



Research Article

© 2021 Vančíková et al.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 4 May 2021 / Accepted: 21 July 2021 / Published: 5 September 2021

Various Perceptions of Inclusive School: Q Methodological Study

Katarína Vančíková

Barbara Basarabová

Robert Sabo

Denisa Šukolová

Faculty of Education, Matej Bel University, Ružová 13,
Banská Bystrica, 974 11, Slovakia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2021-0100>

Abstract

Although inclusive education has become a global norm, it cannot be said that there is a universal definition of it. Namely, the ideas of what inclusive education is are formed in a local context under the influence of societal, political, economic and cultural forces. This is confirmed also by results of the research the subject of which was examination of perceptions of inclusive school formed in the Slovak socio-cultural context. The aim of the research was to find out how education actors (teachers, school headmasters, teaching assistants, specialists providing support to pupils, parents) think about the concept "inclusive school". For this purpose, the Q-methodology was used that produced eight various descriptions of inclusive school. They uncovered various contexts in which education actors' ideas about inclusive school were formed. Some are wider, others refer to socio-cultural specifics of the country; others are more personal, reflecting personal experience, inner beliefs or even projected ideas and desires. The research shows that the pedagogical discourse about inclusive education in Slovakia is not only specific, but also internally variable.

Keywords: inclusive education, inclusive school, Q-methodology

1. Introduction

Inclusive education has become a truly global norm and subject of political debate around the world in recent decades (Powell, Edelstein, & Blanck, 2015). It has also become a generally accepted and monitored criterion for the quality of education systems (see OECD 2016, 2018; Ebersold & Watkins, 2011). The belief that all children regardless of their characteristics have the right to be educated together at neighbourhood schools is expressed in various documents of transnational companies (UNESCO, 1994, 2008; OECD, 2007; European Commission, 2014; United Nations, 2006). However, as more published studies show, national governments face specific problems when implementing inclusive education (e.g., Alves, 2019; Stepaniuk, 2018; Miškolci, 2016; Selvaraj, 2015; Dubkovetska, Budnyk, & Sydoriv, 2016; Gilham & Williamson, 2014; Fasting, 2013; Graham & Jahnukainen, 2011; Göransson, Nilholm, & Karlsson, 2011; Ghergut, 2010). The ways of applying inclusive education into

the policies and implementing them into practices vary by country because the meaning of inclusive education is "shaped by societal, political, economic and cultural forces" (Savolainen et al., 2012). And also, ideas of people about what inclusive school is and what its attributes are formed in a local context. This is why the global discussion does not lead to a uniform universal definition of inclusive education.

The variability in grasping the concept "inclusive education" has been pointed out in studies by several authors (e.g., Ainscow & C ezar, 2006; G oransson & Nilholm, 2014; Moberg et al., 1997, Savolainen et al., 2012; Moberg et al., 2020). The differences can be observed also in legislations of individual countries (see, e.g., Carrington et al., 2015). However, there are also researches with results uncovering the diversity of inclusive education perception inside countries. For instance, Kruse & Dederling (2017) find differences in the concept of inclusion among teachers of different types of schools. According to their findings the significant differences in the concept of inclusion correlate also with the prior experience of "integrative or inclusive teaching". Evidence of the influence of experience on conceptualization of inclusive education has been brought also by Hodkinson (2006) who finds out that newly qualified teachers' conceptualisations of inclusive education considerably changed after one year of school practice. An interesting contribution to the debate is also the research on a sample of Indonesian teachers. The authors state that teachers' epistemological beliefs are a significant predictor of their beliefs about inclusive education. It is even stronger than the type of school where they work, or the nature of their previous experience (Sheehy et al., 2019). The research expanding the knowledge about the variability of inclusive education perceptions includes also the research uncovering specific views of professional groups. It is obvious that a specific discourse may arise among kindergarten teachers (Arhiri, 2014), elementary school teachers (Olsson, Sand, & Stenberg, 2019), primary or secondary teachers (Kruse & Dederling, 2017), special education teachers (Moberg, Zumberg, & Reinmaa, 1997) or administrators (Kruse & Dederling, 2017). However, special inclusion perception may be generated for instance also at the level of a particular institution (school, counselling facility, etc.) or, as Skidmore (2002) shows, in the same workplace.

2. Methodology

As in other countries, in Slovakia too, inclusive education perceptions are formed against the background of a specific socio-cultural context. The goal of our research was to find out how actors of education think about a less abstract concept "inclusive school". Education actors included teachers, school headmasters, teaching assistants, various specialists providing support to pupils whether directly at school or in counselling facilities (special education teachers, psychologists, etc.). And, of course, children's parents. The following research questions were asked:

- a. What is the content of education actors' thinking about inclusive school? What attributes they assign to it and what characteristics of it prevail in their ideas?
- b. What may have an influence on the way how they think about inclusive school?

