: “In practice, the quality of children’s education has been merely dependent on the nature and degree of teachers’ commitment and goodwill” (p. 38). It is remarkable how this comment is still supported by teachers more than 10 years later. The same authors suggest, however, that “the nature and degree of teachers’ commitment” is influenced by the environment and contexts of their work (Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000, p. 38). Teachers of this study have also expressed the complexities and challenges of inclusion in various ways and have also referred to the political, cultural, school, and personal dimensions of its implementation. Indeed, Lawson et al. (2006) suggested that attitudes towards the implementation of inclusion could be seen as “constructed outcomes of social interactions” (p. 56). It is also suggested that teachers beliefs, knowledge and ideals, as seen through a social constructivist lens, “influence their actions in the implementation of inclusive schooling” (Zoniou-Sideri and Vlachou, 2006, p. 383). The tendency of teachers in general (and teachers in this study in particular) to approach and implement inclusion in different ways according to their own understandings can be attributed to a lack of clarity on policy, cultural factors, and personal assumptions, which affect not only teachers but also the notions of disability held by wider society.

The teachers in this study perceived that the way in which Greece has implemented inclusion was not fulfilling the purpose it was intended for. Teachers suggested not only that there were contradictions in government policies, but also that the existing policies did not promote inclusion. P11, for example, suggested that students with SEN being withdrawn into a separate class “is not inclusion”. Additionally, teachers reported that the way in which inclusion is implemented was not effective. This disbelief and dissatisfaction is not new. Coutsocostas and Alborz’s (2010) study revealed that a large majority
of Greek teachers not only believed that “education was not successfully implemented in Greece” but that that one out of three teachers believed that “inclusive education for all pupils with SEN was not an achievable goal” (p. 154). An earlier study conducted in 2004 also highlighted PE teachers’ doubts about the effectiveness of the implementation of inclusion in Greece (Papadopoulou et al., 2004). This study was, however, conducted in 2004, before the implementation of the latest legislation regarding special education in 2008 (Law 3699/2008). The lack of change identified by the PE teachers in this study probably explains their negative attitudes. Not all of them thought the same about inclusion, however. P14, focusing on the inclusive practices in his school, suggested that inclusion had been successful where he worked. Previous studies conducted after 2008 have suggested that PE teachers' attitudes towards inclusion were mainly ‘positive’ or ‘moderate’ (Doulkeridou et al., 2011; Mousouli et al., 2009). On some occasions, however, Greek teachers’ attitudes were affected by the type and/or severity of students’ SEN (Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou, 2014).

The essential issue of the placement of students with SEN has been discussed by several authors and is considered to be a key dilemma surrounding inclusion (Frederickson and Cline, 2009; Norwich, 2008b; Hyde and Power, 2006; Booth et al., 2000; Warnock et al., 2010). The notion that inclusion can be achieved by placing individuals with SEN in mainstream environments has been heavily criticised, since it does not take into consideration the complexities of inclusion: “inclusion should mean much more that the mere physical presence of pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools” (Topping and Maloney, 2005, p. 5). One reason for this is given by Bayliss (1995) who emphasises the importance of participation in the social context under conditions of equality: “true equality of participation requires interdependence between peers, where meaningful relationships arise out of joint activity” (p. 131). The creation of an environment which can accommodate students’ social needs therefore seems to be more important than simple student placement in mainstream environment.

Teachers in this study actually suggested that students with SEN should be helped to prepare for school before attending mainstream schools either by initially attending special schools or the ‘inclusive classes’ until they are ready.
Other suggestions included teaching PE on a one-to-one basis, in small groups, or initially on a one-to-one basis and then in the mainstream class with parallel (human) support. If inclusion was merely a matter of placement in a mainstream environment, the first part of these suggestions would not be considered inclusive, since these suggestions tend to place students with SEN in separate environments. Most of the aforementioned proposals suggest a gradual or later transfer to mainstream schools, however. The logic behind these proposals suggests that given enough time, students with SEN can improve and progress to the next ‘stage’. This logic thus represents the understanding of disability as a “problem from within the child” (Topping and Maloney, 2005, p. 207).

Categorisations of special educational needs from the past have conceptualised disability as a deficit originating from the individual with SEN. Issues regarding labelling and stigma come from the era of the medical model of disability. While current literature and theory have surpassed this understanding, it has also been argued that the Greek educational system has yet to abolish such notions (Fyssa et al., 2014; Vlachou, 2006; Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005; Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006; Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000). The explanation for this could be located to the fact that in Greek society, the notions of ‘special/segregated provision and ‘integration’ (later ‘inclusion’) were introduced within a short space of time of each other, not giving enough time for the changes to be absorbed and “generating social and practical confusion as to what equality of opportunity in special education means” (Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris, 2000, p. 34).

It is therefore not surprising that teachers in this study also suggested that students with mild learning difficulties should be able to attend mainstream schools, whereas students with more severe learning difficulties should only attend special schools or ‘inclusive classes’. This differentiation in attitude according to the severity of SEN is a not unique, however. Several types of special educational needs have been investigated over teachers attitudes in several countries and in Greece (Avramidis et al., 2000; Avramidis and Kalyva, 2007; Avramidis and Norwich, 2002; Coutsocostas and Alborz, 2010; Forlin, 1995; Hodge et al., 2004; Koutrouba et al., 2006; Meegan and MacPhail, 2006; Morley et al., 2005; Obrusnikova, 2008; Smith and Green, 2004; Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou, 2014). Teachers’ suggestions in this study, though, which have
been generated in the Greek context many years after the implementation of the most recent Law regarding special education (Law 3699/2008) highlight the challenges teachers face and the direction of their understandings.

Another teacher of this study stated that the ‘inclusive classes’ function at the expense of the schools they are part of. The understandings of inclusion described so far, along with the complex issues generated from inclusive education policies in Greece, mostly refer to inclusion through the lens of the ‘medical model of disability’. Describing the context of inclusion in Greece more than 10 years ago, which obviously still presents many similarities with the current situation, Vlachou-Balafouti and Zoniou-Sideris (2000) concluded: “the existing prevailing context has reinforced the perception that inclusive priorities are either an additional burden or are extremely difficult to implement” (p. 38). It is not as usual as it seems for inclusion implementation to be difficult or impossible: “school reform efforts have often failed because they have been imposed from the top without input from and partnership with those who do the work” (Thomas et al., 2005, p. 26).

Given that inclusive structures do not seem to have changed drastically and effectively since 2000, or at least not in the investigated schools in this study, there is an increasing necessity to examine the reasons why inclusion and inclusive practice are still perceived in similar ways to how they were in the past. I do not want to generalise in suggesting that, however; rather to focus attention to the fact that due to the centralised educational system in Greece, these findings might be applicable to other local authorities as well.

5.3 What influences Greek PE teachers’ understandings of inclusion?

This research question derived from the understanding that teachers’ understandings of inclusion did not just appear within them but occurred and were affected by environmental factors. With this understanding the related findings are summarised as follows:

- **Student-related drawbacks and benefits of inclusion:**
  Teachers’ challenges regarding inclusion involved:
- Students’ with SEN displaying behavioural issues and/or unwillingness to participate (for example wandering, distracted or fearful students).
- Students' with SEN are unable to make progress (problems from within the child).
- Possible delays and/or disorganised lessons due to the presence of students with SEN.
- Overcrowded classrooms (class-related factors) in mainstream classrooms.

Benefits of inclusion:
- The presence of students with SEN in lessons can teach their peers to accept differences, to cooperate, be patient, and show solidarity.

- **Teacher related factors affecting perceptions and attitudes to inclusion:**
  - Teachers’ experience.
  - Teachers’ understanding of their role (teach every student ‘good or bad’ and teach students with the necessary knowledge).
  - Teachers’ feelings related to teaching students with SEN, such as fear, stress, and regret.
  - Teachers’ lack of knowledge and training regarding teaching students with SEN.
  - Teachers’ willingness/desire for further training and frustration at the inadequacy of existing training.
  - Disciplining students with various ways was reported and observed in the PE lessons.

- **Reported challenges to inclusion in the educational environment:**
  - Greek society does not usually accept difference, however urban environments might be more accepting.
  - Lack of human and material support (suitable personnel, equipment and infrastructure).
  - Parents often do not accept that their children have SEN and do not inform the school.
- The diagnostic process, which begins at KEDDY, is dysfunctional.
- Unsuitable or outdated legislation.

- **The nature of the PE lesson:**
  - The PE lesson was understood as a lesson where students ‘unwind’.
  - There was less concern about teaching specific subject matter within a certain amount of time compared to other subjects.
  - A number of teachers planned their lessons daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, or annually, although they usually felt that this was meaningless since they did not know what to expect each day in school.
  - The national curriculum for PE was usually used as a guide by the PE teachers, but was also criticised as not being adjusted to the reality of the Greek educational context.
  - It was often considered an easy lesson for students with SEN to attend.
  - Parents (indirectly) interfered in the lesson.

**5.3.1 Student-related drawbacks and benefits of inclusion**

Teachers’ often suggested being challenged by the behaviour of students with SEN. They referred to students’ (perceived) unwillingness to participate which manifested as wandering in the yard or tendencies to leave the lesson, and be distracted. Teachers also complained about delays and/or disorganised lessons due to challenging behaviour from students with SEN. These challenges were perceived as problems coming from within the child, which come from the ‘medical model of disability’, the consequent interpretations of which have been discussed earlier (section 5.3.3). In a study by Coutsocostas and Alborz (2010) (also conducted in Greece) teachers took a similar stance towards students with SEN: “the pupils with SEN… themselves were a problem either because they made the educational procedure difficult or lacked the competence to follow the lesson” (p. 160). Anderson et al. (2007) also referred to behavioural issues on the part of students with SEN as being one of the disadvantages of teaching an inclusive class. Van Reusen et al. (2000) in particular referred to the negative impact that the presence and behaviour of students with SEN had in the
“learning environment, their delivery of content instruction and the overall quality of learning” (p. 13).

Teachers also referred to a lack of progress or tendency to ‘backslide’ after having made some progress among students with SEN. The expected progress of students with SEN and their perceived failure to achieve and maintain it highlights another issue related to inclusion. It is suggested that:

achievement is usually seen in terms only of raising academic standards as measured by national tests and examinations, rather than more broadly in terms of social, emotional, creative and physical achievements (Black-Hawkins, Florian and Rouse, 2008).

The national curriculum has been criticised, particularly in Greece, for demanding and fostering academic achievement as its most important purpose (Vlachou, 2006). According to the Salamanca statement (UNESCO, 1994), however, every child should be given the opportunity to achieve and learn, since inclusion is much more than placement but also about participation and achievement (Bayliss, 1995). The most recent legislation regarding special education provision in Greece (Law 3699) addressed issues of academic achievement by promoting personalised and differentiated curricula issued by KEDDY for students with SEN (Government of Greece, 2008). These curricula were not mentioned by the PE teachers of this study, however, leading to two possible conclusions: 1) Teachers ignored consciously or unconsciously the existence of such curricula for their students, or 2) These curricula did not take into consideration issues related to the PE lesson. Both explanations deprive students from a vital part of the complete educational experience which is the PE lesson. Additionally, the second explanation reduces PE to an inferior lesson.

Inclusion, however, is also discussed in the literature in terms of social justice. Through a capability approach framework - a framework which ‘defends an understanding of difference as a specific variable of human diversity with an objective reality’ – inclusion focuses on individuals' wellbeing (Reindal, 2016, p. 6). Through this framework and its focus on individuals' capabilities (the objective reality) inclusion is suggested to “entail developing capability equality to enhance each person’s capability to achieve functionings that he or she
values” (Reindal, 2016, p. 7). When teachers and the Greek curriculum focus on academic progress and achievement, they do not recognise students’ freedom of choice in achievement. As a result a lack of respect and thus social justice towards individual difference emerges, affecting both students with and without SEN (Terzi, 2014). As a result, policymakers and researchers should focus on how schools and institutions can change to support all students “while acknowledging and respecting individual differences” (Terzi, 2014, p. 484). Given the current educational reality, particularly in the Greek context, attention should be paid not only to differentiating the curriculum for students with SEN, which also take into consideration PE lessons, but also to changing the national curriculum in such a way that it respects student diversity and freedom of choice.

An additional challenge for the PE teachers was overcrowded classrooms. Issues relating to overcrowded classrooms have been discussed both by international research (Abbott, 2006; Avramidis et al., 2000; Avramidis and Norwich, 2002; Gyimah et al., 2009; Ammah and Hodge, 2005; Miles and Singal, 2010) and Greek literature (Panagopoulos et al., 2014; Tsigilis et al., 2011). Some authors referred to overcrowded classrooms because according to them it influenced inclusion and the way in which it was implemented (Avramidis and Norwich, 2000; Avramidis et al, 2000; Gyimah et al, 2009). Others referred to it as a cause of stress, since if it coexisted with student discipline or motivational problems, or a student with SEN needing one-to-one instruction, it could lead to the rest of the students being neglected (Tsigilis et al, 2011; Ammah and Hodge; 2005). In comparison with teachers of other subjects, however, PE teachers are the least affected by stress issues relating to overcrowded classrooms due to the nature of the lesson and the space in which it takes place (Panagopoulos et al, 2014). Teachers in this study not only complained about overcrowded classrooms, but also about the stress and responsibility they felt when they had to leave their students on their own in their effort to chase and/or find a student with SEN who had absconded. On average, however, the number of students in the observed lessons were between 14 and 18 with only on teacher having 25 students in one lesson (with the exception of the lessons for rehearsals, where although students were double or triple the
usual number, the PE teacher was usually assisted by the class teacher/s). Ammah and Hodge (2005) suggest that:

class sizes larger than 30 when working with students with or without disabilities contributes to teacher burn out, intensify discipline problems, and is a barrier to individualizing instruction (p. 51).

This suggestion was accompanied by a comment that, regardless of class size, support needs to be provided for more effective inclusive practices (e.g., adapted physical education specialists and or peer tutors) (Ammah and Hodge, 2005). The Greek educational system is one that does not provide additional support in the class unless it is for a student with SEN who needs co-teaching from a special education teacher (Greek Government, 2008). However, this teacher is not required by law to teach a lesson that is not their speciality, therefore this teacher would not provide support to a PE teacher. In addition, teaching assistant or learning support assistant support, extensively used in the UK, is not provided in mainstream education in Greece. Most teachers in Greece, therefore, are required to teach in classes without additional support regardless of the number of students in class. It can be assumed that a large number of students without SEN can be a cause of stress for teachers. However, stress is definitely present when the number of students with SEN increase in a class, contributing to teacher burnout (Fejgin et al, 2005).

According to Fejgin et al (2005), teachers receiving help and support when teaching inclusive classes present lower levels of burnout. The teachers in this study could therefore be helped by receiving additional help and human support.

