

Inclusion of immigrant students in the Greek educational system: a survey research at Patras¹

Konstantina Sarri & George Nikolaou
Department of Education and Social Work
University of Patras
sarrhkwnna@gmail.com, gnikolaou@upatras.gr

Abstract

This paper, under the title “Inclusion of immigrant students in the Greek educational system: a survey research at Patras”, refers to a study that was carried out at the Department of Primary Education of the University of Patras. The aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward the specific, individualized needs of these students, as well as to present the applied practices. The sample of the survey consisted of 72 primary school teachers from various districts of Patras. Moreover, in this study the quantitative research paradigm was adopted. Questionnaires- extracted from many published scientific surveys- were used as a research instrument to collect data and the SPSS program was employed in order to analyze and process the statistical analysis. Overall, the results of the research indicated that teachers hold a positive attitude towards both the inclusion methodologies and the CRT (“Culturally Responsive Teaching”) practices proposed. The results of this survey did not seem to agree with the findings in the current literature. Teachers did not seem to have developed positive attitudes toward inclusion and CRT. Instead, they seemed to be using limited educational methods aligned with the CRT philosophy, even if they have not obtained any kind of further training in this field, so far.

Keywords

teachers’ attitudes, teachers’ practices, inclusive education, culturally responsive teaching, interculturality.

¹ If this paper is quoted or referenced, we ask that it be acknowledged as:
Sarri, K & Nikolaou, G. (2020). Inclusion of immigrant students in the Greek educational system: a survey research at Patras. In B. Krzywosz-Rynkiewicz & V. Zorbas (Eds.), *Citizenship at a Crossroads: Rights, Identity, and Education* (pp. 238 - 253). Prague, CZ: Charles University and Children’s Identity and Citizenship European Association. ISBN: 978-80-7603-104-3.

INTRODUCTION

It is widely known that there are many changes that need to be made in the field of education and educational policy. These changes have become necessary over the years because of the issues of globalization and knowledge society. In this context, the term *intercultural education* has made its appearance and seems to be strongly related with the elimination of discrimination and the promotion of egalitarianism, equality, mutual understanding, mutual acceptance and solidarity. Intercultural education applies both to culturally diverse and to native student population at the same time (Palaiologos & Evangelou, 2003). It also aims at school integration, which is the fundamental requirement and condition in order to achieve social integration (Soulis, 2002).

During the past few years, education centered on *inclusion*, which is defined as an educational procedure through which teachers attempt to satisfy the cognitive, social and psychological needs of each student as an individual and through which all students enjoy the same education opportunities, regardless of their different needs and abilities (Campbell, 2002; Norwich, 2002; Kypriotakis, 2001).

As population movement has brought many new and different people to countries, which are not representative of their cultural profile, a need for balanced coexistence based on mutual acceptance and cooperation has arisen (Nikolaou, 2005). *Intercultural Education* (and specifically *Inclusive Education*) has made its appearance and seems to be one of the answers to this issue.

It is a reality that teachers and the educational environment have proved to be strictly structured and formed in such a manner that they cater almost exclusively to the very specific educational needs of the native students, ignoring the cultural and linguistic characteristics of culturally diverse students (Orosco, 2010; Orosco & O' Connor, 2011). Inclusive education practices, such as CRT (Culturally Responsive Teaching), can deal effectively with the issue of educational inequality that arises.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The topic is not new, but neither has it been dealt with fully, as every society must adapt to meeting the needs set out in accordance with their legal, cultural and educational parameters.

Recent research has shown that nationality, cultural background and other components (such as poverty etc.) have a significant impact on the students' academic success and progress (Harry & Klinger, 2006; Orosco & Klinger, 2010; Skiba et al., 2011). Also, one of the greatest challenges society faces nowadays is

to adequately address the individualized needs of immigrant students, since the majority of teachers are not sufficiently prepared for that. It is an accepted fact that often teachers do not have the ability required to teach culturally diverse students and, consequently, they end up reinforcing the existing phenomenon of discrimination. Additionally, another possible effect of this situation is the creation of a “cultural gap” between teachers and students (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2009).