To determine the perceptions, the Q-methodology was applied. It incorporates a quantitative analysis of data with a qualitative interpretive framework (Stephenson in Stenner, Stainton, 2004) and it is considered an effective way how to explore a range of diverse, dynamic and complex contexts in the field of education research (Lundberg, de Leeuw & Alliani, 2020). Since the Q-methodology examines contexts, correlations between individual participants in order to find out which persons have similar attitudes, beliefs or relatively close discursive constructs (Bianchi et al., 1999), thus factor analysis could be applied to identify shared systems of ideas and beliefs in the tested sample.

2.1 Compilation of the Q-set and creation of a quasi-normal distribution

Our intention when compiling the Q-set was to obtain the most possible diverse scale of statements with ensured ecological validity. Statements were collected by means of an online form where education actors completed the unfinished sentence: "Inclusive school is ..." Next, obtained

statements were reduced and adjusted by four researchers independent of each other and in several phases so that (1) their meanings were not repeated, (2) they contained only one informative value, (3) were understandable, (4) had a sufficient differentiating value. The final set included 40 statements for which a quasi-normal distribution matrix was created. The scale range (9 points) and its slope followed recommendations (Watts & Stenner, 2005) for 40 to 60-item Q-sets - Picture 1.

fully disagree	more disagree	disagree	partially disagree	neither - nor	partially agree	agree	more agree	fully agree
2	3	5	6	8	6	5	3	2

Figure 1: Distribution of items in the matrix of a quasi-normal distribution

The first line is the reference scale of statements differentiation (- 4 I fully disagree - the statement describes me the least, 0 - vague statement (neither, nor), 4 - I fully agree - the statement describes me the best). The second line presents the number of statements to be placed in the matrix.

2.2 Sample and Data Collection

The research sample consisted of 36 participants. The rule of the greatest variation was followed there (Lukšik, 2013), so that the research sample reflected the most various scale of actors and the number of participants was lower than the number of items (Stenner, Stainton 2004). Table 1 presents an overview of participants' socio-demographic characteristics. Data were collected online via the server Q-assessor.com (© The Epimetrics Group, LLC 2010-21).

Table 1: Participants' characteristics

Years of age	up to 25 (1), 26-35 (13), 36-45 (14), 46-more (8)
Gender	Male (11), Female (25)
Education	Bc. (5), Mgr. (25), PhD. (3), PhDr. (2), Other (1)
Type of Institution where employed	Mainstream school (18), Special education school (3), Counselling facility (7), Higher education institution (2), Local government (1), School for gifted children (1), Centre of pedagogical-psychological counselling and prevention (1), Therapeutic-educational sanatorium (1), Children's home (1), Maternity leave (1)
Position at work or parent	Teacher (4), Teaching assistant (4), Special education teacher (4), Therapeutic pedagogue (4), Speech therapist (4), School psychologist (4), Social pedagogue (4), School headmaster (4), Parent (4)
Length of practise	up to 5 (11), 6-10 (10), 11-20 (8), 21-30 (5), 31-more (2)
Experience with SEN children	I have experience (35) out of it: I am a parent of SEN child (15), We have a SEN child in family (5), Experience at work (15), I have no experience (1)

2.3 Analyzing of Data

Data were processed by inverted factor analysis with varimax rotation in the program Q-assessor. Participants were included to factors based of the following: (1) the loading coefficient value higher than 0.40 (Watts & Stenner, 2005), (2) the Fuertratt criterion taking into account both the loading coefficient and the communality value (h^2), similarity with all participants in factors. When interpreting individual factors, the condition was fulfilled of Watts & Stenner (2005) of the eigenvalue above 1.00 (see also Kaiser, 1991) and the own condition of representation of at least 2 participants per factor.

3. Results

7 factors were identified and total variance was 54,375%. Out of them, 5 were standard (A, C, D, F, G)

and 2 (B, E) inverted. The rule for extraction was fulfilled by 6 factors A, B, C, D, E, F and 1 factor G (eigenvalue 0.2106) did not fulfil the requirement. Table 2 presents significant results of factor analysis. Participants who did not meet the condition of Fuertratt criterion were not displayed.