Finally, most teachers agreed that a benefit of the inclusion of students with SEN in lessons taught their peers to accept difference, to cooperate, be patient, and show solidarity. It is not unusual for teachers’ favourable beliefs to be influenced by positive interactions among students (Coutsocostas and Alborz, 2010; Ammah and Hodge, 2005). During the observations, students with and without SEN did indeed interact positively and respectfully to each other in many occasions. These findings concur with a recent study conducted in Greece by Georgiadi et al (2012) who found that students without SEN in
inclusive settings were more accepting of their peers with SEN in comparison to students from non-inclusive settings.

5.3.2 Teacher related factors affecting perceptions and attitudes to inclusion

Teachers’ experience helped them in their lessons, since as suggested, they found easier solutions, prioritised better, and many parts of the teaching became automatic. Teachers also suggested that they understood their students’ needs better and were more patient and less stressed over time. Finally, teachers said that they became less ‘perfectionist’ and lowered their expectations of their students. It is interesting to mention here that the aforementioned recorded findings referred to both students with and without SEN. It is reasonable for parts of teaching to become ‘automatic’ and for teachers to be able to deliver their lessons easier and more effectively due to experience. Teaching experience has, however, been mentioned as a factor affecting teachers' perceptions of inclusion as well (Avramidis et al., 2000; Avramidis and Norwich, 2002; Coutsocostas and Alborz, 2010; Morley et al., 2005; Tsakiridou and Polyzopoulou, 2014).

Teachers becoming less ‘perfectionist’ and lowering their expectations of the students can result in a ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’. This self-fulfilling prophecy can be defined as being “in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the originally false conception come true” (Tauber, 1997, p. 9, author’s italics). According to this definition, when teachers of this study lower their expectations of the children they might as well unwittingly create the conditions for children to be content with lower performance than the possibly higher they could actually achieve. As Jussim and Harber (2005) argue, this is an “oversimplified” way to understand self-fulfilling prophecy it though (p. 133). As a result of such an explanation, it could be concluded that high teacher expectations can create advantages for some students, whereas low expectations create the opposite. Jussim and Harber (2005), however, suggest that the effects of such self-fulfilling prophecies are, more often than not, insignificant. Although the phenomenon of the self-fulfilling prophecy is real and all teachers should be aware of it, other factors should therefore be investigated in relation to teachers’ expectations from both students with and without SEN.
Disciplining students in various ways was reported and observed in the PE lessons. More specifically, many teachers suggested that they set rules at the beginning of each year and/or during the lessons. It is suggested that Greek secondary education students “are significantly more intrinsically disciplined” in computer science and physical education lessons than in foreign languages, physics and religious education (Zounhia et al., 2004, p. 293). In physical education in primary education, however, students’ intrinsic motivation for PE (i.e. enthusiasm for a particular game students like) can easily give way to other types of behaviours (i.e. hostility due to competition). Indeed, students in this study were sometimes disappointed or annoyed when they felt disadvantaged because of the presence of a peer with SEN in their team. Metzler (2005) suggests that providing “an underlying structure to facilitate student learning and to establish a positive environment for the teacher and students” (p. 122) should be one of the basic goals of class management. To achieve this goal, the learning environment should be established the first two weeks of each school year and then be maintained throughout the year (Metzler, 2005). This, as Metzler (2005) suggests, can be achieved by establishing rules regarding student safety, responsibility and conduct, rules for the beginning and setting up of each lesson, physical boundaries, care of equipment, practice of students’ listening skills, and rules for student discipline. Teachers of this study were indeed observed reminding students of the rules of fair play, the rules regarding physical boundaries, and were urged to listen. P12’s escalating strategy of punishment, as described in subsection 4.2.1.4, involved the whole class being punished because of the misbehaviour of one student. Although, this type of punishment intends to cause guilt to the ‘naughty’ student it resembles authoritarian (strictly teacher-centred) teaching strategies. For this reason, other types of behavioural improvement programmes should be made available to PE teachers so that they can choose from a variety of options.

Teachers expressed being tired due to a demanding schedule, fear for the safety of their students, and stress because of the inclusion of students with SEN and the consequent reported difficulties. Some also expressed feelings of regret regarding past decisions involving students with SEN. As discussed earlier (section 5.3.4) teachers expressing feelings of stress, tiredness, and also self-blame might be experiencing burnout syndrome (Fejgin, 2005). For P11,
however, one reason for regret and self-blame concerned a time when he had excluded a student with SEN from the school parade. The outdated legislation which he followed at the time of the incident, he said, caused him great regret later on. The legislation that P11 referred to concerned the student parades during the two national days celebrated in Greece. Indeed, the latest legislation regarding student parades was issued in 1985. Student parades have been at the centre of debate in the Greek press over the years for several reasons, with the nationality of the flag bearer, and the usefulness and purpose of such parades being the most frequent discussion topics. With ministerial decisions deriving from the Law 1566/85 (Government of Greece) stating that during the parades student uniformity, correct walking and appropriate appearance was important for student participation, the participation guidelines regarding students with SEN were not always clear. According to another ministerial decision, however, students with SEN can participate in the parades if they want to and if their parents and teachers agree (Ministerial Decision Γ4/150/24-02-2000) (Greek Government, 2000). Although the latest decisions makes it easier for students with SEN to participate in the parades, it still allows parents and teachers to make the final decision. As a result, whether or not students with SEN can participate in school parades depends to a large extent on adults’ good will (Pieridou and Phtiaka, 2012). In conclusion, P11 felt regret and blamed himself for excluding his student from the parade, although as became apparent a lack of fair and clear legislation was essentially responsible for his ordeal and failure to include the student.

Some teachers understood their role as being to teach every student ‘good or bad’ and to equip students with the necessary knowledge. According to Eacute and Esteve (2000) teachers are expected to:

- facilitate learning, be an efficient educator and organise work groups.
- Teachers must also teach, care for the psychological equilibrium of the pupils, help their social integration and attend to their sexual education.
- We [society] ask them to do intercultural education, education for health, prevention of drugs taking. Often, they have to care for a pair of pupils with special needs who are integrated into the class and who need very specific attention (p. 199).
For teachers in this study, teaching all students (‘good or bad’) with all necessary knowledge bears a wide responsibility, as wide as the responsibilities expressed earlier by Eacute and Esteve (2000).

The debate over the role of teachers has, however, been met with many contradictions, not only because they have to “satisfy different educational and social models” but also because their training has remained largely unchanged and thus inadequate (Eacute and Esteve, 2000, p. 202). Indeed, many of the teachers in this study admitted that they lacked knowledge and training regarding teaching students with SEN and expressed their willingness to undergo further training, along with their frustration about the existing attempts at training. This lack of knowledge resulted in teachers suggesting that they could not do their job as well as they would like to. International literature also suggests that teachers’ lack of confidence in teaching students with SEN is attributed insufficient training, which leads to a lack of knowledge (Smith and Thomas, 2005; Doulkeridou et al., 2011; Fejgin, 2005; Hodge et al., 2004; Meegan and MacPhail, 2006; Morley et al., 2005; Papadopoulou et al., 2004).

Furthermore, research suggests that teachers who have attended relevant training - during university, in seminars or otherwise – tend to hold more positive attitudes towards inclusion, while teachers who have had less training regarding SEN are more likely to hold negative attitudes (Avramidis and Norwich, 2002; Coutsocostas and Alborz, 2010; Morley et al., 2005; Obrusnikova, 2008; Papadopoulou et al., 2004; Tindall et al., 2015). It has been suggested, however, that there is usually a tendency to over-emphasise the importance of professional training (Smith and Thomas, 2005; Green, 2008; Green, 2002). Caution is suggested on the grounds that “PE teachers tend, in practice, to seize upon convenient, retrospective rationalizations for the things they actually do in the name of PE” (Green, 2008, p. 18). As a result, it has also been suggested that teacher training could be deemed the only factor affecting teachers’ confidence/effectiveness in teaching students with SEN, whereas this is not always the case (Smith and Thomas, 2005). As studies have shown, however, additional teacher training tailored to teachers needs to add to their confidence and contribute to the development of positive attitudes.
5.3.3 Reported challenges to inclusion in the educational environment

Teachers in this study suggested that Greek society does not usually accept difference; however, there is evidence to suggest that urban environments might be more accepting. Teachers’ mostly negative views regarding the present and future implementation of educational inclusion were discussed in detail in section 5.2.3. Thomas et al (2005) suggest that inclusion in practice (expressed through inclusive schools) is community based: “an inclusive school reflects the community as a whole. Membership of the school community is open, positive and diverse. It is not selective, exclusive or rejecting” (p. 23). The inclusive school and its practices thus reflect the whole community. When teachers doubt society’s levels of acceptance, so they doubt about the inclusivity of the inclusive school itself. This study recorded many reasons why teachers have doubted society’s readiness for inclusion and acceptance of difference. Their basic complaints involved the Greek state with its limited resources (lack of suitable personnel, equipment and infrastructure) and outdated legislation and dysfunctional supporting services (KEDDY) and the low levels of acceptance among parents of their children with SEN.

Lack of suitable equipment and infrastructure was reported and observed in most of the schools of this study to be a reason why teachers did not feel able to implement inclusion. Vlachou and Fyssa (2016) suggest that the poor quality of inclusion in Greece can (among other factors) be attributed to the “insufficient resources of a society that struggles with a poverty rate of 23.1% compared to the other European countries” (p. 13). Indeed, teachers’ struggle to acquire even basic equipment for their lesson and the unsuitable infrastructure for PE lessons is indicative of the current political, social and educational situation in Greece at the moment. Furthermore, teachers in Greece are required to teach without additional help (i.e. teaching assistants) since such provision is not available and is not provided through legislation in Greek mainstream education. As a result, the teacher of the class is responsible for his/her students solely during the lesson, irrespective of the number of students or their possible difficulties. These findings are congruent with the literature, which suggests that “physical and material barriers to inclusion have been shown to
have a limiting effect on the participation of children with special educational needs in PE” (Coates and Vickerman, 2008, p. 174).

The issue of outdated legislation was discussed in detail in section 5.3.2 in relation to its effects on one of the PE teachers in this study. The issue of unclear legislation and its effects on teachers’ understanding of inclusion has also been discussed in detail in section 5.2.1. The function of KEDDY has, however, been another cause for teachers’ negative attitudes towards inclusion, which relates to legislation and organisational issues. The poor functioning of KEDDY was mentioned by the teachers in relation to the fact that parents of students with SEN frequently do not disclose their child’s SEN to the school. Teachers thought that non-disclosure of students’ SEN prohibited them from including those students in their lesson and made their work difficult. As Dialektaki (2014) suggests, the function of KEDDY is questionable, since a shortage of personnel, along with long waiting lists of students waiting to be diagnosed, make the process of diagnosis a difficult task. However, the initiative for the diagnosis is usually taken by the school staff with parental agreement and consequent responsibility to complete the diagnosis through KEDDY. The fact that teachers and parents are expected to cooperate for the diagnostic process to proceed, combined with the other reported issues, suggests a gap in legislative or/and inter-service initiative and issues of miscommunication. Parents’ apparent lack of acceptance might relate not only to the communication issues among teachers and parents but also to the stigma attached to statemented (and thus obvious) SEN (Davis, 2005). Moreover, as discussed earlier (in section 5.3.2) KEDDY is responsible for the development of personalised curricula for the students with SEN. It has been suggested, however, that the KEDDY statement does not offer “significant insight to the teachers on how to provide better support to students with SEN” (Dialektaki, 2014, p. 122).

5.3.4 The nature of the PE lesson

The PE lesson was understood in this study as a lesson during which students unwind. Additionally, for some teachers it was important for students to have fun, and feel joy and happiness during the lesson. PE lessons are therefore associated feelings of enjoyment and possibly relaxation by the students.
Indeed, literature suggests that PE is often seen by students “as a route of escape from other subjects” (Medcalf et al., 2011, p. 200). This opportunity for ‘escape’ and enjoyment was suggested to appear because the PE lesson offered “great relief, specifically for participants who felt they struggled in other aspects of the curriculum” (Medcalf et al., 2011, p. 200). It has also been seen as “a fun and enjoyable lesson in which [students] take part in the company of friends” (Smith and Parr, 2007, p. 44). Interestingly, the opinions of the teachers in this study matched the students’ opinions in the studies mentioned above. More often than not, teachers have suggested in the literature that the purpose of physical education ranges from sport participation, health and character development, social learning through games, exercising and getting fit, and gaining knowledge (Green, 2008; Chroinin and Coulter, 2012; Tsangaridou, 2008). It could be argued that teachers in this study, like students, saw the PE lesson as ‘different’ from the rest and thus related it to feelings of enjoyment (Green, 2008). In congruence with this conclusion Bailey et al (2009) suggested that “enjoyment is … identified by teachers as an important outcome of planned activities” (p. 12). In addition, it is suggested that ‘enjoyment experienced during physical activity and sport can reinforce self-esteem, which, in turn, can lead to enhanced motivation to participate further” (Bailey et al., 2009, p. 12).

It could also be argued that when teachers suggested that PE is a lesson where students could enjoy themselves, they did so because they [teachers] did not feel the pressure of specific curriculum requirements and expectations. Indeed, some teachers reported that they did not have to worry about teaching certain subject matter in a certain amount of time. This suggests a general view of the PE lesson as being different from other lessons (this time though in terms of being less connected with academic knowledge). Indeed, careful reading of the Teacher’s Guide books produced in the latest educational reform in PE, reveals that PE teachers are allowed to teach the content in whichever order they see fit for each class. Specifically, the authors urge PE teachers to:

Remember that the lesson order but also their content is indicative. No-one can suggest how you may teach and with which way to your own students. Only you know the particularities of the spaces in your schools and your students’ characteristics. Use the lessons of this book as ideas, which along with your own knowledge, fantasy and creativity are
certainly going to bring the expected results (Mpournelli et al., 2006b, p. 11).