According to Ainscow (2004), inclusive education as a process has to do with finding the way to learn to accept difference and making good use of it in the classroom. Inclusion is about identifying and removing the barriers that make intercultural communication difficult. It focuses on the “presence”, “participation” and “achievement” of both culturally diverse and native students in the education system and caters to the needs of learners who may be at risk of marginalization, exclusion or underachievement (Ainscow, 2005).

To put it more clearly, *inclusion* as a term appears to be strictly related to *social justice*, since it aims at both the promotion of democracy and social equality and the reconsideration and restructuring of society’s institutions (Miles & Singal, 2010). It is crucial for schools to be flexible in order to accommodate student diversity. In addition, there is a need for schools to make all the necessary and suitable adjustments that would lead to the integration of immigrant students without any exception or further hesitation (Norwich, 2010).

Modern teaching practices were evolved in a way so that schools could meet the new educational needs that the student population has. Nowadays there are many training programs, seminars and graduate programs which help teachers support student populations with different educational needs within the already existing formal educational context (Bornman & Donohue, 2013).

Inclusive education helps build a school community that embraces every student, by creating a meaningful and genuine school culture (Howes et al., 2009). In other words, students with special educational needs should not just be placed in the already existing typical school framework, but in a program which caters to their needs and eventually grants them the opportunity to join the mainstream school community (Angelides et al., 2006).

Moreover, in the field of inclusion there is “Culturally Responsive Teaching” which is an inclusive education practice that can deal effectively with the issue of educational inequality. According to the theories of Gay (2010), Ladson-Billings (2009) and Nieto, Bode, Kang and Raible (2008), teachers who use CRT practices appreciate students’ cultural and linguistic background and make good use of this knowledge. These teachers apply teaching methods that support students’ cultural, linguistic, and racial experiences and integrate the methods with

evidence-based practices (Harlin & Souto-Manning, 2009; Hersi & Watkinson, 2012; Nieto et al., 2008; Santamaria, 2009).

Apart from the above, one of the main factors that usually affects the teaching procedure (and subsequently inclusive education teaching practices) is the teacher's feeling of self-efficacy. According to Bandura (2006), it affects the attitude, behavior and expectations that the teacher holds while teaching. Many researchers have defined "teachers' feeling of self-efficacy" as the sum of the beliefs a teacher holds concerning his skills either "to plan, organize and conduct the activities necessary in order to achieve the given educational goals" (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1059) or "to teach his lesson even to students who face difficulties in learning" (Holzberger, Philipp & Kunter, 2013, p. 774).

RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTIONS

This paper refers to a study that was carried out at the Department of Primary Education of the University of Patras. The aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward the specific, individualized needs of these students and toward inclusive practices, as well as to measure the teachers' feeling of self-efficacy in the existing educational context. More specifically, the research questions were the following:

1. What are the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward inclusive education practices?
2. Was there a correlation among the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward inclusive education practices?
3. Was there a correlation between the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward inclusive education practices and the teachers' feeling of self-efficacy in the existing educational context?
4. Was there a correlation between the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward inclusive education practices and certain demographics (Master's degree, Training program)?

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample of the survey consisted of 72 primary school teachers from various districts of Patras. At first, a pilot research took place, in which 10 teachers participated. The vast majority of the sample (73.6%) were female and only 26.4% were male. According to our research data, five teachers were under 30 years old, 16 were from 31 to 40 years old, 19 were from 41 to 50 years old and 32 teachers

were over 50 years old. In addition, 15 teachers who participated in the research did not speak any foreign language, 53 had good knowledge of English, 17 spoke French, four spoke German and three had knowledge of another language. Furthermore, 23 teachers reported that had attended seminars while 38 had participated in training programs. Additionally, all of the participants held a bachelor's degree, 30 had a master's degree, one had a doctorate, eight had a second degree and 20 mentioned that had obtained another type of educational degree.

Research instruments

In this study, the quantitative research paradigm was adopted while questionnaires written in Greek were used as a research instrument to collect data. To develop our questionnaire, we reviewed a number of published scientific surveys and used questions that were relevant to our study. The following questionnaires were used to collect data for validity and reliability purposes (e.g., Galović, Brojčin, & Glumbić, 2014; Demir, Yurtsever, & Çimenli, 2015): *My Thinking About Inclusion (MTAI)* and *Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES)*. Specifically, these questionnaires measured the relationship between tertiary level EFL teachers' self-efficacy and their willingness to use communicative activities in speaking.