Table 2: Rotated Factors

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	h^2
ID: 1	0,72*	0,09	-0,16	-0,02	-0,06	0,35	0,06	0,68
ID: 3	0,13	0,20	0,32	0,18	0,48*	0,10	0,04	0,44
ID: 4	0,62*	-0,20	-0,05	0,08	-0,17	0,25	0,01	0,52
ID: 6	0,15	-0,51*	-0,01	0,09	-0,12	0,02	0,06	0,31
ID: 7	0,68*	-0,23	-0,16	0,17	0,15	0,21	0,03	0,64
ID: 8	0,05	-0,12	-0,22	0,59*	0,02	0,08	0,05	0,43
ID: 10	0,81*	0,15	0,01	0,30	0,26	0,04	0,02	0,84
ID: 12	0,78*	0,07	0,10	0,36	-0,05	0,06	-0,04	0,77
ID: 14	0,80*	-0,15	0,13	0,29	0,12	-0,05	0,01	0,78
ID: 16	0,01	0,04	0,70*	-0,08	0,06	-0,05	0,06	0,05
ID: 18	0,77*	0,17	0,06	0,36	0,09	-0,13	0,05	0,78
ID: 20	0,32	-0,05	0,01	0,68*	-0,03	-0,14	0,03	0,60
ID: 21	0,16	-0,21	0,12	-0,03	0,14	0,58*	0,01	0,46
ID: 23	0,04	-0,04	0,04	0,03	-0,51*	0,15	0,03	0,29
ID: 24	0,61*	0,05	0,15	0,41	0,25	0,15	-0,07	0,65
ID: 26	0,29	0,05	0,19	0,63*	0,20	0,29	-0,08	0,65
ID: 27	0,19	0,67*	0,23	0,09	0,06	-0,10	0,16	0,60
ID: 28	0,19	0,31	0,26	0,57	0,27	0,11	-0,01	0,61
ID: 29	0,19	0,15	0,67*	0,07	-0,03	0,24	-0,02	0,56
ID: 31	0,78*	-0,14	0,16	0,07	-0,06	-0,07	0,05	0,67
ID: 33	0,14	-0,01	-0,10	0,09	-0,26	0,61*	0,02	0,48
ID: 34	0,05	-0,03	0,13	0,12	-0,05	0,73*	-0,01	0,57
Eigenvalue	6,95	1,93	2,46	3,23	1,76	3,05	0,21	-
% Total Variance	19,31	5,37	6,83	8,99	4,88	8,47	0,59	54,4375

Notes: Participants who did not meet the condition of Fuertratt criterion were not displayed; * - significant by Fuertratt criterion; h^2 - communality; ID – number of participants

In the description phase, maps of factor meanings were created. They were based on items with their placement in a given factor considerably different from their placement in other factors. Next, the semantic context was looked for between strong statements in the factor (item placed in extreme positions). Thus 8 descriptions of inclusive school were created. They are presented in Table 3 together with the overview of participants' characteristic connected with them.

Table 3: Descriptions of Factors

FACTOR A (standard): Operational bottom-up inclusion	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: men (3), women (6); age: 36-45 (5), 46 and over (3), 21-36 (1); position: teaching assistants (2), school head masters (2), speech therapists (2), social worker (1), teacher (1), therapeutic pedagogue (1); education: secondary school (1), HE level I (1); HE level II (3); most participants worked at mainstream schools, (2) at special school, (1) in a counselling facility, (1) in a therapeutic-educational sanatorium; length of practice: 6-10 (2), 11-20 (5), 31- more (2); experience with a child with SEN (all): child in the family (2), parent of child (2), work experience (2), did not specify (3)	
Description	School where inclusion is not a matter of strategic planning. The idea of inclusive education is not institutionally anchored and is not implemented through a strong leader who would lead his staff to its fulfilment. The inclusive environment and practice are created intuitively; they are rather a matter of operational actions of experienced and qualified professionals (teaching assistants, special education teachers, etc.) who teachers can rely on. Owing to the functioning co-operation among them and good material and technical conditions the school can respond to various needs of pupils, including pupils with disadvantages.