This permissive statement, which gives PE teachers freedom to organise and plan their lessons in their own unique way, does not, however, mean that teachers are allowed to differ their lessons from the targets and subject matters stated by the national curriculum for PE (Mpournelli et al., 2006b). Although curriculum implementation might be considered easier for year groups 1 & 2, because of the types of suggested activities (psychomotor, music-dance, team - individual - traditional - free and organised games, Greek traditional dance (Greek Government, 2003)), this cannot be considered the case for older year groups. For the older year groups, the national curriculum includes sports, athletics and gymnastics (Government of Greece, 2003). These activities require specific material equipment and infrastructure and as mentioned in previous section (section 5.3.3) teachers complained about limited resources. It could be argued therefore that the loose attitudes towards curriculum implementation might be attributed firstly to the relative freedom being given to them by the Teacher’s Guide books, combined with persistent lack of suitable infrastructure for PE. This conclusion was reinforced by findings which showed that although a number of teachers reported planning their lessons daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, or annually, they usually felt that this was meaningless, since they did not know what to expect each day in school. Teachers, also, reported using the curriculum mostly as a guide because it was not adjusted to the reality of the Greek educational context. In addition to the conclusion drawn in the previous paragraph teachers’ attitude towards curriculum might suggest either perceived inability to implement the curriculum or limited knowledge of the curriculum. In Greece, the most recent national curriculum for PE promoted more student-centred teaching styles instead of traditional teacher-centred teaching (Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011). The books that accompanied this reform though, apart from general directions on teaching, also, provided, as mentioned earlier, indicative lessons which PE teachers could follow and in addition use to prepare others based on them. A combination, however, of loose attitudes towards curriculum implementation with lacking infrastructure (section 5.3.3), and the state’s loose attitudes towards teachers CPD (section 5.2.2) seem to have caused many teachers of
this study to denounce at least partially the national curriculum for PE. As Gorozidis and Papaoioannou (2011) suggest, the curriculum change was “a top-down reform which was evidence based but also disconnected from teachers’ continuing professional development” (p. 246). As a result, it was revealed that two years after the curriculum reform “less than 50 percent of the proposed tasks were taught, while a significant number of teachers did not bother at all about its implementation” (Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011, p. 246). Lastly, curriculum change has also been mentioned to receive ‘conservative’, innovative’ and ‘eclectic’ interpretations; in all cases, however, teachers interpreting the curriculum did so by adapting it to their “existing perspectives and ideologies” (Curtner-Smith, 1999, p. 82-92). Given the aforementioned literature, it could be argued that although the PE teachers in this study captured the enjoyment of students through PE, they have somewhat neglected (mostly for salient reasons and/or unwittingly) the learning side of it.

Findings showed that PE was considered an ‘easy’ lesson for students with SEN to attend because inclusion happens through the motivational power of play. Haycock and Smith (2010) suggest that “at an ideological level, there is a strong link between PE and the promotion of inclusion” (p. 304). Bailey (2005) in particular mentions that “participation in sporting activities…has the potential to…contribute to the process of inclusion” (p. 76). Teachers’ assumption, however, that play is, in itself, a motivation for students, thus play is a factor facilitating inclusion in physical education is not addressed directly in the literature. Motivation in PE, though, is addressed as follows: “intrinsic factors, such as ‘excitement of sport’, ‘personal accomplishment’ and ‘doing the skills’, were more important for young people than extrinsic factors” (Bailey et al., 2009, p. 13). Bailey et al (2009), also, suggest that “enjoyment allows for the development of intrinsic motivation” (p. 12). Intrinsic motivation is thus connected with enjoyment in the literature. Enjoyment is connected with play, however; as Stoll et al (2000) suggest, “physical play is one of the first movements we acquire as a means of experiencing enjoyment and freedom … As we mature, experiences such as physical education and athletics become contributing factors to our play” (Stoll et al., 2000, p. 51). If, as it is suggested, a desire for play is enjoyable and thus a motivation for students to keep playing, it is reasonable to argue that since all students desire play, inclusion could be
easily achieved through play. This statement does not, however, take into account the type of play/games that would accommodate all students’ needs, or the material and human factors affecting this facilitation into consideration, which thus renders this assertion false, or at least lacking any evidence-based support.

On the other hand, findings showed that teachers felt being judged by the parents of their students when including students with SEN in their lesson. Due to their nature and the extensive lack of indoor facilities, PE lessons in Greece are usually conducted in the school yard, often at the front of the school and at a small distance from parents watching from outside of the school fence. It is reasonable to argue that the difficulties experienced by teachers during lesson, as discussed in previous sections (5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3), affect their self-esteem and increase their self-awareness in front of an audience. Additionally, because of the accessibility parents have to watch PE lessons, one of the parents was observed calling his child with SEN to the fence in order to talk to him. Finally, the location of the PE lesson has been shown to attract unwanted spectators and/or participants. One of the teachers in this study suggested that one student with SEN who did not usually attend the lessons with his class often watched or requested to participate in the PE lesson. The teacher suggested that she did not know who was responsible for the welfare of this student. A lack of clear school policy regarding issues such as this highlights the larger issue of unclear legislation, as discussed earlier, which have been proven to have additional implications in the PE lesson.

5.4 What inclusive practices are implemented in the PE lesson?

One aim of this study to find out about possible inclusive practices concluded in findings that can be summarised as follows:

- **Inclusive practice:**
  - Teachers used a variety of inclusive practices, such as prompts, praise, creation of a positive atmosphere, encouraging student participation and interaction while interacting with the students themselves, and showing flexibility (in order to accommodate the SEN students’ needs) and acceptance.
- Teachers often checked whether all students understood their instructions and changed some traditional competitive games so that students would not be excluded when they 'lost'.
- Teachers tried to bring students with SEN who wandered away back to the lesson and intervened so that students with SEN could be included (for example, they gave students with SEN a second chance to succeed, gave them an easier role in the game, paired students with SEN with other students, guided students with SEN through games).
- Students interacted positively with their peers with SEN, although sometimes they seemed to get frustrated with them.
- Some competitive games often required some students, both with and without SEN, to be excluded from the game. Some competitive games and traditional ways of selecting teammates did not seem to favour inclusion.

These findings are being discussed in the next section.

5.4.1 Inclusive practice

Many teachers of this study were observed prompting, praising, and creating a positive atmosphere by interacting with their students and showing flexibility and acceptance. By prompting students to participate and praising them for their achievements, teachers showed their care for their students. It is suggested that “caring relationships between teachers and students are fundamental for successful teaching and learning in physical education” (Jung and Choi, 2016, p. 133). Regarding the use of humour in the lesson, Jung and Choi (2016) suggest:

Good humour, which originates from warmth, from empathy, and love, brings people closer together because it helps them to relax and become more comfortable among one another. By using appropriate humour, a class can be made more interesting and provide a touch of entertainment (p. 129).

Indeed, some of the teachers in this study used humour when they chatted with their students at the beginning or during the lessons, made jokes, or made humorous comments, which created “an active as well amusing atmosphere”
(Jung and Choi, 2016, p. 129). It could be argued that an entertaining atmosphere could be considered a positive atmosphere in the lesson, where “everyone is made to feel welcome” (Booth et al, 2002, p. 46). Lastly, some teachers showed flexibility and thus acceptance of the occasional additional need to care for students with SEN. Caring about the “welfare of the ‘whole child’ not simply the acquisition of knowledge and skills” is one of the important parameters of inclusive pedagogy, according to Florian and Spratt (2013, p. 128). As a result, it could again be argued that when teachers showed flexibility to meet their students’ needs, they were also caring for their wellbeing, thus welcoming/including them in their lessons.

Findings of this study also showed that teachers encouraged students’ interaction (sometimes by introducing exercises in pairs or small groups of students) and indeed students frequently interacted positively with their peers with SEN. As discussed in section 5.2.1 (social participation and peer acceptance) inclusion can be considered successful when evidence of peer acceptance and positive interactions among students can be seen (Laws et al, 2012; Soulis et al, 2016). From this point of view, teachers’ initiatives to encourage student interaction through paired or group exercises can thus be considered successful inclusive practice.

Additionally, some teachers changed some traditional competitive games so that students would not be excluded when they ‘lost’. Florian and Spratt (2013) suggest that “seeking and trying new ways of working to support the learning of all children” and additionally working “in ways that respect the dignity of learners” are ways which professionals (on this occasion PE teachers) can provide support while “avoiding the stigma of marking certain children as different” (p. 129, 133). Some (unchanged) competitive games, however, often required students both with and without SEN to be temporarily excluded from the game. In the current study, competitive games did not seem to favour inclusion. Students without SEN sometimes complained or got frustrated because students with SEN were in their team, because they would prevent the team from winning in competitive situations. I assume that the same line of thought was followed when some students were assigned as team leaders with their first duty being to select teammates; students thought to be ‘weak’ in PE and students with SEN were picked last on such occasions. Competitive games
have often been criticised as “unsuitable for children with SEN” (Coates, 2011, p. 170). Additionally, Smith (2004) mentions that “traditional' team games within PE … [tend] to exclude, rather than facilitate the full inclusion of many pupils with SEN” (p.37). Consequently, the choice made by teachers in this study to introduce competitive games and ideals in their lessons may not have been inclusive. Teachers did, however, on many occasions, encourage students’ participation and intervened so that students with SEN would be included in the lesson. They also gave students with SEN second chances in order to succeed, gave them an easier role in the game, and/or guided them through the course of some games or play. In doing this, teachers apparently tried to help students with SEN to overcome the difficulties they faced because of the competitive nature of games/play. Nonetheless, some of these difficulties might have been avoided if teachers had tried to find new ways to support the learning and participation of all students, as mentioned previously (Florian and Spratt, 2013).

The students in the lessons observed in this study could be broadly identified as having sensory impairments and emotional and behavioural disorders (EBD), often accompanied by learning difficulties. Teachers in this study were often observed trying to bring back students with SEN who had wandered away. Usually, these students were those that I refer to as having EBD. Having discussed the importance of social participation as a parameter for successful inclusion (section 5.2.1) it is important to note here that the teachers showed in practice that they valued participation as a means to inclusion. Their efforts were rarely fruitful, however, which could be attributed to the lack of suitable activities for these students (either because of limited or lack of differentiation or because of limited equipment due to lack of resources, as discussed in section 5.3.3).

Finally, the teachers in this study were observed frequently checking if their students understood their instructions. Since ‘clarification of vocabulary’ and ‘checking for understanding of instructions’ are two of the indicators of inclusive practice mentioned in the methodology chapter (table 7), it could be argued that many teachers in this study were successfully inclusive when giving instructions.
It should be noted at this point that the occurrence of inclusive and non-inclusive practices coexisted in the observed lessons, irrespective of teachers’ understandings of inclusion. Although P13, for example, suggested that inclusion is the effort involved in including someone in the social community, in one of his lessons he chose a ‘traditional’ way of separating teams, which included selecting two students who in turn selected their teammates one by one. This type of team separation resulted in the teacher finally choosing the team for the student with SEN, who had not been selected by either team. On the other hand, the same teacher on other occasions, managed to create a positive atmosphere in the lesson by chatting with his students and making the lesson generally enjoyable. Although P13 expressed a clear understanding of inclusion as social participation, he did not always change his practice to accommodate the full participation of students with SEN.

The consequences of the lack of clear legislation in the Greek educational system, as well as the lack of training and suitable infrastructure reported by the teachers and several other factors have been discussed previously as challenges to implementing inclusion. Irrespective of the resources given to them, however, some teachers might have been able to be more inclusive in some occasions (i.e. differentiation or different types of games) if only they had followed the spirit of their understandings of inclusion. This phenomenon is not new in the literature. As Argyris and Schon (1974) suggest, teachers’ adopted theories (teachers’ beliefs about a situation) and theories-in-use (theories/understandings that govern practice) might be incompatible with each other. This incompatibility leads to teachers with inclusive understandings of inclusion conducting their lessons in a way that may actually hinder inclusion.

5.5 What are the teaching styles from the Mosston Spectrum that Greek PE teachers’ use during lesson?

A big challenge of this study was to discover which teaching styles from Mosston’s Spectrum were being used in the Greek primary school PE lessons. The findings showed the following:

- **Knowledge and use of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles:**
  - Most teachers did not have knowledge of the Spectrum of teaching styles.
The Command style and Practice style were the teaching styles used in the observed lessons. The Command style was identified by the frequent use of: instructions, announcements, constant teacher decisions, clarifications, demonstrations, feedback given by teachers, and student compliance. The practice style was identified by the types of decisions that teachers allowed students to take during the lessons.

These findings are discussed in relation to relevant literature below.

5.5.1 Knowledge and use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles

Findings of this study showed that the majority of PE teachers in this study did not have any knowledge of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. The few teachers that claimed to have knowledge gave vague descriptions of some of the teaching styles of the Spectrum. Interestingly, Syrmpas et al (2016) study concluded that all 219 Greek PE teachers that participated in their study were using a wide variety of teaching styles. This conclusion might lead to an assumption that the PE teachers probably had a good knowledge of Mosston’s teaching styles as well. I argue that the discrepancy between this study and Syrmpas et al. (2016) is caused not only by the large difference in the number of investigated PE teachers (219 vs 15), but also by the different methodological tools (brief scenarios for each style included on questionnaires vs open-ended interview questions) which provided different information to the participants and therefore affected their recognition of the teaching styles of the Spectrum. Given that the “spectrum of teaching styles became an integral part of the amended Greek PE curriculum” (Syrmpas et al, 2016, p. 4) in 2006, the inability on the part of the teachers in this study to even acknowledge its existence is worrying. It becomes more worrying when considering that the reform did not take place through legislation (usually considered distanced from teachers’ practice) but through the creation of ‘Teacher’s Guide’ books specifically designed for PE teachers. Three of the books, as mentioned in the literature review of this thesis (section 2.2.1), not only mention but also explain in detail Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and provide indicative lesson plans, while a fourth book (for Year 1 & 2 and first book of the series) makes general comments referring to it. These books are provided to PE teachers by the Ministry of Education in every primary and secondary school. If the reference to the Spectrum is not
understood (justifiably) by reading the first book of the series, PE teachers of a primary school still have two opportunities to find out about it in the other two books (Year 3 & 4 and Year 5 & 6), since they are not provided with just one but all three books regarding primary PE. I can argue therefore at this point that teachers could probably have a better knowledge of the Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles just by reading these guide books. However, a lack of CPD as reported by the teachers might have resulted in this outcome which however still calls for further investigation.

As mentioned in the findings chapter (section 4.2.2) when teachers referred to teaching styles of the Spectrum in their descriptions, they referred to them predominantly as methods and sometimes as styles. The use of these terms can be associated with their meanings in the Greek language. As mentioned in the literature review of this thesis (section 2.3.1) the word ‘style’ in Greek is mostly associated with clothing design and types of dressing, whereas the word ‘method’ has a similar meaning to that in English. With the ‘Teacher’s guide’ books in primary schools referring to the Spectrum interchangeably as methods or styles, it is no wonder why teachers might do the same (Mpourenelli et al, 2006b; Digellidis et al., 2006). An agreement in the use of terminology therefore could prove useful in PE, regarding Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles.

The Command and Practice styles were the most frequently observed teaching styles used in the lesson observations in this study. The Command style was identified by the frequent use of instructions and announcements, teacher decisions, clarifications, demonstrations, feedback that teachers gave, and student compliance. The Practice style was identified by the type of decisions and student initiative that was allowed by the teachers. Both the Command and Practice teaching styles belong to the reproduction cluster of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles (section 2.3.2). Studies conducted on the implementation of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles have indeed shown that teachers, both in Greece and internationally, tend to use more teaching styles from the reproduction cluster, with the most frequently used being the Command, Practice and Reciprocal styles (Cothran et al., 2000; Salvara and Birone, 2002; SueSee and Edwards, 2011; Chatoupis and Emmanuel, 2003a, 2003b; Cothran et al., 2005; Curtner-Smith, 2001; Kulina and Cothran, 2003; Syrmpas et al., 2016).
The literature suggests, however, that the use of a variety of teaching styles from both the reproductive and productive clusters has proved useful for students (Goldberger et al., 2012). In a study by Cothran et al. (2000), students preferred being taught with teaching styles from the production cluster, because they promoted fun, learning and motivation. Similarly, Salvara et al. (2006) found that students’ motivation was affected more positively by the use of child-centred teaching styles (i.e. styles from the production cluster). Another study showed that the perceived athletic competence of students improved when they were taught with the practice and inclusion teaching styles instead of any of the teaching styles (Chatoupis, 2003b). In the UK, Morgan et al.’s (2005) study concluded that students enjoyed being taught with the reciprocal and guided discovery teaching styles more, while in Greece, the guided discovery teaching style seemed to be more effective than the command style when it came to learning motor skills (Derri and Pachta, 2007). Combining the reciprocal style with the self-check style also proved beneficial to motor skill learning (Kolovelonis et al., 2011).