Demographics and specific professional qualities

It contained demographic questions such as gender, age, level of studies, knowledge of foreign languages and further training.

My Thinking About Inclusion (MTAI)

In order to investigate the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward the specific, individualized needs of these students and toward inclusion, a version of *My Thinking About Inclusion (MTAI)* scale was used (Stoiber, Gettinger, & Goetz, 1998). It consisted of 28 questions and had a scale from one to six (1= Strongly accept, 6= Strongly reject). From these questions, questions two, eight, nine, eleven, fourteen, sixteen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty and twenty-one were reversed.

Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES)

In addition, the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES) was used for the measurement of teachers' feeling of self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). It contained 21 questions and had a scale from one to four (1 = Not at all, 4 = Very much). For the purpose of our research, we modified specific questions from this questionnaire in order to focus on

immigrant students. The collected data were analyzed through the SPSS program.

Procedure

This study was conducted from September 2017 to April 2018, with the use of convenience sampling, since we had easy access to teachers and did not seek to generalize the results to any wider population (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2008). A pilot research was conducted from September to November 2017, while the main study took place from December 2017 to April 2018. In particular, from the pilot research (in which 10 teachers from various districts of Patras filled out the questionnaires) we realized that there were some adjustments that had to be made in order to improve the research instruments. The researcher asked from the participants to be spontaneous and honest so that the results would be valid. Permission for this research was granted from the General Meeting of the Department of Primary Education of the University of Patras. The collected data was analyzed through the SPSS program.

RESULTS

In order to investigate the examined teachers' attitudes and views toward the inclusion of immigrant students and their specific, individualized needs, a principal component analysis with varimax rotation was performed, with the exportation of six factors. Each factor contained loadings with values of or above .40 and specific variables for the used ones (Table 1). The variance in the given variables was approximately 70.356%. Based on this analysis each presented sub-scale for these dimensions was constructed as the sum of the variables for each factor respectively using the compute command from SPSS.

The means can lead to relatively positive participants' opinions for inclusion, since in this survey for most of these questions value 1 indicates more positive views toward inclusion while value 6 indicates more negative ones.

According to Table 1, the teachers of the first factor seem to support the opinion that inclusion- as a practice- promotes social independence and self-esteem among immigrant students. Furthermore, the data shows that teachers believe that immigrant students develop a better self-concept in inclusive classrooms. Additionally, teachers appear to believe that parents of culturally diverse students prefer to have their kid placed in an inclusive classroom setting. Furthermore, they claim that inclusion can be beneficial for the parents as well and that these children should be given every opportunity to function in an integrated school environment- in an integrated classroom.

As far as the second factor is concerned, teachers seem to believe that most culturally diverse students are well behaved in integrated educational contexts-integrated education classrooms. The data suggests on the one hand that inclusion is socially advantageous for immigrant students and on the other hand that the presence of these students promotes acceptance of individual differences on the part of the native students. Finally, yet importantly, teachers appear to support the view that it is feasible to teach immigrant and native students in the same classroom.

With regard to the third factor's questions, teachers appear to claim that the parents of immigrant students require more supportive services from teachers than the parents of Greek students. Moreover, teachers seem to think that immigrant students who have special education needs have a tendency to monopolize teachers' time. Additionally, they believe that a good approach to managing inclusive classrooms is to have a specialized teacher be responsible for instructing these children. Furthermore, the data shows that teachers believe that it is necessary to learn more about the effects of inclusive classrooms before inclusive classrooms are created nationwide.

Concerning the fifth factor's questions, we can conclude that the participants claim that immigrant students will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special, separate classroom than in an integrated one. They also state that isolation in a special class does not have a negative effect on the social and emotional development of culturally diverse students. Lastly, in this factor the participants seem to think that parents of immigrant students present a greater challenge for a classroom teacher than do parents of a native student.