FACTOR B (standard): Pupil-centred school	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: men; age: 26-35; position: teacher; education: HE level II; worked at mainstream school; length of practice: up to 5; experience with a child with SEN: work experience.	
Description	School neither superficially striving to fulfil the social demand for a unified school nor presenting itself as school open to everyone. It is aware of its limits in relation to some groups of pupils with special education and training needs. However, it is a good, state-supported school where everyone can show one's emotions, communicate one's needs, discover and develop one's qualities, recognize also one's weaknesses, move forward according to one's individual possibilities, become independent, assume responsibility for one's learning, gain respect for oneself and others.
FACTOR B- (inverted): Integration-centred school	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: men; age: 36-46; position: school psychologist; education: HE level II; worked at mainstream school; length of practice: 6-10; experience with a child with SEN: child in the family.	
Description	School responding to the social need to decline from the trend of segregated education and striving to create conditions for integration of minority groups of pupils, including the Roma. It sees its role in providing help to groups of children at risk who deviate from the norm. It is aware that successful school integration depends on professionally proficient staff, a good leader as well as good material and technical conditions. It perceives integration as its task and does not seek co-operation with external counselling facilities or special schools.
FACTOR C (standard): School as an image of the reality of life	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: woman (1), man (1); age: 36-45 (1), 46-more (1); position: parent (1) therapeutic pedagogue (1); education: HE level II (1), HE level III; worked at mainstream school and UNI; length of practice: up to 5 (1), 6-10 (1); experience with a child with SEN: parent of child (1)	
Description	School that is an image of diversity of the world around. It actively responds to current social problems, innovations and trends. It responds to the diversity of pupil population, prepares pupils for life in the real world, and teaches them to express their emotions, communicate their needs, recognize their strengths and weaknesses, and be a pro-active and initiative, independent and responsible member of society. It is interested in the needs of the community where it is located and that is why it is a sought-after school for parents of any disadvantaged children.
FACTOR D (standard): Equalizing chances as a response to the trend	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: man (1), women (3); age: 26-35 (2), 36-45 (1), 46-more (1); position: school head master (1), special education teachers (2), teacher (1); education: 3 HE level II and HE level III (1); most participants worked at mainstream schools, 1 at special education kindergarten; length of practice: 6-10 (2), 21-30, up to 5 (1); experience with a child with SEN (all): work experience (2), parent of child (1) did not specify (1)	
Description	School that is modern, innovative and open to current trends. It actively responds to the current trend of inclusive education and strives to fulfil the ideas of inclusion also above the scope of standard state support. In accordance with this idea, it opens its door to all pupils, admits otherness, and respects pupils' individuality. It employs professionally variable teams of teachers and professionals (teaching assistants, special education teachers, etc.) expecting their high professionalism and team work. Inclusive education is not a result of work of a strong leader, but rather a result of work of enthusiastic staff working in good material and technical conditions.
FACTOR E (standard): School with a strong leader	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: women; age: 36-45; position: social pedagogue; education: HE level I; worked in local government; length of practice: 6-10; experience with a child with SEN: did not specify.	
Description	School lead by a strong leader, surrounded by a proficient team of professionals respecting and supporting one another. The leader's proficiency is manifested in the ability to initiate, support and motivate the staff and create a space for dialogue about the school direction. The outcome of the dialogue is both a collectively shared idea of school vision, and an elaborated strategy for its achievement. Owing to it as well as good material and technical conditions, the school is able to respond to various needs of its pupils, including pupils with disadvantages, and create a space for fulfilment of every individual's potential.
FACTOR E- (inverted): Inclusion with limits	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: women; age: 36-45; position: teaching assistant; education: HE level I; worked at mainstream school; length of practice: up to 5; experience with a child with SEN: work experience.	
Description	School where inclusion is understood as a modern expression for integration. It creates conditions for inclusion of groups of disadvantaged pupils to the mainstream of education, which is also why it is a sought-for school for parents of such children. They are given support thanks to professional and teaching staff helping them to integrate. Despite this, it does not take itself for an ideal place for all SEN pupils and admits the fact that it is not able to integrate some of them. It seeks co-operation with special schools and thinks about integration also with regard to other pupils whose development may be hampered by the SEN pupils' presence.
FACTOR F (standard): School reflecting ideas of SEN children's parents	
Factor connected with the following characteristics: gender: women (2), man (1); age: 26-35 (2), 36-45 (1); position: parents (2), therapeutic pedagogue (2); education: HE level II; 1 worked at school for gifted children, 1 in a counselling facility and 1 was on maternity leave; length of practise: up to 5 years (2), 6-10 (1); experience with a child with SEN: parent of child (2), child in the family (1).	
Description	School admitting and welcoming otherness with reference to every child's right to education. It is school that supports integration of SEN children and is a hope for their better future. SEN pupils at school are not perceived as hampering or obstructing the development of other pupils. Children at school are not led to compare or compete with one another and every pupil can progress at one's own pace. The quality of education is ensured especially by good and devoted teachers interested also in feedback from parents. Co-operation with pupils' families is perceived as a necessary condition for the school's proper functioning.

4. Discussion

The eight descriptions of inclusive school show that the concept of inclusive education is diverse in Slovakia. Also, the research results create an interesting space to discuss about possible causes for people's thinking this or that way. The next section contains speculations about a broader context in which the individual ideas about inclusive school may have been formed.