Given the many benefits of using a variety of teaching styles, as mentioned in the literature, as well as the fact that the Mosston Spectrum of teaching styles is an integral part of the current Greek physical education curriculum (Syrmpas, 2016) it is interesting that the observed teachers only used two teaching styles, which were both from the reproduction cluster of the Spectrum. It is suggested that “PE teachers’ backgrounds and schooling experiences play important roles in the formation of their professional profile” (Syrmpas et al., 2016, p. 8). As such, teacher-centred teaching styles (reproduction cluster) and the Command style have been traditionally considered as the more effective styles “in helping teachers control and manage the classroom” (Green, 2008, p. 220). Due to students’ age in primary education, teachers might have been seeking to use teacher-centred teaching styles to control their classes. Also, Green (2008) suggests that mandatory curriculums, mandatory assessments and an emphasis on students’ achievement are probably some of the reasons why teachers refuse to use more teaching styles from the production cluster. In addition, teachers’ perceived ability to implement various teaching styles is another factor affecting their implementation (Syrmpas et al., 2016). Since most of the teachers in this study did not know what the spectrum of teaching styles
was, it cannot be expected that they will use it or to know how to implement it. Their lack of knowledge of these teaching styles can be attributed to the fact that teaching styles awareness firstly occurred in Greece only in 2000, not through undergraduate studies or professional development, but through “Government books” complementary to PE guidelines and “participation in optional seminars or workshops” (Sympas et al, 2016, p. 4). Additionally, some awareness was raised through the study material for the national exams for PE teachers (exams through which PE teachers are selected to work in education if successful), conducted every four years between 2000 and 2008. Since most of the teachers in this study had already been working in schools between 10 and 27 years, only a few of them had actually had to take these exams and study the spectrum of teaching styles. However, as mentioned earlier, teachers could have a good understanding of the Mosston’s Spectrum if only they focused their attention to the ‘Teacher’s Guide’ books provided both in primary and in secondary education. This lack of awareness of the teaching styles, which are essential in the current curriculum for PE, calls for further investigation as to the effectiveness of the centralised educational system in informing and training its teachers over its purposes and use of suggested tools.

5.6 What are the connections between the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and understandings of inclusion?

The final challenge of this study was to examine possible connections between the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and inclusion/inclusive practice. These connections are demonstrated in the findings as follows:

- **Connections between the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and understandings of inclusion/inclusive practice:**
  - The Command and Practice teaching styles were used alongside some inclusive practices.
5.6.1 Connections between the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and understandings of inclusion/inclusive practice

Figure 5: Connection between inclusion and Mosston’s Spectrum of teaching styles in Physical Education.

Figure 5 shows the connections between inclusion and inclusive practice with the Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles in Physical Education. A similar figure in the literature review chapter (chapter 2, figure 1) was presented in order to show the areas of investigation in educational theory and research relating to physical education. Figure 5, however, shows the connections revealed by this study, since findings showed that both inclusive practices and some teaching styles of the Mosston’s Spectrum were used in the observed PE lessons. It also shows a theoretical connection between Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles with specific understandings of inclusion.

As mentioned early in this thesis (section 1.4) inclusion and the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles in physical education are promoted in the Greek educational context through relevant legislation and curriculum reforms (Greek Government, 2008; Mpournelli et al., 2006a; Mpournelli et al., 2006b, Digellidis et al., 2006; Goudas et al., 2006; Syrmpas et al., 2016; Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011). Physical education is often recognised for its capacity to contribute to both relational (concerning an individual’s need for belonging and acceptance) and functional (concerning the enhancement
of knowledge and skills) dimensions of a social inclusion agenda (Bailey et al, 2009, p. 9).

The role of the PE teacher in this process is recognised as “central” (Bailey et al, 2009, p. 9). In addition, Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles is based on the premise that
decisions are always made (deliberately or by default) in every teaching-learning event, independent of the teacher’s emphasis in the decision making process (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 4).

Therefore, it could be argued that in the context of physical education social inclusion and teacher decision making coexist (figure 5).

As discussed earlier (section 5.4.1) during their lessons teachers of this study used a variety of inclusive practices such as prompt, praise, encouragement of student participation and interaction, creation of positive atmosphere and clear instructions. The teachers’ practices could be considered inclusive since as mentioned in section 5.4.1 they were focusing not only on making students feel welcome in the lesson, but also on the participation of students with SEN in PE.

In addition, as discussed in section 5.5.1, teachers predominantly used the Command and Practice Teaching Styles. Given that teachers of this study used, for example, competitive games/play quite frequently in their lessons, it could be argued that their lessons were performance focused. Performance focused behaviours particularly for the Command and Practice teaching styles have been connected with feelings of boredom and repetition on behalf of the students (Morgan et al, 2005, p. 279); such feelings were occasionally also observed in the present study. In addition, Spectrum Styles from the reproduction cluster (such as the Command and Practice styles) (see table 2, section 2.3.2) can be considered less inclusive, since the students’ role and participation is mostly passive. In contrast, it could be argued that by nature (at least in theory) the production teaching styles are more inclusive, since they have arguably been connected with offering a wide variety of activities, enjoyment and self-management skills’ acquisition (Morgan et al, 2005), and because emphasis is given to active student participation in decision making. These are probably the reasons why the Greek national curriculum for PE is
premised on the idea that the use of the student-centred teaching styles mostly from the production cluster could be a positive change to the PE lessons (Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011; Mpournelli et al., 2006; Diggelidis et al., 2006; Goudas et al., 2006)). Thus, it would seem that inclusive practices would better incorporate in teaching through Spectrum Styles from the production cluster (Figure 6). This study found, however, that perhaps paradoxically the Command and Practice Teaching Styles, the two styles of the reproduction cluster, which seem to require more than any others student compliance and thus passive student participation, coexisted in the lessons of this study with some forms of inclusive practice.

Figure 6 below illustrates this paradox by placing the Command and Practice styles (purple rectangle) on the same side of the Spectrum (Reproduction Cluster) but making them ‘pop’ out at the same time. By placing them out of their cluster, Figure 6 better illustrates their connection with the implementation of more inclusive practices by the teachers, usually thought to be congruent with the production cluster of the Spectrum. As it is further illustrated, the production cluster of Mosston’s Spectrum is better connected with inclusion since it promotes more active student participation through active and frequent decision-making. On the other hand, the reproduction cluster of Mosston’s Spectrum is connected with less inclusive practices because of its connection with passive student participation and compliance.

Figure 6: Connections between Mosston’s Spectrum of teaching styles and Inclusive practice in Physical Education (In this figure green colour represents Physical Education, purple the Spectrum of Teaching Styles and pink the inclusive practices).
Findings showed therefore that teaching Physical Education with the use of Command and Practice teaching styles - as teachers of this study did - does not necessarily mean that inclusive practices cannot be implemented during a PE lesson. The focus of teachers’ in this study however was not as much on active student participation (student decision making) as in participation in the exercises, games and play. Teachers of this study also focused in making their students feel welcome by creating a generally positive lesson atmosphere and in encouraging and praising student achievements. Therefore, although few decisions were taken by students, they were, as discussed earlier (section 5.4.1), the recipients of inclusive behaviours on behalf of their teachers. It could then be argued that minimum decision making on behalf of the students does not prohibit the use of other types of inclusive practices in the PE lesson. Therefore, the use of the Command and Practice teaching styles does not preclude the use of inclusive practices by the PE teachers (Figure 6). Further, it could be argued that the ‘inclusivity’ of the PE lesson is not therefore necessarily dependent on the use of specific teaching styles, but mostly on the teacher behaviour and efforts for inclusive practice.

It seems that the issue of ‘inclusivity’ of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles is a complicated issue for two reasons. Firstly, the inclusive practices that teachers used with the Command and Practice teaching styles were connected with a welcoming atmosphere in the lesson and care for students’ wellbeing, encouragement of student interaction and participation and clear instructions (section 5.5.1). Positive atmosphere in particular has been discussed in section 5.5.1 in relation to lesson enjoyment which in turn is connected in the literature with enhanced student motivation and participation (Bailey et al, 2009). Therefore teachers’ inclusive efforts did not focus on involving students through decision making, but on inclusive practices with a focus on student participation in PE activities and on making students feel welcome (a prerequisite of inclusion according to Booth et al, 2000). Secondly, it seems that if teachers had used the teaching styles from the production cluster, they would possibly have the opportunity to extend students participation through decision making as well. Being unaware of the variety of teaching styles from the production cluster possibly led teachers to less varied inclusive practices and restricted perceptions of participation. This does not however diminish the value of the
inclusive practices used but rather points out the advantages of a holistic knowledge of the Spectrum. After all it is suggested that the Mosston Spectrum of teaching styles is a framework or ‘a guiding tool’ for teacher practice, because of ‘the unique learning conditions it fosters’ (Goldberger et al, 2012, p. 268). The issue of having limited knowledge of the Spectrum of teaching styles is underlined in this study and this also brings forth a question regarding its usefulness under the conditions described by the participating teachers (sections 5.2.3, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.4.1 and 5.5.1). It also highlights the Spectrum’s focus on a single dimension of inclusion, which is students’ participation through decision making. Inclusion, however, is a more sophisticated concept. As discussed in the literature inclusion is not limited to decision making procedures but is expressed with a variety of ways. Thus, it could be argued that through student decision making, both clusters of the Spectrum of Teaching Style are permeated with a limited understanding of inclusion and therefore inclusive practice.

Under the circumstances the Inclusion style (style E), in particular, can be seen from a different perspective. Although teachers of this study did not use it in their lessons, it still belongs to the reproduction cluster (table 2, section 2.3.2) which is considered less inclusive. Its name though implies otherwise. Apparently, it is considered the most inclusive style of the Spectrum since it creates conditions of inclusion by providing “choice of the degree of difficulty within the same task” (Mosston and Ashworth, 2002, p. 158). Its position in the Spectrum (the last style of the reproduction cluster before the beginning of the production cluster) shows that teacher and student decision making is almost equal. However given that, the reproduction cluster (and the Spectrum) has been connected with a single dimension of inclusion and participation it would be worth investigating in the future inclusion assumptions permeating the Inclusion style (style E).

At a practical level, it could be argued that factors that affect teachers’ perceptions and practice regarding inclusion could affect teaching practice in PE as well. For example, a lack of suitable equipment and infrastructure, both reported and observed in this study, holds the potential to affect not only the quality of inclusive practice but also the quality of the entire PE lesson. Additionally, limited knowledge of the current Greek curriculum for PE and
limited lesson planning on behalf of the teachers also might affect inclusive practice along with the quality of PE lesson. As suggested in the Index of inclusion (Booth et al, 2000) one of the indicators for inclusive practice is teachers being involved in the lesson planning process. The Greek national curriculum for PE urges teachers to create and use recommended daily teaching plans which involve the use of more child-centred teaching styles (Gorozidis and Papaioannou, 2011). The implementation of every teaching style involves lesson planning within the ‘pre-impact’ decision (planning and preparation decision before lesson) making (Goldberger et al, 2012). Therefore, for a lesson to be organised according to a particular teaching style and for inclusive practice to be achieved lesson planning and thus understanding of each lesson’s particular goals is essential (figure 5).

5.7 Conclusions

In conducting this study I have attempted to reveal the beliefs about inclusion that are held by Greek PE teachers and the ways in which these beliefs influence their practice. These beliefs seem to relate to current understandings of inclusion as long as dated ones. In addition, some of teachers’ understanding regarding inclusion derive from legislation inadequacies and confusion over the use of the term inclusion and are thus unique to the educational context of Greece. Teachers’ beliefs regarding inclusion were not always consistent with their practice, however, a variety of inclusive practices were used in their lessons. These inclusive practices improved students with SEN participation and well-being in the PE lesson but ultimately, whenever used, contributed to a more inclusive lesson for all students. In this study, I have also sought to understand the factors influencing teachers’ beliefs on inclusion and the relationship between these and their understanding of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles. Some factors influencing teachers’ beliefs were therefore found to be deeply embedded in the Greek educational context from an organisational, legislative and financial point of view. Most factors however, were in alignment with findings from studies which showed that individual teachers’ characteristics and knowledge, school organisation and material and physical support were influencing inclusive practice. On the other hand, Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles limited knowledge and use was attributed to factors similar to those influencing teachers’ understanding of
inclusion. Another connection was made however between inclusive practice and the use of specific teaching styles of the Spectrum, which emphasises the complexity of teaching as an educational process and of inclusion as a multifaceted process. In this chapter, teachers’ understandings, knowledge, perceptions, and use of all the aforementioned phenomena have been discussed in detail and compared with the findings gained from other investigations and a range of theoretical ideas about inclusion. In the next and final chapter the contributions of this study on a theoretical and practical level are summarised.
6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of my research journey. It then highlights the theoretical and practical contributions that the study makes to the existing body of knowledge about understanding of inclusion in relation to the teaching and learning of PE. The various implications of this new knowledge are then discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the study and some recommendations for further research.

6.2 Summary of the research journey

This research journey, as described in the introduction chapter, began with an understanding that both inclusion and use of different teaching styles should be implemented in PE lessons if a PE teacher abides by the Greek legislation and curriculum requirements. The current literature was investigated in terms of inclusion and inclusive education, international understandings, physical education, inclusion in physical education from the teacher’s perspective, and use of teaching styles. Through this investigation, the gaps in the literature were identified and highlighted. Following this, a suitable research design was chosen, which reflected the philosophical and methodological basis of the study. Data was collected through semi-structured observations and both semi-structured and in-depth interviews with the 15 participating PE teachers. Data analysis involved thematic analysis and the process of constant comparative method. The outcomes of the study shed light on the way teachers understand and implement inclusion and on their knowledge and use of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. The most significant outcome, however, was the finding that the Command and Practice teaching styles can coexist with inclusive practices when teachers chose to incorporate them in their practice.

In the following section, the unique contributions of this thesis are highlighted, along with the practical implications of this study.
6.3 Contributions of the study

The data generated by this study, particularly the way it was combined and discussed based on the relevant theory and literature, provides significant contributions to knowledge on both the practical and theoretical level.