Table 1: Rotated Component Matrix^a

Factor	Q. No.	Question	Loadings	Mean	Std. Dev.
1	3	Immigrant students should be given every opportunity to function in an integrated classroom.	.639	2.0423	1.02032
	4	Inclusion can be beneficial for parents of immigrant students who have exceptional education needs.	.722	2.0986	1.04410
	5	Parents of immigrant students prefer to have their child placed in an inclusive classroom setting.	.698	2.3380	.67493
	11	Inclusion promotes social independence among immigrant students.	.751	2.4225	1.07785
	12	Inclusion promotes self-esteem among immigrant students.	.761	2.2394	.90182
	13	Immigrant students in inclusive classrooms develop a better self-concept than in a self-contained classroom.	.733	2.2286	.95054

2	6	Most immigrant students are well behaved in integrated education classrooms.	.622	2.6087	1.04625
	7	Inclusion is socially advantageous for immigrant students.	.596	1.7917	.76798
	10	The presence of immigrant students promotes acceptance of individual differences on the part of native students.	.694	2.0278	.78672
	17	It is feasible to teach immigrant and native students in the same classroom.	.773	3.0429	1.08261
3	15	Immigrant students monopolize teacher's time.	.746	5.0694	.84464
	16	We must learn more about the effects of inclusive classrooms before inclusive classrooms are created nationwide.	.812	4.9583	1.14372
	19	Parents of immigrant students require more supportive services from teachers than parents of Greek students.	.514	4.5139	1.25589
	21	A good approach to managing inclusive classrooms is to have a specialized teacher be responsible for instructing the immigrant students.	.839	4.6667	1.26714
4	2	Inclusion is NOT a desirable practice for educating most Greek students.	.739	3.5909	1.46736
	9	Immigrant students are likely to be isolated by Greek students in inclusive classrooms.	.826	3.5278	1.32125
5	8	Immigrant students will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special, separate classroom than in an integrated classroom.	.529	3.9014	1.28902
	14	Isolation in a special class does NOT have a negative effect on the social and emotional development of culturally diverse students.	.857	4.0845	1.31743
	20	Parents of immigrant students present greater challenge for a classroom teacher than do parents of a Greek student.	.563	3.8333	1.22187
6	1	Culturally diverse students have the right to be educated in the same classroom as native students.	.452	1.5571	.75442
	18	The behaviors of immigrant students require significantly more teacher-directed attention than those of native students.	.741	4.0833	1.20737

From the following six factors, the fourth and the sixth one are not examined because they only had two items. Also, Cronbach's alpha for the first three factors

had values greater than .70, for the fifth it was greater than .60 while the fourth and the sixth factor had a value of $\approx .5$ and $\approx .2$, respectively. Consequently, only the variables of the first three factors that had high internal consistency and those of the fifth factor that had medium internal consistency are examined.

Table 2: Cronbach's alpha

Factor	Cronbach's alpha	N of Items
F1	.839	6
F2	.842	4
F3	.780	4
F4	.471	2
F5	.625	3
F6	.135	2

In order to investigate if there are statistically significant correlations among the factors, the Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed. The results from the statistical analysis showed strong positive statistically significant correlation between the first and the second factor, weak positive statistically significant correlation between the second and the fifth, moderate negative statistically significant correlation between the third and the first factor and, lastly, weak negative statistically significant correlation between the third and the second factor.

To be more specific, the Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed, in order to investigate if there is statistically significant correlation between the first and the second factor, $r = .718$; $n = 64$; $p < .01$. The direction of the correlation mentioned above was positive, which means that the participants who support what factor one claims tend to support what factor two states as well. Similar results emerged from the statistical analysis of the correlation between the second and the fifth factor, $r = .263$; $n = 67$; $p < .05$ (table three).

Moreover, statistically significant correlations were found between the third and the first factor, $r = -.522$; $n = 68$; $p < .01$. The direction of this correlation was negative, which means that the teachers who support the thesis of factor three also appear to agree with the thesis of factor one. Almost the same results arose from the statistical analysis of the correlation between factors three and two, $r = -.394$; $n = 67$; $p < .01$ (table 3).

Table 3. Correlations

		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 5
Factor 1	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	68			
Factor 2	Pearson Correlation	.718**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	N	64	67		
Factor 3	Pearson Correlation	-.522**	-.394**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001		
	N	68	67	72	
Factor 5	Pearson Correlation	.138	.263*	.040	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.266	.032	.740	
	N	67	67	70	70

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

We also investigated whether there are statistically significant correlations among factors one, two, three and five and the variables 22A to 22L that measure the teachers' feeling of self-efficacy (table 4). The Spearman's correlation coefficient was computed and it showed that there are weak negative statistically significant correlations between the following variables and factors: 22A and factor two, 22E and factor five, 22J and factor two, 22J and factor five, 22K and factor one, 22K and factor three and, lastly, 22L and factor five. Furthermore, there is weak positive statistically significant correlation between variable 22B and the third factor.