The first description (Factor A) titled *Operational bottom-up inclusion* reveals perception of inclusive education as a project arising from the initiative of experienced and competent school staff. Therefore, inclusion in this concept is not a matter of strategic planning at the level of a strong leader. The idea of inclusion takes its practical shape rather intuitively, this owing to good school staff and material equipment. Not only the description itself, but also the characteristics of participants falling into Factor A indicate that this image may be based on personal experience at work. Namely, the participants may be assumed to have experience with work in so-called inclusive teams, introduced in Slovakia in recent years to schools owing to ESF-financed grants. These non-systemic measures have caused certain impulsiveness in the school field. New people (teacher assistants, various specialists) have been coming to workplaces for a limited period of time. School head masters have not always managed to bring them to school life. The old as well as new staff members have had to cope with many obstacles by themselves (Vančíková, Sabo et al., 2018). Another possible interpretative framework of this description may be also participants' personal experience with poor school management. As the survey of the initiative Learning makes sense (To dá rozum) shows, headmasters face multiple obstacles in their decision making and do not receive the necessary methodological support to develop their skills (Drál, n.d.). However, this description may also stem from a deeper understanding of the principles of inclusive education, the success of which does not depend only on the school leader, but especially on the ability of people at school to co-operate in the interest of pupils (Nochajski, 2002; Hemmingsson, Gustavsson, & Townsend, 2007; Hutchinson, 2012; Kennedy & Stewart, 2012).

Inclusive school as *Pupil-centred school* (Factor B) is understood as a space for self-expression and self-development. This description strongly accentuates the need to respect the child's individuality, create a kind environment, and concentrate forces to satisfy children's individual educational needs. This idea of inclusive school resembles the Rogerian concept of child-centred approach the most. Since the Rogerian concept is a starting point of person-centred educational concepts constituting the basis of inclusive education, it can be said that this description indicates deep understanding of the concept. An influence of epistemological beliefs on perceptions of inclusion may also be taken into account (Sheehy et al., 2019), which can be explained also by a very similar description of inclusive school in Vaníková's research (2018) including English participants. The author concludes that such thinking is related to a long tradition of child-centred education in England.

Statements grouped based on the inverted factor B lead to the description capturing perception of inclusive school as *Integration-centred school*. It is this description where the influence of the tradition of special school system may be felt the most, on the actors' thinking about inclusion. For decades school education in Slovakia has functioned on the principle of two parallel streams - mainstream schools and the stream of special needs schools where a major part of SEN children is taught. The latter stream is relatively closed (Hapalová, n.d.a). Moreover, classification of SEN pupils is based on medical diagnoses. The legislation (Act on education) views the category of inclusion through the lens of a child's psycho-medical disability, thus as a deficit (Clough & Corbet, 2000) to be compensated at school. The description shows also the influence of *divisive discourse* (Fulcher, 1989). Not only the Act but also additional methodological guidelines create a space for thinking about education of *normal* students and those with a lack or deficit (Miškolci, 2016, p. 203). The description also emphasizes the need for the integration of Roma children. The true is that a large proportion of Roma children in Slovakia are educated in special schools or ethnically homogeneous Roma classrooms or schools (Hapalová, n.d.a). That is why this description communicates a social need to

divert from the trend of segregated education and create conditions for integration of minority groups of pupils.

The fourth description (Factor C) presents inclusive school as school that is an *image of reality*. In our view, this perception is shaped both by a personal story and one's own philosophy of life. The factor included two participants. In both cases there are reasons why they perceived inclusive school as school that should reflect the diversity around us. This description makes one feel the call for full acceptance of people that are "different". School should not only protect them, but also help them to discover both their strengths and weaknesses, prepare them for independent and valuable lives. It should educate them to be proactive, initiative and valuable citizens of society. It is natural that these were thoughts of the mother of a child with SEN, who was the first participant, as well as the other participant - therapeutic pedagogue. Namely, the latter, already by the very nature of his profession, saw people with disabilities as people able to be aware of their limitations while able to assume full responsibility for their lives.

The variability of inclusive school perceptions is confirmed also by the description entitled *Equalizing chances as a response to the trend* (Factor D). It is dominated by such characteristics as innovation, timeliness, modernity, trendiness. It is assumed that the actors of education assign such attributes to school for two reasons. The first is related to the fact that although the requirement to transform the education system to inclusive begins to appear in national strategic plans, it is not a result of natural development of social consciousness. The mentality of the population in Slovakia is more oriented on exclusion of differences in the broadest sense than on inclusion to the social mainstream. Inclusive education is not perceived as a need, but rather as a political import (Porubský, Vančíková, & Vaníková 2017). The second, closely linked with the first, is related to the non-systematic implementation of pro-inclusive measures just through various EU grants. Schools see such additional sources as an opportunity for modernization, improvement of their material environment, as well as improvement of their staff support. That was also why the statement referring to the effort of school to fulfil the idea of inclusion even above the scope of standard state support was ranked relatively high. Similarly, oriented researches suggest that this concept of thinking is relatively frequent in Slovakia (Vaníková 2018; Sabo, Vančíková, Vaníková, & Šukolová, 2018).