More specifically, the outcomes of this study regarding inclusion and inclusive practice provide a fresh understanding of the views of PE teachers in Greek primary schools. At first, some of the interpretations of inclusion, as discussed in section 5.2.1 (slow process, effort of organised society, social participation, peer acceptance, adjustment of practice, students being able to do the same things as their peers), relate to established understandings, both current and outdated, in the area of inclusion and inclusive practice. The understanding of inclusion as the ‘inclusive class’, however, relating to current Greek educational context offers an insight into the current organisational issues in the Greek education system, which retains a prolonged association of inclusion with the outdated medical model of disability. Secondly, both the inclusive and non-inclusive practices used by the PE teachers in their lessons were identified for the context of the PE lesson. Teachers focused on students having an enjoyable lesson, for example, which was discussed in relation to the results and the importance of teacher behaviour in achieving an inclusive environment. Other inclusive practices (such as prompt, praise, acceptance, encouragement of student interaction etc.) were discussed in relation to the use of seemingly non-inclusive ones (i.e. competitive games/play) and explained in the context of other relevant literature. The qualitative nature of this study allowed for teachers’ actions and behaviours to be identified and discussed in the light of the established research relating to inclusive practice and teacher behaviour.

This study has thus contributed not only to the identification of inclusive practices in the PE lesson, but also to their connection (as ‘corrective measures’) to apparently non-inclusive practice in the PE lesson (i.e. individual guidance to a student with SEN during a competitive game).

Other outcomes of this study referred to the challenges of inclusion (i.e. challenging student behaviour, teacher training, school support and provision, outdated legislation, etc.). Although these outcomes were confirmed and related to existing international and Greek research, they contributed to a current and
in-depth understanding of the challenges of Greek PE teachers, particularly as most studies seeking understandings of inclusion and its challenges in Greece have been conducted with the use of quantitative methods.

The findings of this study also showed that teachers believed PE is a lesson where students 'unwind' and also a lesson where students with SEN can be more easily included because of the elements of play. The former this was connected to findings from similar studies in physical education; however, the association of inclusion with play in physical education (the later) has not previously been directly addressed in the literature. The discussion of this outcome and the connection of play to motivation and enjoyment (and consequently to inclusion) can be considered a contribution to both theoretical and pedagogical knowledge in this area.

The outcomes regarding Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles revealed not only that most teachers ignored the existence of the Spectrum, but also that (mostly unconsciously) they used the Command and Practice teaching styles. The implications of the use of Command and Practice styles in the lesson have been discussed in detail and relate to findings from other studies, international and Greek. These findings provide new and current knowledge regarding the use of the Spectrum by Greek primary school teachers. Additionally, given a lack of knowledge of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles by most teachers, this study offers a new perspective which challenges the usefulness of the Spectrum in physical education of educational systems (such as the Greek one) where its perceived implementation coincides with a requirement for inclusion which is not directly and fully addressed in the Spectrum Styles. Therefore this study provides the ground for both theoretical enhancement of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles and practical considerations of its implementation in the PE lesson.

The use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles was also discussed in relation to the inclusive practices used by teachers. Although the use of Command and Practice styles is associated with a focus on performance and thus can be considered less inclusive, the findings showed that they did coexist and were used alongside inclusive practices. The way ‘inclusive practice’ has been discussed shows that it can be separated from any type of teaching
method or style. The main contribution of this study is the understanding that while the Command and Practice teaching styles cannot be considered ideal for fostering inclusive practice, they can coexist with it, if PE teachers decide to incorporate inclusive practices in their behaviours and choices during lessons. This study thus offers a new understanding of how inclusive practices can enhance the teaching and learning experience in PE lessons and make them more inclusive. This study provides an innovative way of thinking about the Spectrum and inclusive practice in PE lessons, which can be considered as a contribution to their theoretical and practical enhancement.

6.4 Practical implications and recommendations

The engagement with the collected data and participants of this study has created a unique view of their teaching experiences. As a result, some possible practical implications have come to light.

One of the outcomes of this study suggests that the educational system in Greece has not adequately addressed issues relating to inclusive educational settings. According to the findings, this manifested itself in teachers' confusion regarding the meaning of inclusion, outdated notions of disability, and numerous challenges regarding inclusion implementation, due to teachers' lack of knowledge of their role in inclusion, lack of training, and unsuitable or insufficient infrastructure. The current educational system in Greece would therefore benefit from clear legislation which would clarify the meaning of inclusion in such a way that it would be directly reflected in school policies and organisation, teacher training, and infrastructure.

Additionally, the outcomes of this study showed that teachers did not always think that planning their lessons was a meaningful process and did not take advantage of the current national curriculum for PE as much as they could possibly have. As concluded in the Discussion chapter (Chapter 5) the use of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles and implementation of inclusion seem both to be required in the PE lesson. Teachers did not use the more student-centred teaching styles as suggested by the national curriculum, which according to recent literature foster inclusive practice more successfully. Furthermore, they also did not plan their inclusive practice. PE teachers and students would therefore benefit from clear guidance and possibly professional
training around the current national curriculum for PE and ways to develop their planning and practice. In addition, the curriculum itself could be enhanced in a way that would allow and create suitable conditions for incorporating the full range of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles to promote inclusive practice. An emphasis should be given, however, to the Style of Inclusion, which although reflecting a single dimension of inclusion, provides teachers with practical alternatives.

A common denominator of the aforementioned implications seems to be the centralised nature of the Greek educational system. This nature allows for problematic situations to arise simultaneously and extensively. In addition, it creates a distance between teaching practitioners and policy makers, leaving teachers to feel unable to make a change and possibly indifferent. This after all might be one of the reasons why teachers did not feel obligated to plan for inclusion and to occasionally suggest that they are not responsible for it, along with loosely following PE curriculum guidance. Therefore, apart from the policy clarifications, changes and general improvements on both inclusion and the Spectrum of Teaching Styles, the Greek educational system would benefit from a reduction of distance between policy makers and teachers and a selected and thoughtful transfer of control to local authorities.

Finally, PE teachers and teachers in general would benefit from being given the opportunity to attend behavioural improvement programmes. Given the disciplining strategies some teachers of this study have used during their lessons, such programmes would provide them with a variety of options to choose from when disciplining students.

6.5 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research

The current study suggests that inclusive practices and the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles (particularly the Command and Practice styles) can coexist and even thrive together depending on teachers’ choices. This conclusion was derived after observing 28 PE lessons and interviewing 15 PE teachers. From a methodological perspective, these numbers of observations and interviews can be considered adequate for a qualitative study. Claims of generalisation cannot
be made through this study, however, because of its small scale. This project has presented in detail its context, participants, methods, and its theoretical framework in a way that would allow future researchers or practitioners to decide whether this study can be compared to their own settings and context. Further research on a small or large scale would definitely add to knowledge regarding the ‘ifs and hows’ of the coexistence of inclusive practice and use of the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles in the PE lesson, not only in Greece, but also internationally. Additionally, since this study’s findings indicated the widespread use of only two teaching styles of the Mosston’s Spectrum, it would be worth investigating whether inclusive practices can coexist with all of Mosston’s teaching styles.

Teachers in this study implemented inclusive practices and Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles mostly in a loose and unplanned way. Research regarding inclusive practice in PE would benefit from observing inclusive practices which would emerge from pre-planned lessons.

Another limitation of this study relates to one of the methods used, particularly the semi-structured observations. A usual concern with use of semi-structured observations, despite them being non-participant observations, is that the “observer [might] affect the situation under observation” (Robson, 2002, p. 311). Additionally, when it comes to observing Mosston’s teaching styles, literature suggests that most researchers chose systematic observation designs (Chatoupis, 2010). According to Chatoupis (2010), without systematic observations of the Spectrum of Teaching Styles, it is difficult to estimate all the variables accounted for in the recognition of the different styles. Although I took precautions by carefully designing my observation sheet and I was confident in my identification of the Teaching Styles of Mosston’s Spectrum used by the teachers of this study, there is always a possibility that I may have failed to record something crucial in order to correctly identify them.

Additionally, the outcomes of the study suggest that teachers’ understandings of inclusion are sometimes related to outdated or misleading conceptions of the term, which has been attributed to a lack of clear legislation. Literature on the Greek educational system has criticised its organisational shortcomings, particularly due to its centralised nature. Further research on this issue is
therefore a necessity to identify and specify the causes of such miscommunications and to suggest ways for effective communication between the Greek state and its schools and teachers.

Finally, in expressing their understandings of inclusion, teachers of this study often suggested that inclusion was the responsibility of the teacher of the inclusive class. Given that inclusion is a requirement of all schools and teachers, there is a vital need for further studies to investigate the extent to which inclusion is understood and implemented in school level and further in national level. Such studies would provide wholistic evidence of the inclusive practice in Greece.

6.6 Concluding comments

The journey through the current study has provided me with valuable knowledge and understanding regarding the concept of inclusion and the Mosston Spectrum of Teaching Styles. This project has provided me with the opportunity to visit many schools and to observe and interview many PE teachers, who allowed me to enter their school-based reality. As a result of this experience I have gained confidence both as a PE teacher and as researcher.

This study suggests that it would be beneficial if PE teachers, researchers and stakeholders to consider inclusion in mainstream PE in relation to the model teaching styles formulated by Mosston. The findings of this study are encouraging in as much as they show that the Command and Practice teaching styles are compatible with the existence of inclusive approaches in the PE lessons. The implementation of the recommendations would require deep rooted organisational issues to be resolved to promote the changes in teaching practices that are needed in order to benefit the experiences of students with special educational needs during PE lessons.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Table of research on Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Aims of study</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Methods used</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cothran et al. (2000)</td>
<td>To identify students’ experiences with the Full Spectrum of Teaching Styles.</td>
<td>438 college students enrolled in PE courses</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Survey, including short scenarios of each teaching style.</td>
<td>Most students had experiences being taught with styles from the reproduction cluster. Students viewed styles from the reproduction cluster as positively as styles from the production cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtner-Smith et al. (2001)</td>
<td>To identify teaching styles used by teachers</td>
<td>18 PE teachers</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Videotaping of lessons followed by their coding with the IFITS (a systematic observation instrument).</td>
<td>Teachers mostly used teaching styles from the reproduction cluster with the Practice style being the most commonly used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvara and Birone (2002)</td>
<td>To identify teaching styles used by teachers</td>
<td>42 Greek and 42 Hungarian PE teachers</td>
<td>Greece Hungary</td>
<td>Videotaping of lessons followed by their coding with the ITLB (a systematic observation instrument).</td>
<td>Both Greek and Hungarian teachers used more styles from the reproduction cluster. Hungarian teachers had also an increased use of two styles from the production cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatoupis and Emmanuel (2003a)</td>
<td>To identify difficulties in teaching with the Inclusion style (by students or teachers) and to find ways to overcome them</td>
<td>Students from 2 fifth-grade and 2 sixth-grade classes in an elementary school</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Intervention. The authors taught students with the Inclusion style twice a week for four weeks and recorded their observations. They also questioned students in an informal way.</td>
<td>Tips for PE teachers. Students should: focus on their task individually, work in their own space until they learn how to make impact decisions, start practicing decision making with one or two decisions at a time, be reminded of individual decision making, be reminded of the non-competitive nature of the tasks, be reminded of their role in the Inclusion style with the use of charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatoupis and Emmanuel (2003b)</td>
<td>To examine the effects of Practice and Inclusion styles on the perceived athletic competence of students</td>
<td>111 fifth-grade students from 3 primary schools</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Instructional intervention followed by Harter’s Self Perception Profile for Children Questionnaire</td>
<td>Groups taught with the Inclusion and Practice styles performed better than the control group in terms of perceived athletic competence. Girls had higher perception of athletic competence with the Inclusion style. Boys had equally good perception of athletic competence with both styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulinna and Cothran (2003)</td>
<td>To investigate teachers self-reported use and perceptions of various teaching styles</td>
<td>212 PE teachers from primary and</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Survey, including short scenarios of each teaching style, using the “Physical Education Teachers’</td>
<td>Teacher reported using mostly the Command, Practice, Reciprocal, Inclusion and Divergent discovery teaching styles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Survey:** Study methods include surveying teachers or students.
- **Videotaping:** Lessons are recorded and then analyzed.
- **Intervention:** The study involves a specific teaching approach or program designed to improve student learning.
- **Harter’s Self Perception Profile for Children Questionnaire:** A standardized tool used to assess students' perceptions of their athletic competence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Instrument Used</th>
<th>Findings/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan et al. (2005)</td>
<td>To investigate the effects of Command, Practice, Reciprocal and Guided discovery styles on teacher behaviours and motivational climate in class</td>
<td>4 initial teacher education teachers and 92 secondary age students</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3 lessons of each PE teacher were filmed and then coded according to TARGET.</td>
<td>The Command and Practice styles resulted in more performance focused behaviours from teachers in comparison with the Reciprocal and Discovery styles. Students showed more adaptive cognitive and affective responses with the Reciprocal and Guided discovery styles which they also preferred being taught with than the Command and Practice styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvara et al. (2006)</td>
<td>To investigate the impact of different teaching styles on students’ perceptions on PE motivational climate</td>
<td>75 students between 11-12 years old</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Intervention. The same teacher taught students four 20-minute lessons for four weeks. Students then answered the LAPOPECQ questionnaire.</td>
<td>Styles from the production cluster had more positive impact on students’ motivational orientation. Students taught with styles from the production cluster were more ego oriented, worried and competitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derri and Pachta, (2007)</td>
<td>To compare the Command and Guided discovery styles in terms of motor skills and concepts acquisition and retention.</td>
<td>59 students between 6-7 years old</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Test of Gross Motor Development was used to test skill acquisition. Paper and pencil test was used to examine concept acquisition.</td>
<td>Students improved in skills acquisition with the use of both teaching styles. Students taught with the Command style showed lower level of retention of skills compared to the Guided discovery style. Finally, both styles are effective for concept learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouratidou et al. (2007)</td>
<td>To investigate if teaching with the Reciprocal style promotes moral reasoning and development</td>
<td>157 students from secondary schools</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Six week moral development Intervention. LAPOPECQ questionnaire before and after the intervention was administered to students.</td>
<td>The Reciprocal style of teaching positively affects students’ moral reasoning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatoupis (2015)</td>
<td>To investigate whether pairing primary age students by companionship preference improves motor skill development and comfort level in the Reciprocal style</td>
<td>52 students between 8-9 years old</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Two week intervention by teaching for 30 minutes, four times a week.</td>
<td>Students paired with friends improved significantly more in motor skill acquisition than students who did not pair with friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SueSee and Edwards (2011)</td>
<td>To identify the self-identified and observed use of teaching styles</td>
<td>110 senior PE teachers</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Lesson observations 9 PE teachers (out of 110). ‘Instrument for collecting teachers' beliefs’ questionnaire.</td>
<td>The questionnaire showed that teacher most often used the Practice style. The 9 observed teachers though used the Command, Practice, Reciprocal, Self-check and Convergent discovery styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorozidis and Papaioannou (2011)</td>
<td>To examine teachers' self-efficacy, goal orientation, attitudes and intentions of implementing the newest PE curriculum.</td>
<td>290 secondary school PE teachers</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Teachers were satisfied using the familiar to them teaching styles from the reproduction cluster to implement the curriculum instead of the bigger proposed range proposed by the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolovelonis et al. (2011)</td>
<td>To examine the effects of the use of the Reciprocal and Self-check styles on specific motor skills acquisition (basketball chest pass) and on related psychosocial variables</td>
<td>64 fifth and sixth grade students</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Intervention Evaluation of students’ performance according to 5 scale test based on criteria.</td>
<td>Both teaching styles were effective in achieving student accuracy. A combination of both investigated teaching styles however, is more effective than both of them separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez et al. (2012)</td>
<td>To investigate college students' perceptions of the Command, Practice and Inclusion styles.</td>
<td>77 college students</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Interventions followed by questionnaires, ratings of perceived exertion and 48 randomised interviews</td>
<td>The Inclusion style was reported to be more physically and cognitively involving for participants comparing to the Command and Practice styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papaioannou et al. (2012)</td>
<td>To examine whether the Self-check style creates advanced task involvement, intrinsic motivation and metacognitive regulation</td>
<td>269 sixth grade students</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Intervention preceded and followed by questionnaires</td>
<td>Being taught with the self-check style students showed advanced processes of self-monitoring and planning confirming the initial hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byra et al. (2014)</td>
<td>To investigate student and teacher behaviours in the Command, Practice and Inclusion styles.</td>
<td>77 college students</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Three observational instruments</td>
<td>The Inclusion style was proved to allot more time to instruction than the activity itself compared to the other two teaching styles. Feedback was more positive in the Inclusion style whereas in all lessons students were engaged in similar active fitness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympas et al. (2016)</td>
<td>To investigate teacher implementation and perceptions of Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching Styles</td>
<td>219 PE teachers</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Survey, including short scenarios of each teaching style, using the “Physical Education Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching Styles” instrument.</td>
<td>Teachers used more often styles from the reproduction cluster namely the Command, Inclusion and Practice styles. Some styles of the production cluster were found to be used however more often than the rest styles of the reproduction cluster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Observation schedule with field notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Lesson topic</th>
<th>Subject matter</th>
<th>Field notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Teacher</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Lesson on XYZ</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Describes a single question in class, mentions a variety of questions asked during the lesson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teacher's notes:* (all, some subject)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Mr. Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject: Mathematics
Lesson 1 of 2
Date: 3/15/23
School: [School Name]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject matter</th>
<th>No of students with SEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: Initial observation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>PE teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class:</td>
<td>Lesson: 1st or 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of students:</td>
<td>Subject matter:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of students with SEN:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Field notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) Takes (all or some) decisions concerning…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2) Lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T3) Accepts students’ requests on subject matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T4) Asks questions related to the subject matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T5) Gives feedback private or not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T6) Sets performance criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T7) Designs task with multiple degrees of difficulty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T8) Accepts students requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S1) Individual practice or in groups or pairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2) Reproduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S3) Reciprocation of roles among students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S4) Use of criteria sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S5) Answer questions by the PE teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S6) Produce a programme to solve a (set or not set) problem independently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S7) Engage in reasoning and questioning toward a particular goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S8) Engage in reasoning and questioning toward a particular goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I1) Everyone is made to feel welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I2) Peer interaction/support encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I3) Students treat each other with respect; peers helped to give feedback in positive ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I4) Teacher’s aides, interpreters, attendant service providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I5) Special features or equipment at school: ramps, elevators, adapted accommodation etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I6) Participation of all students encouraged in classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I7) Sensitive allocation to teaching groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I8) Clear objectives of the lesson; clarification of vocabulary; teachers checks understanding of instructions and attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I9) Time out used to maintain attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I10) Time and support given before response is required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: Example of observation notes after being transferred in Word