Additionally, the data in table four shows that the participants who think they have the ability to control disruptive behavior in the classroom, tend to agree with the thesis of factor two. Furthermore, the participants who believe they can motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork, also tend to agree with what factor three claims.

What is more, the teachers who believe they can pose good questions to their students agree with the thesis of factor five and those who believe they have the ability to provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused are negative- to a great extent- to the questions of factor two and the thesis of factor five. Also, the participants who answered positively and stated that they can assist families in helping their children do well in school tend on the one hand not to support the thesis of factor one and on the other hand to agree with what factor three states. Lastly, the teachers who feel they can implement alternative strategies in their classroom have the tendency not to support the fifth factor's thesis.

Table 4. Correlations among the factors one, two, three and five and the variables 22A to 22L

Spearman's rho	Questions		F1	F2	F3	F5
		How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom? (Q22A)	Correlation	-.150	-.380**	-.003
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.227	.002	.978	.425
		N	67	66	70	68
	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork? (Q22B)	Correlation	-.102	-.184	.258*	.011
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.414	.142	.031	.930
		N	66	65	70	68
	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork? (Q22C)	Correlation	-.043	.038	.178	-.089
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.728	.757	.135	.465
		N	68	67	72	70
	How much can you do to help your students value learning? (Q22D)	Correlation	-.027	.056	-.001	-.116
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.825	.655	.997	.340
		N	68	67	71	70
	To what extent can you pose good questions to your students? (Q22E)	Correlation	.038	-.033	-.093	-.242*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.757	.793	.440	.043
		N	68	67	72	70
	How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules? (Q22F)	Correlation	-.159	-.207	.158	-.057
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.197	.093	.184	.638
		N	68	67	72	70
	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy? (Q22G)	Correlation	-.140	-.095	-.013	-.229
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.254	.444	.913	.057
		N	68	67	72	70
	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students? (Q22H)	Correlation	-.183	-.221	-.032	-.200
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.135	.072	.793	.097
		N	68	67	72	70
	To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies? (Q22I)	Correlation	-.130	-.186	.136	-.099
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.289	.132	.253	.414
		N	68	67	72	70
	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused? (Q22J)	Correlation	-.194	-.311*	.025	-.360**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.112	.010	.836	.002
		N	68	67	72	70
	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school? (Q22K)	Correlation	-.255*	-.087	.285*	-.138
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.036	.487	.016	.256
		N	68	66	71	69
	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom? (Q22L)	Correlation	-.216	-.187	-.095	-.250*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.077	.130	.430	.037
		N	68	67	72	70

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Moreover, statistically significant correlations were found neither among the four factors (i.e., factor one, two, three and five) and the master's degree, nor among these factors and the training program.

Furthermore, we investigated whether there were any statistically significant correlations firstly between the variables OSTES and the master’s degree and secondly between these variables and the training program. The data collected was analyzed with the use of the criterion chi square (χ^2) (“test of Independence”) in order to examine the above-mentioned correlations. Generally, the results of the statistical analysis do not indicate any statistically significant correlations among these variables.

Table 5. Variables OSTES and the Master’s degree

22A	$\chi^2= 2.589$; $p > .05$	22G	$\chi^2= 3.527$; $p > .05$
22B	$\chi^2= 1.970$; $p > .05$	22H	$\chi^2= 8.516$; $p < .05$
22C	$\chi^2= .735$; $p > .05$	22I	$\chi^2= 3.878$; $p > .05$
22D	$\chi^2= 1.801$; $p > .05$	22J	$\chi^2= 7.958$; $p < .05$
22E	$\chi^2= 5.680$; $p > .05$	22K	$\chi^2= 13.354$; $p < .01$
22F	$\chi^2= .228$; $p > .05$	22L	$\chi^2= 5.966$; $p > .05$