The sixth description (Factor E) links inclusive school with a *strong leader*. This idea is supported by research results confirming the key role of school management in promotion of inclusive education and initiation of school-wide changes (Hall & Hord, 1987; Kersten & Sloan, 1987; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). However, Vaníková's results (2018) show that such a perception is closer to English rather than Slovak education actors.

The inverted Factor E gave rise to the description *Inclusion with limits* where inclusion is understood as a modern expression for integration. Thus, conceived inclusive school makes effort to integrate SEN children, but has its limits and cannot help all children. That is why integration is not for all SEN children, and it should be thought about also with regard to other children in the class. Such a vision appears to be based on the knowledge of the reality of school practice that has considerable reserves in integration of SEN children to mainstream schools (Hapalová, n.d.a, n.d.b). Findings of Kusá & Juščáková (2017) show that "schools and teachers are largely failing to cultivate inclusive attitudes and an inclusive class culture where no one is left behind" (2017, p. 332). However, the authors add that schools and teachers are not able to face the challenge because of missing organizational support, such as assisting staff. Another problem is poor preparedness of teachers to individualize their teaching. They are aware of their limits in the work with children with various educational needs. Many of them demand further education in this field (Hapalová, n.d.b). The above facts indicate that inclusive education perceptions can be formed also under the influence of emotions evoked by low self-efficacy in inclusive education (see, e.g., Savolainen et. al., 2012). Such way of thinking cannot be perceived as a-priori rejections of inclusion. They are rather an image of mature and deeper thinking about real possibilities of Slovak schools to admit children with various disadvantages.

Diverse inclusive school perceptions are supplemented by the description showing inclusive school as *School reflecting ideas of SEN children's parents* (Factor F). All elements of the description refer to the need for full admission of SEN children to mainstream schools. It also highlights co-operation with family and two-way communication. Thus, defined school corresponds with the image that arose in the research by Sabo, Vančíková, Vaníková, & Šukolová (2018) entitled *Inclusion as a natural part of community life*. The authors state that the description clearly shows that inclusive school is perceived as a place that can be attended by all children living in the neighbourhood, this regardless of their characteristics. This feeling appears to be shared by the participants of our research, included in Factor F. Two of them were namely parents of SEN children and the third one had such a child in family. This personal involvement naturally results in ideas of inclusive school connected with protective attitudes towards children whom people have a close relation to.

5. Conclusion

Eight different descriptions of inclusive school uncovered various contexts in which ideas of education actors are formed. The research shows that the pedagogical discourse about inclusive education in Slovakia is internally variable. The results also refer to the need for a sensitive approach to examination of attitudes towards inclusion. Caution is warranted especially when making comparisons of countries. An examination of attitudes towards inclusion actually is examination of attitudes towards notions about inclusion which differ across countries, this depending on many factors. We also perceive our work as a contribution to the pedagogical definition of inclusion in conditions of the Slovak education system.

6. Acknowledgements

The contribution is the output of the research task within Project No. 1//0642/20 of the Scientific Grant Agency of the MŠVVaV SR and the Slovak Academy of Sciences. This work was supported by the [Slovak Research and Development Agency] under the Grant [No. APVV-16-0458].