Beginning of the lesson. Warm up: PE teacher tells children to start jogging around the yard. One girl with Down syndrome runs in front of the line of all the other children. At the third round she comes to me [I'm sitting on a bench at the side of the yard] and asks my name. [PE teacher tells her] ‘Natali will you come?’. She is going back to her line.

Stretching: The PE teacher tells children to stop jogging. The children are standing on the lines of the yard and they start stretching. The PE teacher gives all the instructions and the children follow. He clarifies instructions and gives feedback: ‘nice’ or ‘hands higher’. [He tells off some children:] ‘who’s talking over there?’. Natali seems to be following the lesson normally. She stands in front of all the children. PE teacher prompts one of the girls to start speaking loudly: ‘1-2-3 stretch’ [exercise that includes hand stretching according to PE teacher’s instructions]. Children are following the rhythm of the girl. Natali repeats at the same time shouting. The children don’t seem to mind her although she might be annoying to them [because of the shouting]. Another girl goes in front of the other children [to demonstrate, after prompted by the PE teacher]. She shows children the exercises, that PE teacher names, and the rest of the children follow. [PE teacher asks] Natali to go at the front near the girl. She follows the exercises while shouting the rhythm. PE teacher tells ‘bravo, this is it’ to all the children. He tells them to relax, inhale and exhale. So far he gives them clear instructions [details about what exactly to do]. All the children follow teacher’s lead. [He asks:] ‘We woke up didn’t we?’

Change: Announcement that the game they are going to play is chase in couples. [The PE teacher tells children to find their couple and after a while most children have chosen. PE teacher is the one who designates Natali’s couple, a boy who complies readily with the PE teacher’s instruction]. Natali is couple with a boy. [the game starts and] is running with her peer. All the children are participating, they know the game. Natali’s couple is one of the first to go out [leave the game because they lost] but the game that doesn’t last long.

As the children regroup at the end of the game, the PE teacher approaches me and starts describing Natali to me. ‘She participates, it didn’t take her long time
to do all these [exercises, games], she only is afraid of playing some of the games’.

Second round of the same game: she gets out of the game again soon after the beginning. She gets caught [by the hunters of the chase game] early in the game again both she and her couple. Children that lose go and sit at a bench. The game doesn’t last long.

Change: children are sitting on the ground at the middle of the yard. and another girl are still standing and they talk to each other; the girl hugs her. The PE teacher ‘come here now’ [teacher calls student with SEN to approach]. Separation of two teams. PE teacher designates two girls as leaders of the two teams and they start choosing the members for their teams. He warns them that the two teams will be the same at the next game at the basketball court and to choose boys as well. Children take their time to split the teams and the PE teacher prompts them ‘choose a little bit faster, it’s free’ [humoristic]. After that he just observes. Each child that is chosen stands behind the leader of the team. stays last. PE teacher tells her to go to the team of one of the leaders ‘go to ’’s team’. She goes and stands next to her team. She watches the other children and she doesn’t speak.

The teams are going to the right position to play ‘mantilaki’. [It is a game where the two teams are lining one opposite the other and they are given numbers, so that one number belongs to one child of every team. When each number is called the two children run from opposite sides towards the centre and try to grab a scarf or a ball and return to their line without getting caught by their opponent]. The PE teacher allocates the numbers and calls the numbers. The children are cheering their teammates. The PE teacher prepares before he calls her number (12). ‘Get ready , get ready’. Teacher calls her number she runs grabs the ball, [pretends to] threatens the girl for a bit, but quite friendly, and she wins the round. PE teacher says ‘Bravo ’. She seems happy with her win. The game continues with the PE teacher calling other numbers. wanders further away for a while and the game finishes.

Change: PE teacher asks children to remain at the same teams and start playing datsball. It is a game that they know and they start organising it.
The PE teacher comes and sits at the bench. Teacher starts talking to me about 
[________] while observing the children. [________] doesn’t play this game. She wanders 
around the yard and from time to time she comes and sits next to the PE teacher, 
she hugs him and she is asking my name again and again. [________] is asking for 
PE teacher’s whistle. Some children are coming to complain that they lost. PE 
teacher asks them what happened. He tells a girl not to cheat on the game while 
he keeps observing from the bench. Later he chats with the children, and he 
solves some disputes. In the meanwhile [________] is sitting next to me. PE teacher 
organises the game again and the children start playing for a little longer. PE 
teacher whistles the end of the game and he tells everybody to go to the class. 
[________] is left behind and] PE teacher prompts her to follow.
APPENDIX 5: Example of interview with first level coding

PE teacher 2 (P2) interview

Q: First of all I would like to ask you how many years of service you have.
A: I've been teaching for 14 years.

Q: And in how many of those years have you had experience teaching children with SEN?
A: All of the years that I have been here at the school. All of the 13 years that I have been at this school, there have always been children that were going to the 'inclusion' [inclusive class].

Q: Has there always been an inclusive class since you started?
A: Yes, yes, from the first year.

Q: Alright. First of all, what is 'inclusion' in your opinion? What do you think that inclusion is?
A: You mean the goal of the inclusive class or what we mean in general?

Q: Inclusion in general.
A: We try in some ways to make it more special, more personal. I mean with the child; to include him, to include them, in the school in general.

Q: What you just said to me right now, where does it come from? I mean the way that you understand inclusion, where does it come from? How have you formed this opinion?
A: Look, from my experience here in this school, with some of the children that have some special needs, we try in different ways to be more personal, with different connections through the inclusive class and their inclusion in the school, to help them, so that as the years pass, they might not even need to be in the 'inclusion' [inclusive class]. It might be a) matter of behaviour, matter of adjustment, his personality... he might not be ready, he might not be mature... regardless of the medical problems that the child has.

Q: Yes, OK. Did you ever have relevant training concerning children with SEN, in how to do your lessons?
A: Not very much. Only at the university - for almost a year we taught children with SEN, but in a school that taught children with motor problems.

Q: was this a part of the placement?
A: Not of the placement, just a lesson. Some days we went to different schools, but I didn't go to a special school as such. I went to a school that had a class with children with quadriplegia and things like that. Because here as well, in the first few years I had a child with quadriplegia, so I had a little...
experience, but no specific training. At least not until the time I finished [university]. In general there were not many children with SEN in lessons. We had a lesson [at the university] on 'Special education' [title of the lesson] but it was very short.

Q: Afterwards when you started working?

A: There wasn’t something specific, no. Most of my contacts are from here and usually with the teachers in ‘inclusion’ [inclusive class] I have tried to learn a few things or asked them to give me some more materials concerning children with autism, or concerning children with Down syndrome. There are a few more elements that I can’t always implement here; when a class is heterogeneous in essence. OK, a few things. I was trying to take responsibility myself to learn a few more things.

Q: Yes, with your own initiative?

A: Yes, with my own initiative, without special training.

Q: Something else, new you mentioned that you had asked your colleagues from the inclusive classes for example – anything else? Do you have some other kind of support? Or did you or...

A: For this matter, right?

Q: Yes, for your lessons...

A: With these children, with these classes... no. I always try to find ways myself. This is the essence. This is the practical part. I am trying to find a way, first of all for the children to be safe for the time that they are with me, especially the children that have more serious problems, and then to try for them to do at least a few things throughout the year, simple [things]. Because it is not easy... certainly most of the time, and last year, I had to leave the other children a little bit behind, you try to protect the child that is maybe more of a risk during the lesson, because ok, it is [the child/children] in a place like you can see outside, on concrete. We are not in a room where we are a little bit freer to do a lot of things, without having the danger of a child getting lost or getting hurt, from that point of view.

Q: Yes, safety is a priority.

A: Yes, first of all for me safety is a priority. The same way as it is for all of the children, because the space doesn’t always help, so especially for the young children this is a priority.

Q: Yes. Has it ever happened in your career that you have needed to ask for help from someone else, for anything, any kind of help?

A: For my lessons outside you mean?
Q: Yes, in order to make your lesson easier.

A: Not really. No, I can't say that I have asked for help. And I don't think that there would be someone that could help in particular.

Q: So, you feel that even if you needed help you wouldn't...

A: Yes, but mostly [I would like] theoretical [help]. For example, the way I asked you if you have a paper that can tell me something about the children with this problem, to study, to get a bit more informed, or to ask the teacher in 'inclusion' for example, what could we do with this child so that we help them even a little. For example, to teach them right or left, to teach them that to go inside the hula-hoop, that they need to run until there and come back. These kinds of simple things, yes, I have asked for those. For example, you could tell me that yes, this child needs to learn or to help them for example to learn orienteering in the yard. Where we go, where we go forwards, where we go back; I have asked simple things like that so that I can maybe implement them. But simple forms like that.

Q: OK. I understand. Do you think that the way you do your lessons, taking into account what you told me just now, do you manage to include these children in the lesson?

A: Look, with the more simple cases of children [with SEN], I think I can include them now. The more severe cases, I think I can help just a little. If they stay with me at least for 10 minutes there in the lesson, I will find a way to make them happy or to gain something. You need to make them happy first of all, that they managed to do something. Right? But it doesn't always happen. Of course it's the child that doesn't always help you. Right? The more simple cases, yes, I think that I adapt the lesson in a way... i.e. everybody stays a bit behind usually, so that almost everybody will be happy and satisfied.

Q: Yes

A: When I have a child or two in the class that are... that they can't reach one level higher, we necessarily stay a bit behind, all of us.

Q: Yes, I understand. Do you think that your experience throughout the years has affected the way you teach?

A: My experience, yes. I have changed a lot of things over the years.

Q: For example?

A: Look, because all children are different... there can be children with the same problems, but all children are different. So, I need to find different ways. I can't handle every child in the same way.
because I have learnt that this child has this problem and the other [child] has the same problem... but no child is the same.

Q: Yes

A: Yes, I think that as with all of the children, apart from the children that have problems or special needs, I change my ways. I have changed to accommodate that as well.

Q: Ok. I saw in the first lesson with Year 4, Andrew was there, at some point you said that he tried to shoot the basketball with the other children...

A: To encourage him a little bit...

Q: Yes, why do you do that? What do you think about that?

A: *Look, because I know that he likes playing with the basketball, and I know that the others [peers] know that he can score, so they want him in their team, I believe that if they encourage him they will make him a bit happier. Either he scores or not.*

Q: So, they accept him.

A: They accept him, they accept him, yes. It doesn’t seem [weird to them] I mean... they won’t react badly to it. And I think that they did it as well, without needing something special...

Q: Yes, I didn’t notice anything and that’s why I’m asking. How come you did it so comfortably and there was no further issues with it?

A: No, yes I am doing this many times, or we will congratulatate him, or we will say high five, either me or the children. They do it easily.

Q: I understand. Are there some other kind of advantages or disadvantages that you can think of when you have children with SEN in the lesson?

A: Advantages. Look, there are always advantages. First of all, there are advantages concerning the children. They need to know that we are not all the same. So, we need to accept those that are not like us. Like a child that misbehaves; all of us need to accept him and find a way to adjust to him in the class, in the same way we need to learn that we are not all the same and we need to help some people in a different way. I think that this is an advantage in a class. Now, disadvantages... I can’t call them disadvantages; I think that you need to find a way to make them all advantages. The fact that a class might not progress a couple of levels ahead at the lesson of P.E. in primary school, I don’t see it as a disadvantage.