Table 6. Variables OSTES and the Training program

22A	$\chi^2= .249$; $p > .05$	22G	$\chi^2= .229$; $p > .05$
22B	$\chi^2= 2.222$; $p > .05$	22H	$\chi^2= 8.876$; $p < .05$
22C	$\chi^2= .920$; $p > .05$	22I	$\chi^2= 4.655$; $p > .05$
22D	$\chi^2= 1.440$; $p > .05$	22J	$\chi^2= 8.035$; $p < .05$
22E	$\chi^2= .666$; $p > .05$	22K	$\chi^2= 2.630$; $p > .05$
22F	$\chi^2= .037$; $p > .05$	22L	$\chi^2= 4.074$; $p > .05$

Conclusions, Limitations and Future Researches

Overall, the results of the research indicated that teachers hold a positive attitude toward both the inclusion methodologies and the CRT practices proposed. Teachers seem to be using limited educational methods aligned with the CRT philosophy, even if they had not obtained any kind of further training in this field, so far. As mentioned above, specific factors emerged from the data analysis that show strong, moderate and weak correlations among the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward inclusive education practices. Some studies point out that teachers hold positive attitudes toward inclusion (e.g., Sharma, Aiello, Pace, Round & Subban, 2018). Also, specific weak and moderate correlations were found between the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward inclusive education practices and the teachers’ feeling of self-efficacy in the existing educational context. This feeling seems to be one of the factors that affect teachers’ attitudes concerning inclusion, as mentioned in other studies as well (Vaz, Wilson, Falkmer, Sim, Scott, Cordier, & Falkmer, 2015; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Lastly, the data shows statistically significant correlations between the attitudes and views that teachers hold toward inclusive education practices and certain demographics (Master’s degree, Training program). However, limited

studies have evaluated the effectiveness and importance of such programs in altering teachers' attitudes and knowledge in this field (Kurniawati, De Boer, Minnaert & Mangunsong, 2017).

The present study's results should be interpreted in the context of several limitations. One limitation is that the data were drawn from a very specific group of teachers, since this was a survey whose sample was primary school teachers from various districts of Patras (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2008). Research is needed to better understand the attitudes and views teachers hold toward the specific, individualized needs of culturally diverse students as far as other places in Greece or other countries are concerned. Moreover, another limitation is that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are generally presumed to be raised and strengthened through classroom experience, including high-quality student-teacher interactions, students' engagement for their schoolwork, and their academic performance (Bandura, 1997). From this point of view, there is a good possibility that because of the fact that the majority of the teachers who participated in this study are not sufficiently prepared to address the needs of culturally diverse students, they felt less self-efficient (Zee & Koomen, 2016). It would be beneficial if future researchers emphasized on the results of further educating teachers in the field of inclusion as well as the respective inclusive practices. The challenge is to educate future teachers in ways that promote and sustain understanding and acceptance of a range of cultural concepts and provide them with the skills necessary to support culturally diverse students in inclusive classroom settings.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M., Booth, T. & Dyson A. (2004). Understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools: a collaborative action research network, immigrant. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 8(2), 125-139.
- Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: what are the levers for change? *Journal of Educational Change*, 6(2), 109-124. doi:10.1007/s10833-005-1298-4.
- Angelides, P., Stylianou, T. & Gibbs, P. (2006). Preparing teachers for inclusive education in Cyprus. *Teaching and Teaching Education*, 22(4), 513-522.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2006a). *Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales*. In F. Pajare, & T. C. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, 307- 337. Retrieved from:

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e55c/7382e8cd2doad48deb53odf9ddd874189355.pdf>.

Bandura, A. (2006b). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 1(2), 164-180. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x.

Bornman, J., & Donohue, D. K. (2013). South African teachers' attitudes toward learners with barriers to learning: Attention-deficit and hyperactivity disorder and little or no functional speech. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 60(2), 85-104.

Campbell, C. (2002). *Developing Inclusive Schooling: Perspectives, Policies and Practices*. London: Institute of Education, University of London, Chapters 1, 3, 8.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2008). *Methodologia ekpedeftikis erevvas (rev. ed.) [Methodology of Educational Research]*. Athens: Metechmio.

Demir, A., Yurtsever, A., & Çimenli, B. (2015). The relationship between tertiary level EFL teachers' self-efficacy and their willingness to use communicative activities in speaking. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 613-619.

