


Inclusive education in schools in rural areas

J. Antonio Callado Moreno^{1*}, M^a Dolores Molina Jaén², Eufrasio Pérez Navío³, Javier Rodríguez Moreno⁴

¹Department Pedagogy, University of Jaén, Spain {juanancamo@hotmail.com}

²Department Pedagogy, University of Jaén, Spain {lomolin@hotmail.com}

³Department Pedagogy, University of Jaén, Spain {epnavio@ujaen.es} 

⁴Department Pedagogy, University of Jaén, Spain {fjavier.rodriguez.moreno.edu@juntadeandalucia.es} 

Received on 5 December 2014; revised on 6 December 2014; accepted on 30 January 2015; in press on 15 April 2015; published on 15 July 2015

DOI: 10.7821/naer.2015.4.120

ABSTRACT

Since Spain decided to embark on the development of inclusive schooling, studies have taken place to see if the inclusive principle is being developed satisfactorily. Inclusive schooling implies that all students, regardless of their particular characteristics, may be taught in ordinary schools, and in the majority of cases receive help in the classroom in which they have been integrated in order to cover any special educational needs. Our research aims to find out if schools situated in rural areas follow this principle and, once it has been put into practice, what strategies are being used. To this end, we designed a questionnaire addressed to Infant and Primary school teachers in the Sierra Sur area in the province of Jaén, in an agricultural context where most of the population live on olive picking and the cultivation of olive groves. Given the extension of the area, our research concentrated on schools situated in urban nuclei with a population of less than one thousand five hundred inhabitants. The results obtained demonstrate that rural areas do not take full advantage of the context they are in to favour inclusion processes and continue to develop proposals that are merely integrative.

KEYWORDS: INCLUSIVE EDUCATION, RURAL SCHOOLS, SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (SEN) AND TEACHING STAFF

1 INTRODUCTION

Quality education, in which we can all actively participate, is an objective shared by everyone involved in a student's formative process. This objective has been a long-standing concern and has brought about profound educational reforms, both in developed and developing regions (and countries) (Muntaner, 2010; 2013).

In our current educational context, we can appreciate how unjust and unsupportive it is to marginalize students and how dangerous it is from a social perspective to orientate them toward exclusion. Educational attention to students with permanent serious disabilities has helped increase their social integration. This has in turn substantially improved schools, from the institutional and organizational point of view, as well

as at the teaching and political levels. Ultimately society as a whole is a beneficiary (López-Torrijo & Mengual, 2014). Several causes explain why students fail to fully acquire educational competences (Carro et al., 2014), which can, and should, be considered the joint responsibility of everyone. They bear consequences for the educational future of the entire population. Inclusive education arises in order to find an educational model that really responds to every single person's educational demands (López Melero, 2004). In other words it leads us towards the creation of an educational framework that respects each individual.

It is therefore necessary to adjust the components of the schooling process for the benefit of students themselves, its end recipients, together with educational authorities, teachers, families and the community in general (Itzcovich, 2012) involved in the process. This should constitute an imperative for educational institutions.

What characterizes inclusive education is that it values diversity and respects individual differences present in any learning community. At the same time, it recognizes that these differences are due to social, educational and cultural factors as well as to individual competences. It favours a dynamic, open and, above all, participative process. The dynamic nature the educational task is involved in means that each school, taking into account its surrounding context (urban or rural), develops its own educational programme in response (Monge & Monge, 2009) to both its sociocultural reality and to the diversity of its pupils. Inclusive education must recognize four premises which inevitably form part of its being: inclusion as a human right; inclusion as a way to achieve educational equality; everyone has the right to be educated among peers and in the cultural context they live in; and lastly society must guarantee all children's rights, including their inclusion in a normalized school framework (León, 2010). Finally, as stated by Booth & Ainscow (2002), Inclusive Education must be understood as a process which increases students' participation in curricula, in culture and in their academic future, whilst simultaneously producing a reduction in exclusion. Moreover, as pointed out by Verdugo Alonso (2009):

Inclusive education is a process of change which slowly opens the doors to tolerance towards students

*To whom correspondence should be addressed:
 Universidad de Jaén, Departamento de Pedagogía
 Edificio C5, despacho 234. Buzón nº 19
 Campus Las Lagunillas s/n
 23071 Jaén (España)

through the development of strategies and processes which order efficient ways to attend them (p. 25).

Therefore, in our research we have tried to find out how teachers in rural schools in the Sierra Sur area of Jaen, understand the principle of inclusion and, above all, what methodology they use to achieve it, taking into account that the very nature of the rural context may contribute to this principle.

2 INCLUSIVE EDUCATION, A REALITY IN CURRENT EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT AND LEGISLATION?

In the current educational context, the presence of pupils with differing potentials and needs in the classroom is evident. Since the Education Bill for Special Education was passed, schooling and integration of students with special educational needs (SEN) in normal schools has become ever more obvious. It is important to continue to develop policies which regulate inclusive education, and that reflect a deep understanding of the value of differences and diversity rather than regarding them as a hindrance (Kim, 2013).

The intervention system currently being developed is that of educational integration (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002), in which students with specific educational needs go to a normal school but are attended by specialists both in and outside the integration classroom depending on the support they require. Article 74 of the Education Bill of 3rd May (LOE, 2006), states that the schooling of students with special educational needs is regulated according to the principle of normalization and inclusion. This approach strengthens the idea of the inclusive school, attending to students and taking into account their potential and needs.