Q: Yes.
A: I think that if all of us leave the lesson and we are all happy... apart from the usual nagging. I think that we are fine, even if we didn't reach the level we wanted. Let's stay at B [grade level] until year 6. I don't think it matters particularly. As long as you find a formula that everybody will be more or less satisfied, more or less happy with. I mean, the purpose is not to say that it is an advantage to reach, until year 6... to become excellent in one particular thing/field.

Do you want to stop it for a minute? [Interruption]

So I think it's not an end in itself that my children will become superb in one field... and to leave or to neglect someone and make him feel sad. It's ok, it's better to stay in one place and to be happier.

Q: Yes. You said before that one of the advantages is that children learn to accept difference. How do you... how do you manage to show them this?

A: Look, I am not looking for special ways. I mean, I think that this comes to me a bit spontaneously in the lesson. I mean I don't look to do this a lot. I don't make it my purpose. Throughout my whole lesson, I think that I try with my behaviour, I manage it most of the time. I believe I make them all feel that we are the same in the lesson. Even if we actually are not, in essence [the same]. And even if some of them understand that we are not [the same]. But, through different ways and different tricks that you try to find sometimes, you make them understand that we are here all together. You may be a little bit 'down' and I am more 'up' but we are going to play all together. We can co-exist all together in the lesson.

Q: Yes, OK. Do you think... I will repeat myself a bit but I would like to confirm it. Is there some kind of support that you would like to have and that you don't have?

A: Look, as the years pass by, and because in general the classes and the children... we see that there are problems. I mean that as the years pass there are more children with problems. In a normal school, more children with different problems are coming... I think that we need to be informed by our superiors of course. Usually, the information and the training we get is a bit theoretical, like we have never done some types of teaching, or had contact with some children, with special schools, with other inclusive classes, other schools with inclusive classes, children with other problems, so that if a child came with a problem that I had never seen before, I would be a bit more ready. Yes, I think that needs to be updated, because we see these children more often now.

Q: Why do you think that more children like that are coming more often now in schools?

A: This is also one of my questions too. In general, I don't know, I see more children with more problems year in year out. That's what I've found at least in my 13-14 years.

Q: The seminars that you were talking about earlier...
A: Very few and mostly this year we had some updates…

Q: What about…

A: Mostly they gave us some leaflets with some information about certain conditions. I mean written… We were supposed to update our knowledge and see some teaching. I mean we would observe some teaching hours, like the way you observed the lesson, we would go to some schools to see some other Year 4 class with children in it [with SEN]. Of course it didn’t happen.

Q: So, they gave you information, for example, these are the characteristics of a child with Down syndrome.

A: Yes, things I could note for a child or a class like that. What they might need to learn or what are their characteristics concerning the PE lesson, skills mostly. They were mostly theoretical. There was no special practice. We were sitting, watching and listening.

Q: And you think that practice is what is missing?

A: Yes, if you don’t have contact, no matter what I say to you, if you don’t observe the lesson, you wouldn’t be able to understand some things. No matter how analytically I could describe it, or give to you written down.

Q: Yes, OK. What are the existing difficulties when you try to implement inclusion?

A: You mean in my lessons?

Q: Yes.

A: Look, first of all it’s the space… because usually children with these kinds of problems, they need a safe space. You can’t control their safety.

Q: You don’t have a room for PE, do you?

A: No, we don’t have anything. There is only what you see.

Q: In the yard?

A: Yes.

Q: And in winter where do you go?

A: In the winter we try. We either some things in the classroom, with books that we have [PE-related books] or sometimes here in this space, but because usually there is noise and you know, you can’t control them… yes… basically in the classroom. We don’t have some special solutions for when it rains. So, first of all space come first. When you have children like that you need to be in a more...
enclosed space. It is one thing to be in a yard that is 100m² and another thing in a small room that is just 20m², in order to able to do some more simple things. This is basic. Right?

Q: Anything else?

A: I believe this is my main difficulty. Maybe if I had a little bit more controlled space, maybe I could control things a little bit more. Because you can forget the issue of safety -- you are a bit safer in a room -- and you can play it differently. If you have mattresses, if you have small games... it is different to have them outside on the concrete and move around playing games than to have them in a more controlled space.

Q: Are there some changes that you consider essential for the improvement of 'inclusion' in the schools in general and also specifically for your lessons?

A: Yes, look, updating knowledge and training is the important thing. Right? I believe it is the basis, because in general, because all the updates are being done on a theoretical level, they don't help you. So, in a theoretical frame yes, I can do it myself, I open the book, I read a lot of things on the internet, I watch... but if you don't enter the problem, i.e. to go in a different class that's not in your school, a different class... and go do a lesson, to see what kind of problems this child has? Different problems... so, when you see it again you will be more ready. So, practice is the most important thing. If you don't have practical training, at least in special schools, or in other inclusive classes with different problems... I might have two problems here, but another school might have three different problems with children. I want to see how they are, what they are doing. So that I will be a little bit more ready when I have it in front of me.

Q: I understand.

A: I mean I need someone to show me how I can teach 15-16 children, including a child with a problem. What can I do outside (in the yard)? To control the lesson? To be safe? To have fun? Everybody to be happy? The other children to adjust to the situation... these are basic things. If you don't enter the problem I don't think that anyone can help you theoretically.

Q: ok. Do you think that society has a role in the process of inclusion in general?

A: No, I don't think it has a role. There is not some updating. Most people, we look at a problem only when we have it in our home. Only then do we start looking at the problem... the issue. Most of the times we are outsiders; it's easier to gossip, to judge.

Q: Does this affect...

A: What do you mean?
Q: Does this affect inclusion in any way. Who does it affect?

A: Mostly it affects those who have the problems, I believe.

Q: So for example, the child, the mother, and the father. Is that what you mean?

A: Yes, it affects them. Because when people in general don’t know how to deal with a problem, at some point this is going to hit us; people will go against us; they will be negative towards the problem. Because they will not know how to deal with it usually, and they usually are a bit absolute. People around us are a bit absolute. Maybe because they don’t know how to face it, so they will usually have an extreme reaction. People around us can be absolute, cruel, abrupt. Because they don’t know, because in general, society in our country doesn’t know how to treat different needs, difference from the norm, depending on how you think about it.

Q: Yes.

A: We don’t see these people around us usually, people with problems, children…they are more…we cover it, we hide it, we…we don’t show them in public.

Q: Yes. So do you think that school is affected in any way by the social surroundings, concerning inclusion? Have you felt something like that?

A: OK, not so much, no, I can’t say that I have felt this kind of problem.

Q: OK. OK, another question. Were you hired through ASEF or not?

A: Yes

Q: So, you had done the exams etc. I’ll tell you why I’m asking later. Do you prepare your lessons beforehand? The everyday lessons?

A: Look, my lessons in general, no, because you don’t know what to prepare, right? OK, don’t mind now that it is the summer and you know what you are going to face. I usually know what I am going to do during the day, meaning that when I come here in the morning I know which classes I have lessons with and I know roughly what I am going to do. I don’t prepare it [the lesson] in a sense that I write anything down. I usually take notes afterwards, what I did today with Year 4 or what we did not do with Year 4 because it was raining…if I had said that we will do this subject today. As the years pass by, my experience allows me to not have to do much paperwork. But I always have in my mind what I’m going to do this month, or during this week.

Q: OK, do you make an annual programme in your mind, for example?
A: Annual, yes. I know, especially in the senior classes you know. Also in the junior classes, right? In the junior classes when I star with Year 1 and Year 2, especially with Year 1, yes, I know in my mind what I have to have achieved by June, eventually. I mean my experience allows me to known that.

Q: Yes, yes, it's not that you have to keep...

A: No, I mostly keep notes for the senior classes. What we did this week, what we did this month. Yes, we have worked on this, or he haven't worked on that because four out of six times it was raining.

Q: Yes, yes.

A: Do you get it [understand]?

Q: I understand.

A: So, this might happen the next month [the planned lessons that got postponed due to the weather]. The thing that I had thought I would do in December and it didn’t happen.

Q: Yes, what are the priorities when you are doing your lessons?

A: Firstly, it’s the issue of safety for me. We have different kinds of accidents. Then it is for us to be happy at the end. Of course this doesn’t always happen; they might be a bit upset with each other sometimes, you know, rivalries and stuff, but I try to do what I have in my mind. You don’t always do it of course, I mean I might have something in my programme but two or three things might go wrong during the lesson and I won’t be able to do it. But, OK, this is not a priority, you can do it tomorrow, the day after, it’s not that...OK, it wasn’t done today because an accident happened. Because when an accident happens I will have to go inside, to come back after five minutes, to see what the rest [of the children] are doing, to see what they are up to… It is safety, doing what we have in our minds, what I have in my mind that we have to do today or this week, to play... meaning that apart from what we are being taught, to play something, whatever that is… to have a game in the end, and at the end not to be very upset with each other [rivalries] in general, meaning half of them are shouting and the other half complaining.

Q: Yes, yes, yes. Do you remember ever being taught or having learnt the Mosston methods of teaching? For example, the Command, Practice, Reciprocal, Guided discovery style, etc. Do you remember those?

A: Yes. We did those in the pedagogical lessons etc. in the first years.

Q: At university?

A: Yes.
Q: Do you have them in mind when you are doing your lessons?

A: Yes, I do, because I don’t have one way of implementation for all the classes. There are classes that might flow easier, so, there I am going to give more initiative to the children. Right? Other classes, especially the junior ones where they don’t always allow you…I mean you need to keep them more under control; I am the one who guides them.

Q: Yes...

A: But because in general I’ve been at the same school for years, and they know me, they know my rhythm and my way, as year by year passes by, they know what kind of instructions I am likely to give or if I am going to give a few instructions or that I will nod for some things, now that the children know me. Even things like how we are going to position ourselves in the given space, how we are going to assemble in rows, how we are going to place ourselves in a circle.

Q: Yes, I noticed that you were saying “rows” [assemble in rows], they were positioning themselves in the rows and they knew immediately how to do everything.

A: Yes, because they know me. Do you understand? So, as the years pass by, as the classes grow older [the children in the classes], my interventions are fewer. They know how to do some things by themselves. But always the control lies with me, right? I simply let them take the initiative. I mean, that I will let them…they will show some things. I prefer not to show them [the execution of an exercise]. I will ask someone to show them, today you, tomorrow the other. I mean they will [usually] learn what I am saying…so they can try it themselves. I can’t always show them [how to do it]. I want to train them to be in the state of mind where they watch me with more attention so they know what we are going to do.

Q: OK. How do the different characteristics of each child affect your lesson? Not only when we are talking about children with special needs, but more generally.

A: Yes, I think a lot. I mean, I try with every child, because I always look for information and I ask about the children, I don’t leave it [the matter] to fate from Year 1, when the children first come to me, I can understand now with my experience, even from the first week what I need to be careful about and where the children might have a problem. Meaning that from Year 1, within the first two weeks, when I have done 3-4 lessons, I can even understand which child might even have a problem in the classroom [in the PE lesson]. In the lessons that are not PE… I can understand it, I don’t know how, I think I can understand it, but usually my lessons are PE. With difficulty I mean…because I pay attention, right?

Q: Yes, yes...
A: I mean I won’t do the lesson just in order to do the lesson. I will try to go through a process of talking with you and making jokes to see if you react right, if you are going to understand, what I’m talking about. I don’t know, to see what you are going to consider unusual [I’m saying]…so, I always try through PE to give them other ways of thinking, not only for what we are going to do in games or motor skills. And I usually point it out to their teachers.

Q: So you talk, you cooperate with them.

A: Yes, yes, yes.

Q: When you observe these issues, in what way do you change…do you change something?

A: Yes I change. I change. You can’t just make changes; I mean if you say that I am going to do the same lesson for three days, there is no chance, no matter how many times you think about it. So, from the 20 children that a class might have…you need to find almost 20 different ways to pass the time and the lesson in the right way. I cannot find one way for all 20 children. No, I might treat one child differently to another, differently for a boy, differently for a girl…of course I usually use the same way when it comes to gender, but maybe I will speak differently to one, I might tease someone differently, or I will never tease someone else maybe, I tell someone off differently, all in the same lesson.

Q: Yes, do you think that how you speak with the children… I mean… because I saw you doing it, chatting, joking, how does this help you?

A: How does it help me? Or how do I come up with this reaction?

Q: Generally in the lesson.

A: Look I think I make them a bit freer, I might make them struggle a bit sometimes…by teasing them, but only up to the limit I set for teasing… I mean, I am going to stop it myself if I see them go over their limit, if they like it or not. They like it to go over the limits a little bit, but within the limits I have defined. I am not going to go over those limits just for fun. I think that the lesson needs to be diverse. And I think that this is a part of this diversity. I think that it needs to be an intense activity, action and reaction during the lesson.

Q: OK, is there something that you would like to have in order to become more effective, more…

A: …productive with the children you mean?

Q: Yes.

A: Look, I think that for me, at a basic level, it would help me to have a small space, where I would be able to have these inside classes, especially for the younger classes, until Year 3, so that we could
play a bit differently along with the children that might have various problems...because a space that
is more controlled and enclosed gives a kind of convenience. You don’t fear as many things. And
these children also feel more comfortable in a smaller place. They don’t get lost. And secondly, a
practical briefing in some things; but practical. No papers and theory; it’s good you have to read
them, they are necessary; you always need to be informed theoretically. Year by year things change,
they don’t stay the same. We see them every day. And to go see and do stuff; to see children,
classes, see other educators; I have to see other people, what they are doing. See what they are
doing well. I can’t be...I am definitely making errors here, there is no doubt; I am doing some things
wrong. I have to see what others are doing, in order to compare them to what I am doing, and have
someone else observe me, someone who is more experienced with these things, more experienced
though in practice. Not experienced in theory. Do you understand?

Q: Yes...

A: ...to be able...to be judged by someone in relation to what he teaches in practice. Do you
understand? Meaning to go out in the yard or go in a class and do a lesson with a person who can
judge and show me there and then, not just tell me. That’s my opinion.

Q: In general...how have you obtained the mindset that you have as an educator and as a PE
teacher. You have a mentality, a way of thinking, what has affected it, how has it been affected?

A: How I have obtained it?

Q: What has affected and formed it?

A: I have worked with children for many years. I mean, I’ve been involved in sport as a coach, almost
from the second year in university – from 20 years old – so almost 20 years now. I have been in
contact with children of this age. Children of primary school age, that is. I have older children, but
mostly I’ve worked with these children. And you have to want to get to know the children. I think that
it’s a matter of character, my contact with children. I mean I don’t pursue it very much - if you stay
here during the day you will observe that many times I am strict. But most of the time, children want
to be with me. I am strict but they don’t mind. I won’t shout at them. I don’t shout. I rarely shout inside
the school.

Q: I observed that.