References

- Ainscow, M., & César, M. (2006). Inclusive education ten years after Salamanca: Setting the agenda. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 231-238. doi:10.1007/bf03173412.
- Alves, I. (2019). International inspiration and national aspirations: Inclusive education in Portugal. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(7-8), 862-875. doi:10.1080/13603116.2019.1624846.
- Arhiri, L. (2014). Kindergarten Teachers' Social Representations of Inclusive Education in Romania. *Psihologia socială*, (33), 75-84.
- Bianchi, G., Popper, M., Lukšík, I., & Supeková, M. (1999). *Q-metodológia: alternatívny spôsob skúmania sexuálneho zdravia* [Q-methodology: an alternative way to study sexual health]. Retrieved March 18, 2021, from <http://www.uvsk.sav.sk/q-metodologia/>
- Carrington, S., Sagers, B., Adie, L., Zhu, N., Gu, D., Hu, X., ... & Mu, G. M. (2015). International representations of inclusive education: How is inclusive practice reflected in the professional teaching standards of China and Australia?. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 62(6), 556-570. doi:10.1080/1034912X.2015.1077933.
- Clough, P., & Corbett, J. (2000). *Theories of inclusive education: a student's guide*. Sage.
- Dubkovetska, I., Budnyk, O., & Sydoriv, S. (2016). Implementing inclusive education in Ukraine: problems and perspectives. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, 3(2-3), 99-105. doi:10.15330/jpnu.3.2-3.99-105.
- Drál, P. (n.d.). School management in regional education. [Online] Available: <https://en.todarozum.sk/analysis/106-governance-and-management-in-education/126-school-management-in-regionaleducation/?fbclid=IwARiHEl67W7khGgSaryYiO1Kfd8CunBRLUrpwoU1qKlHNj4RuxcgCnxaKDC> (December 15, 2020)
- Ebersold, S., & Watkins, A. (2011). Mapping the implementation of policy for inclusive education (MIPIE).

- European Commission. (2014). *Report on the Implementation of the UN CRPD by the EU. SWD*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Fasting, R. B. (2013). Adapted education: the Norwegian pathway to inclusive and efficient education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(3), 263-276. doi:10.1080/13603116.2012.676083.
- Fulcher, G. (1989). *Disabling policies?: A comparative approach to education policy and disability*. Routledge.
- Fullan, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. MCSEER Publishing.
- Ghergut, A. (2010). Analysis of inclusive education in Romania: Results from a survey conducted among teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 711-715. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.170.
- Gilham, C., & Williamson, W. J. (2014). Inclusion's confusion in Alberta. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(6), 553-566. doi:10.1080/13603116.2013.802025.
- Göransson, K., Nilholm, C., & Karlsson, K. (2011). Inclusive education in Sweden? A critical analysis. *International journal of inclusive education*, 15(5), 541-555. doi:10.1080/13603110903165141.
- Göransson, K., & Nilholm, C. (2014). Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings—a critical analysis of research on inclusive education. *European journal of special needs education*, 29(3), 265-280. doi:10.1080/08856257.2014.933545.
- Graham, L. J., & Jahnukainen, M. (2011). Wherefore art thou, inclusion? Analysing the development of inclusive education in New South Wales, Alberta and Finland. *Journal of education policy*, 26(2), 263-288. doi:10.1080/02680939.2010.493230.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process*. Suny Press.
- Hapalová, M. (n.d.a.) Separate education of SEN designate children. [Online] Available: <https://en.todarozum.sk/analysis/102-customised-support-for-learners/111-separate-education-of-sen-designated-children/> (December 12, 2020)
- Hapalová, M. (n.d.b.) Problems in education of SEN designated children. [Online] Available: <https://en.todarozum.sk/analysis/102-customised-support-for-learners/112-problems-in-education-of-sen-designated-children/> (December 12, 2020)
- Hemmingsson, H., Gustavsson, A., & Townsend, E. (2007). Students with disabilities participating in mainstream schools: Policies that promote and limit teacher and therapist cooperation. *Disability & Society*, 22(4), 383-398. doi:10.1080/09687590701337892.
- Hodkinson, A. (2006). Conceptions and misconceptions of inclusive education: A critical examination of final-year teacher trainees' knowledge and understanding of inclusion. *Research in Education*, 73(1), 15-28. doi:10.7227/RIE.76.4.
- Hutchinson, N. L., & Martin, A. K. (2012). *Inclusive classrooms in Ontario schools*. Pearson Canada.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1991). Coefficient alpha for a principal component and the Kaiser-Guttman rule. *Psychological reports*, 68(3), 855-858. doi:10.1177/00131644600200016.
- Kennedy, S., & Stewart, H. (2012). Collaboration with teachers: A survey of South Australian occupational therapists' perceptions and experiences. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 59(2), 147-155. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1630.2012.00999.x.
- Kersten, T. A., & Sloan, C. (1987). Principal Leadership Style: Which Is Appropriate for you and Your School?. *NFEAS Journal*, 3, 1986-1987.
- Kruse, S., & Dederig, K. (2017). The idea of inclusion: Conceptual and empirical diversities in Germany. *Improving schools*, 21(1), 19-31. doi:10.1177/1365480217707835.
- Kusá, Z., & Juščáková, Z. (2017). Ready for Inclusive Education? Ethnographic and Survey Perspectives. *Sociológia*, 49(3).
- Lukšik, I. 2013. *Q-metodológia: faktorové zobrazenie ľudskej subjektivity [Q-methodology: factor representation of human subjectivity]*. Pedagogická fakulta Trnavskej univerzity v Trnave.
- Lundberg, A., de Leeuw, R., & Aliani, R. (2020). Using Q methodology: Sorting out subjectivity in educational research. *Educational Research Review*, 100361. doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100361
- Miškolci, J. (2016). Inclusive education in the Slovak Republic two decades after the dissolution of Czechoslovakia. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(2), 199-213. doi:10.1080/13603116.2015.1079272.
- Moberg, S., Zumberg, M., & Reinmaa, A. (1997). Inclusive education as perceived by prospective special education teachers in Estonia, Finland, and the United States. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 22(1), 49-55. doi:10.1177/154079699702200105.
- Moberg, S., Muta, E., Korenaga, K., Kuorelahti, M., & Savolainen, H. (2020). Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(1), 100-114. doi:10.1080/08856257.2019.1615800.