Galović, D., Brojčin, B., & Glumbić, N. (2014). The attitudes of teachers towards inclusive education in Vojvodina. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(12), 1262-1282. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2014.886307.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College.

Harlin, R., & Souto-Manning, M. (2009). Review of research: Educating Latino children: International perspectives and values in early education. *Childhood Education*, 85(3), 182-186. doi:10.1080/00094056.2009.10521388.

Harry, B., & Klingner, J. (2006; 2014). *Why are so many minority students in special education?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hersi, A. A., & Watkinson, J. S. (2012). Supporting immigrant students in a newcomer high school: A case study. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35(1), 98-111.

Holzberger, D., Philipp, A., & Kunter, M. (2013). How teachers' self-efficacy is related to instructional quality: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(3), 774.

Howes A., Davies S., Fox S. (2009). *Improving the Context for inclusion: Personalizing Teacher Development through Collaborative Action Research*. London: Routledge.

Kurniawati, F., De Boer, A. A., Minnaert, A. E. M. G., & Mangunsong, F. (2017). Evaluating the effect of a teacher training programme on the primary teachers'

attitudes, knowledge and teaching strategies regarding special educational needs. *Educational Psychology*, 37(3), 287-297.

Kypriotakis, A. (2001) *Mia Pedagogiki: Ena scholio gia ola ta pedia*. [A Pedagogy: A School for All the Children]. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, S., & Signal, N. (2010). The Education for All and Inclusive Education Debate: Conflict, contradiction or opportunity? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14 (1), 1-15. doi: 10.1080/13603110802265125.

Nieto, S., Bode, P., Kang, E., & Raible, J. (2008). *Identity, community, and diversity: Retheorizing multicultural curriculum for the postmodern era*. In F. Connelly, M. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 176-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nikolaou, G. (2005). *Diapolitismiki didaktiki* [Intercultural Pedagogy]. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

Norwich, B. (2002) Education inclusion and individual differences: recognizing and resolving dilemmas, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50(4), 482-501.

Norwich, B. (2010). A Response to "Special Educational Needs: A New Look". In L. Terzi (Ed.) *Special Educational Needs" A New Look* (pp. 47-113). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Orosco, M. J. (2010). *Sociocultural considerations when using RTI with English language learners*. *Theory Into Practice*, 49(4), pp. 265-272.

Orosco, M. J., & Klinger, J. (2010). One school's implementation of RTI with English language learners: "Referring into RTI." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 43(3), 269-288. doi:10.1177/0022219409355474.

Orosco, M. J., & O'Connor, R. E. (2011). *Cultural aspects of teaching reading with Latino English language learners*. In R. E. O'Connor & P. F. Vadasy (Eds.), *Handbook of reading interventions* (pp. 356-379). New York, NY: Guilford.

Palaiologou N., & Evangelou Od. (2003). *Diapolitismiki Ekpedefsi* [Intercultural Education]. Athens: Atrapos.

Santamaria, L. J. (2009). *Culturally responsive differentiated instruction: Narrowing gaps between best pedagogical practices benefiting all learners*. *The Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 214-247.

Sharma, U., Aiello, P., Pace, E. M., Round, P., & Subban, P. (2018). In-service teachers' attitudes, concerns, efficacy and intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms: An international comparison of Australian and Italian teachers. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 33(3), 437-446.

- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Burnout A Study of Relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1059-1069.
- Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C. G., Karega Rausch, M., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review*, 40(1), 85.
- Soulis, S.- G. (2002). *Pedagogiki tis entaksis. Apo to scholio tou diachorismou se ena scholio gia olous [Pedagogy of integration. From a desegregation's school to a school for everyone]*. Athens: Typothito- George Dardanos.
- Stoiber, K. C., Gettinger, M., & Goetz, D. (1998). Exploring factors influencing parents' and early childhood practitioners' beliefs about inclusion. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 13(1), 107–124. doi:10.1016/s0885-2006(99)80028-3.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. doi:10.1016/s0742-051x(01)00036-1.
- Vaz, S., Wilson, N., Falkmer, M., Sim, A., Scott, M., Cordier, R., & Falkmer, T. (2015). Factors associated with primary school teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities. *PloS one*, 10(8), e0137002.
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational research*, 86(4), 981-1015.