A: I mean rarely...I mean we might be inside the class during winter and I don’t shout [raise my voice]
you know to most this seems weird. We are 20 children in the class with the door open, we talk,
we have fun sometimes, we talk about the lesson without me ever shouting [raising my voice]. I won’t
shout, they know that I won’t need to shout; because I set some rules from the beginning. When you
set rules for a child, to a class, you can survive a lot better; both you and the children can have a
better time. I don’t think that much noise does them good; children don’t want noise. They need calmness; that’s when they have a better time. You are going to make noise once or twice a year. You will let things run free for a while. But you also stop it at the right time.

Q: Yes.

A: Now, I don’t know. It might be an issue of character, personality, but also of experience. My experience and the fact that I am looking [to find] myself; how do I change certain things. I don’t stay on one beaten track that I will follow for the next 20 years that I will be working. For example, I have changed a lot of things. The first few years I was stricter. As the years pass I’ve become less... not the rules I set, in my behaviour, in the way they see me, it probably [shows] in my face. That I learned throughout the years. I didn’t know it when I first started; but I learned it. I changed it. Ok. I try to change some things. You can’t do everything well. Through time... I believe that the experience in a school and especially in a primary school gives you a lot of skills. As long as you keep looking, [as long as] you want to change. If you want to look at what you want to change.

Q: Yes, yes. This is a little bit irrelevant, but what do you do with the [national] curriculum?

A: Yes, in general, I study it. I study it every year, the first time more so, but also in general I look at it every year [study it]. I always look at some things and some additional helpful books that I have concerning this [the curriculum].

Q: Do you use it? Do you follow it to the letter?

A: To the letter... I believe that you can’t follow it to the letter. I mean that anyone... the circumstances have to be ideal to follow it to the letter. However, I study it many times throughout the year.

Q: Yes.

A: I take and remember a lot of things, I remind myself of them, I change some things, but you can’t follow it to the letter.

Q: What do you mean by “ideal circumstances”?

A: Ideal circumstances... you have to know that there will be some times where all the children will be ideally set up, but I won’t make a programme for how I am going to do my lessons for the 3-4 months that it rains. If it will be slippery outside or if it will be a bit sunny, or if it will be wet, because I’ll have to change in order to take my lesson in the half of the yard that doesn’t have water and the rest of it will be dry. If the circumstances will be... most classes have children that go to the inclusive class. So, then I cannot follow the national curriculum of a normal school. Because this programme, the national curriculum, is for a normal school. There are some paragraphs that highlight some things to you that you might be presented with, some different circumstances, but these are in the small print. With an
ideal programme and ideal circumstances; that’s what I mean. But these are not ideal circumstances. Simply you have to make the ideal circumstances; and you follow some of the recommendations.

Q: OK. I will return to some things we talked about previously now. Do you consider that there is inclusion in Greece today? Does inclusion work?

A: No, I don’t think so. I think we are very far behind in these matters. There can be no inclusion as long as there is no information in the society around us. For the people with differences, with special needs, with motor problems, anything like that. In general, the right conditions for people who are different from what we consider ‘normal’ are not there. That’s why it doesn’t exist in schools.

Q: But you told that you include some of the children [with SEN] in your lessons. I mean why do you have this idea while you manage that in your lessons?

A: I don’t know. OK, I try a little bit maybe. It’s not that I manage to do it perfectly. I imply that I try to do it. I try to make everyone understand that we are not all the same. This is a basic thing in the world around us.

Q: Yes, yes, yes, OK, is there anything else that you would like to add after all these questions?

A: No, I don’t think so. I hope I helped you a little bit.

Q: Thank you very much!
APPENDIX 6: Presentation of themes, subthemes and second level codes

### Theme Inclusion (Interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Understanding of inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Understanding of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of understanding of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem from within the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Inclusion Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Inclusion implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desired route to inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Placement of students with SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advantages and disadvantages of inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Barrier to inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advantages of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disadvantages of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PE lesson</strong></td>
<td>PE lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Inclusive approach</strong></td>
<td>Inclusive approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/student relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Inclusion in action</strong></td>
<td>Successful inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Use of language</strong></td>
<td>Use of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Legislation</strong></td>
<td>Laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Teaching styles (Interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching styles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Mosston's Spectrum of Teaching Styles</strong></td>
<td>Known/unknown teaching styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching styles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use of Mosston's Spectrum of Teaching Styles</strong></td>
<td>Use of teaching styles/methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme Teacher (Interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desired training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Teacher cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings and reflection</td>
<td>Teacher feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Lesson (Interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Lesson planning/preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Game playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Lesson differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Lesson priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson conditions</td>
<td>Lesson conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Environment (Interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parent acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Financing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme School provision (Interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School provision</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic process</td>
<td>Issues relating to the diagnostic process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Sport equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sport/School facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Student (Interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Student behaviour/characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student progress</td>
<td>Student progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Theme Inclusion (Observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td><strong>Inclusive approach</strong></td>
<td>Inclusive approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prompt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion in action</strong></td>
<td>Non inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Teaching styles (Observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching styles</td>
<td><strong>Command style</strong></td>
<td>Announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explanations and clarifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarifying questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE teacher decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE teacher leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pace setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reproduction and student compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial initiative to/from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching styles</td>
<td><strong>Practice style</strong></td>
<td>Partial initiative to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observatory role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal teacher involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme Lesson (Observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subject matter</strong></td>
<td>Subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Game playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rules of the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Differentiation</strong></td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Logistics</strong></td>
<td>Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Peace-making</strong></td>
<td>Peace-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Structure of the lesson</strong></td>
<td>Structure of the lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme School provision (Observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School provision</strong></td>
<td><strong>School facilities</strong></td>
<td>School facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sport equipment</strong></td>
<td>School sport equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unattended students</strong></td>
<td>Unattended students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of students</strong></td>
<td>Number of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Student (Observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Student behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student feelings</strong></td>
<td>Student feelings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Teacher (Observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teacher interaction and cooperation</strong></td>
<td>Teacher cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teacher/student interaction</strong></td>
<td>Teacher/student interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme Environment (Observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Second level Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parent interference</strong></td>
<td>Parent interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weather conditions</strong></td>
<td>Weather conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Second level Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the researcher</td>
<td>PE teacher/researcher interaction</td>
<td>PE teacher/researcher interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student/researcher interaction</td>
<td>Student/researcher interaction Researcher/class interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7: Emerged themes according to individual Interviews and Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews (P) &amp; Observations (O)</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Role of the researcher</th>
<th>School provision</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Teaching styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1b</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O10b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O11a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O11b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O13a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O13b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O14a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O14b</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ
ΥΠΟΥΡΓΕΙΟ ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΘΡΗΣΚΕΥΜΑΤΩΝ

ΕΝΙΑΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΙΚΗΤΙΚΟΣ ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΠΡΟΤΩΘΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΩΘΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΠΡΟΤΩΘΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
ΤΜΗΜΑ Α' ΕΦΑΡΜΟΓΗΣ ΠΡΟΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΩΝ

Ταχ. Δήλωση: Άνδρες Πεταλούδα 37
Τ.Κ. – Πόλη: 15180 – Μαρούσι
Ιστοσελίδα: http://www.minedu.gov.gr
Email: spudonpe@minedu.gov.gr
Πληροφορίες: Χριστίνα Παπακούτση
tηλ/φ: 210 344 2246

ΘΕΜΑ: Έγκριση έρευνας
Σχετικά έγγραφα: το σχετικό 89733/Γ'14-7-2013

Απαντώντας σε σχετικά αίτημα σας και έχοντας υπόψη την αφεθή 23/1-7-2013 πρόβες
tου Δ.Σ. του Ι.Ε.Π., σας κάνουμε γνωστό ότι εγκρίνουμε τη διεξαγωγή της έρευνας σας με θέμα
"Εθική Αγωγή (ΦΑ) στα δημοτικά σχολεία στην Ελλάδα: Η χρήση των μεθόδων διδασκαλίας
από τους καθηγητές φυσικής αγωγής (ΚΦΑ) και οι αντιλήψεις τους" σχετικά με την ένταξη
μαθητών με ειδικές εκπαιδευτικές ανάγκες (ΕΕΑ) στο μάθημα της φυσικής αγωγής" η οποία θα
πραγματοποιηθεί στα σχολεία του συνηθισμένου πίνακα με τις σκάλες έπιπρομάνειας:

1. Η άδεια χορηγείται για μια τριετία.
2. Πριν από την επισκέψη σας στα σχολεία να υπάρχει συνεννόηση με τους Διευθυντές
tους, το Σχολικό Σύμβουλο και συνεργασία με το διδακτικό προσωπικό, ώστε να εξασφαλίζεται η
ομαλή λειτουργία των σχολικών μονάδων.
3. Τα αποτελέσματα της έρευνας θα κανονιστοποιηθούν ηλεκτρονικά στη βιβλιοθήκη του
Ινστιτούτου Εκπαιδευτικής Πολιτικής.
4. Η συμμετοχή των εκπαιδευτικών στην έρευνα είναι πάντα προαιρετική, γίνεται με δική
tους ευθύνη και εφόσον το επιθυμούν.
5. Η ερευνητή θα ζητήσει την έγγραφη συναίνεση των εκπαιδευτικών που θα λάβουν
μέρος στην έρευνα και των οποίων θα απομακρυνθούν οι ημ-δομημένες συνεντεύξεις. Οι
συνεντεύξεις θα διεξαχθούν σε χρόνο και τόπο που θα επιλέξουν οι συμμετέχοντες και εκτός
του σχολικού τους χώρου.
6. Για την παρουσία της ερευνήτριας στα μαθήματα Φυσικής Αγωγής να υπάρχει η σύμφωνη γνώμη του Διευθυντή του σχολείου και του εκπαιδευτικού Φυσικής Αγωγής. Ο χρόνος παρατήρησης των διδασκαλιών δεν θα υπερβαίνει τις δύο διδακτικές άρεις ανά τμήμα.

7. Τα ηχητικά αρχεία με τις ημι-δομημένες συνεντεύξεις των εκπαιδευτικών να καταστραφούν μετά την απομακρύνθηση τους για τις ανάγκες της συγκεκριμένης εργασίας.

8. Δεν επιτρέπεται σε καμία περίπτωση η βιντεοκόπηση και η μαγνητοφωνία των μαθητών και των διδασκαλιών. Σε κάθε περίπτωση να περηφανεί η ανωνυμία των μαθητών και των εκπαιδευτικών.

Ο Διευθυντής Πρωτοβάθμιας Εκπαίδευσης στους οποίους κοινοποιείται το έγγραφο αυτό, παρακαλούνται να ενημερώσουν σχετικά τα σχολεία στα οποία θα διεξαχθεί η έρευνα.

Συν.: 1 φύλλο

Ο ΠΡΟΪΣΤΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗΣ

Σωτηρική Δημοκρίτη
Διεύθυνση Σπούδων Γ.Ε.

-ΟΣΤΑΣ ΠΑΝΑΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ

Πτωτή Αντιπροσωπευτική.
Από τη Διεύθυνση Διοικητικού
Τμήμα Διεύθυνσης & Πρωτοβάθμιας
ΣΠΗΛΙΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ
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APPENDIX 10: Informed consent forms for teachers and headteachers.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR THE PARTICIPANT PE TEACHERS

Title of the project: Physical Education (PE) in Greek primary schools: PE teachers’ use of the Spectrum of teaching styles and their perceptions towards inclusion of students with special educational needs (SEN) in the PE lesson.

Dear Sir/Madam,

With this letter I would like to inform you about a study I conduct within the MPhil/PhD programme I am currently undertaking. The study is conducted under the supervision of Dr Hazel Lawson and Dr Nigel Skinner of Graduate School of Education of the University of Exeter, UK.

The aim of my study is to learn more about P.E teachers’ perceptions and practice (use of teaching styles during lesson) towards the inclusion of students with SEN in mainstream primary schools in Greece. In order to reach this aim, I would like to observe two school hour P.E. lessons and have an in-depth interview with fifteen P.E. teachers. The interviews and the observation results will be completely confidential and will be shared with you for verification. In my thesis there will be no mention of the name of any of the P.E. teachers or the names of the schools. If you need more information please do not hesitate to contact me at 0044(0)7xxxxxxxxx or ek265@exeter.ac.uk

Along with this letter I attach a consent form which I would like you to sign. Thank you in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Efstathia Karageorgopoulou
CONSENT FORM FOR THE PROJECT

Physical Education (PE) in Greek primary schools: PE teachers’ use of the Spectrum of teaching styles and their perceptions towards inclusion of students with special educational needs (SEN) in the PE lesson.

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project.

I understand that:

there is no compulsion for me to participate in this research project and, if I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation

I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about me

any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications

If applicable, the information, which I give, may be shared between any of the other researcher(s) participating in this project in an anonymised form

all information I give will be treated as confidential

the researcher(s) will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

..........................................................
(Signature of participant )
(Date)

..........................................................
(Printed name of participant)

One copy of this form will be kept by the participant; a second copy will be kept by the researcher.

Contact phone number of researcher: 0044(0)7xxxxxxxxx

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact me at my email address: ek265@exeter.ac.uk
Dear Sir/Madam,

With this letter I would like to inform you about a study I am conducting within the MPhil/PhD programme I am currently undertaking. The study is conducted under the supervision of Dr Hazel Lawson and Dr Nigel Skinner of Graduate School of Education of the University of Exeter, UK.

The aim of my study is to learn more about P.E teachers’ perceptions and practice (use of teaching styles during lesson) towards the inclusion of students with SEN in mainstream primary schools in Greece. In order to reach this aim, I would like to observe two school hour P.E. lessons and have an in-depth interview with fifteen P.E. teachers. The interviews and the observation results will be completely confidential. In my thesis there will be no mention of the name of any of the principals, P.E. teachers or the names of the schools. If you need more information please do not hesitate to contact me at 0044(0)7xxxxx or ek265@exeter.ac.uk

Along with this letter I attach a consent form which I would like you to sign. Thank you in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Efstathia Karageorgopoulou
CONSENT FORM FOR THE PROJECT

Physical Education (PE) in Greek primary schools: PE teachers’ use of the Spectrum of teaching styles and their perceptions towards inclusion of students with special educational needs (SEN) in the PE lesson.

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project.

I understand that:

there is no compulsion for my school to be part of this research project and, if I approve its participation, I may at any stage withdraw it

my approval for its research project to be conducted in the school premises does not mean the PE teacher(s) of the school is obligated to participate

I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about the school

any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications

If applicable, the information, which I give, may be shared between any of the other researcher(s) participating in this project in an anonymised form

call information I give will be treated as confidential

the researcher(s) will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

.......................................................................................................................... 
(Signature of participant )  
(Date)

..........................................................................................................................
(Printed name of participant)

One copy of this form will be kept by the participant; a second copy will be kept by the researcher.

Contact phone number of researcher: 0044(0)7xxxxxxxx

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact me at my email address: ek265@exeter.ac.uk