- Nochajski, S. M. (2002). Collaboration between team members in inclusive educational settings. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care, 15*(3-4), 101-112. doi:10.1080/J003v15n03_06.
- OECD Publishing. (2007). *Students with Disabilities, Learning Difficulties and Disadvantages*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD Publishing. (2016). *Equations and Inequalities: Making Mathematics Accessible to All, PISA*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD Publishing. (2018). *Equity in education: Breaking down barriers to social mobility, PISA*. Paris: OECD.
- Olsson, I., Sand, M. L., & Stenberg, G. (2019). Teachers' perception of inclusion in elementary school: the importance of imitation. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 35*(4), 567-575. doi:10.1080/08856257.2019.1709704.
- Porubský, Š., Vančíková, K. & Vaníková, T. (2017). Possibilities and perspectives of inclusive education in Slovakia as a result of comparing historical development of two education systems. *ICERI 2017 Proceedings 2242-2249*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2017.0651>.
- Powell, J. J., Edelstein, B., & Blanck, J. M. (2015). Awareness-raising, legitimation or backlash? Effects of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on education systems in Germany. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 14*(2), 227-250. doi:10.1080/14767724.2014.982076.
- Sabo, R., Vančíková, K., Vaníková, T., & Šukolová, D. (2018). Social representations of inclusive school from the point of view of Slovak education actors. *The New Educational Review, 54*(1), 248-257. doi:10.15804/tner.2018.54.4.20.
- Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Nel, M., & Malinen, O. P. (2012). Understanding teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy in inclusive education: Implications for pre-service and in-service teacher education. *European journal of special needs education, 27*(1), 51-68. doi:10.1080/08856257.2011.613603.
- Selvaraj, J. (2015). Inclusive education in New Zealand: policies, politics and contradictions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 19*(1), 86-101. doi:10.1080/13603116.2014.907584.
- Sheehy, K., Budiyanto, Kaye, H., & Rofiah, K. (2019). Indonesian teachers' epistemological beliefs and inclusive education. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities, 23*(1), 39-56. doi:10.1177/1744629517717613.
- Skidmore, D. (2002). A theoretical model of pedagogical discourse. *Disability, culture and education, 1*(2), 119-131.
- Stenner, P., & Rogers, R. S. (2004). The example of discriminating between emotions. *Mixing methods in psychology: The integration of qualitative and quantitative methods in theory and practice*, Psychology Press.
- Stepaniuk, I. (2018). Inclusive education in Eastern European countries: a current state and future directions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23*(3), 328-352. doi:10.1080/13603116.2018.1430180.
- Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behavior; Q-technique and its methodology*. University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO. (1994, June 7-10.). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for action on special needs education: Adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality*. Salamanca, Spain.
- UNESCO. (2008, November 25-28.). *Inclusive education: The way of the future. Conclusions and recommendations of the 48th session of the International Conference on Education*. Geneva.
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- Vančíková, K., & Sabo, R. (2018). *Inkluzívne vzdelávanie – skúsenosť slovenských škôl* [Inclusive education – the experience of Slovak schools]. Belianum: Banská Bystrica.
- Vaníková, T. (2018). *Sociálne reprezentácie inkluzívneho vzdelávania z pohľadu aktérov vzdelávania* [Social representations of inclusive education from the point of view of education actors]. (Dissertation). Univerzita Mateja Bela, Banská Bystrica.
- Wagner, W., Duveen, G., Farr, R., Jovchelovitch, S., Lorenzi-Cioldi, F., Marková, I., & Rose, D. (1999). Theory and method of social representations. *Asian journal of social psychology, 2*(1), 95-125. doi:10.1111/1467-839X.00028.
- Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2005). Doing Q methodology: theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative research in psychology, 2*(1), 67-91. doi:10.1191/1478088705qp0220a.