Moreover, the initial rulings of the Regulation of 25th July, which regulates the attention to diversity of students in state primary schools in Andalusia (the autonomous community where this research has taken place), state that curricular and organizational measures to attend to diversity should address social and academic inclusion and in no case should they impede students from achieving the objectives of basic education and corresponding qualifications. In the second chapter of the Regulation, Article 4, item 4 clarifies that attention to students with specific needs of educational support must be carried out within their own group. The fact that this attention may require different timetables or physical spaces, must not entail discrimination or exclusion of students presenting some kind of diversity (intellectual, visual, auditory or physical deficiency), developmental disorders (hyperactivity, autism, Asperger's Syndrome, selective mutism, etc), learning difficulties (developmental dyscalculia, dyslexia, dysgraphia, etc), giftedness or late admission to the educational system (long illness, immigrants, etc.). From the above, one can deduce that sufficiently trained teaching staff is necessary to manage students with diverse educational needs (Ainscow, 2001; Álvarez Castillo & González González, 2008). In an educational framework characterized by homogeneous schooling, inclusive education constitutes a challenge, because we have to know and understand local experiences, paying special attention to rural area tradition, since this is what is going to contribute to making us what we are and how we see the world (Adamson, 2012).

However, research carried out by Llorent García & López Azuaga (2012) showed that a majority of teachers (85.7%) consider that students with specific educational needs should be in normal classrooms part of the time and the rest of the time in a special needs class attended by specialists for specific help and

support, because of the limited initial training teachers receive in Attention to Diversity. Nevertheless, despite lack of training, they say they are ready, capable and willing to take on the teaching-learning process. Teachers' response highlighted the importance of specific classrooms in ordinary schools, but also showed that incorporating students into the ordinary classroom played a vital role in their social integration. Additionally 57.1% of the teachers (Arranz, 2008) did not know the term 'inclusive education', and gave very superficial definitions. A large number of teachers also claim to be dissatisfied with inclusive processes that have been undertaken. Moreover, Palomares & González (2012), point out that response to diversity in schools must inevitably revolve around the structuring of varied and flexible teaching and learning situations, allowing a maximum possible number of students (Broderick, Mehta-Parekh & Reid, 2010) to reach a maximum possible level of competence.

As we can see, certain practices we thought belonged to the past are still going on today, and are naturally not in accordance with current legislation. It is fundamental that teacher attitudes change, and future teacher training programs should encourage more positive behaviours towards integrating disadvantaged students, who present disabilities and a greater need of support (Haq & Mundia, 2012). The Regulation of 25th July on attention to diversity in state primary schools in Andalusia, defines what is to be understood by inclusion, namely the full integration of students with special educational needs in the ordinary classroom. Today, many obstacles to Inclusive Education have been overcome, such as accessibility to ordinary classrooms, the incorporation of educational professionals, etc., although some methodologies which could be considered discriminatory still persist (CERMI, 2010).

Today's society must strengthen the development of inclusive schools where contextual diversity is valued, where cultural differences are facilitated and financed, and where students' traditions are encouraged (Townsend & Fu, 2001; Harris, Misk & Attig, 2004; Fernández, 2011; Palomares & González, 2012). The aim is that teaching-learning become an individualised process where social interaction plays an important role. Students with special educational needs have different learning capabilities according to their specificities. These particular capabilities must be strengthened by methodological strategies, as stated by Barton (2009):

The struggle for equality and for a non-oppressive, non-discriminatory world, goes beyond the very question of disability and is centered on the establishment and maintenance of a social world in which people experiment the reality of inclusive values and relationships. (p. 174)

Inclusive Education is leading to a transformation of schools where all students are attended to, where the educational process will take place in all contexts with no exception. This inclusion not only affects the schooling framework but must also involve the family in its role as primary educator, and the education community in general in its role as a socializing agent (Vega & Garin, 2012). Therefore, Inclusive Education is not a marginal issue, but an issue that will be crucial to achieving quality education for all students and in the development of more inclusive societies" (UNESCO, 2008, p. 3).

3 DEVELOPMENT OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN RURAL AREAS

Current practices which segregate, exclude and classify students and perpetuate a deficient model across the Administration (Glazzard, 2013) cannot be considered to be inclusive (Glazzard, 2014). This application is contrary to the legislation in question, especially for those students who, in addition to having some kind of disability, live in rural zones which in itself could be an additional problem in seeking the necessary services to relieve or reduce their learning differences with respect to their peers. The rural context itself can interfere with adequate social integration, so it can be presumed that the move is towards schooling which promotes equal educational opportunities, along the lines of the developments taking place in surrounding countries (Alonso & Araoz, 2011).

Rural areas still differentiate themselves from more urbanized areas in certain aspects, although there is a clear tendency to "urbanize rural settings" (Boix, 2011) in the majority of our contexts. Multigrade classrooms are not external to this transformation. However, "two-way" pedagogical bridges can be built between official curriculums and context-based curriculums.

Diversity within the heterogeneity of multigrade classrooms has always been one of its most notable characteristics, particularly the diversity (Trianes et al., 2003), of ages dealt with by one teacher, either as a tutor or as a specialist, etc. in the framework of what we could call inclusive pedagogic practices. This is more visible in rural schools given their close relationship with the education community. It is therefore by no means an exaggeration to state, as does I. Gelis (2004), that rural schools in this country have helped students connect to their environment, have strengthened local culture and have helped bring life to all village inhabitants; this has occurred in the respect of rural culture, country people and diversity, while also sometimes reaching beyond context limitations. These schools also present positive aspects, such as chronological heterogeneity and a lower ratio (Bustos, 2010), which have contributed towards good results for the students in rural schools in Andalusia.

Moreover, when assessing effectiveness of training programs that present inclusion strategies and conceptual approaches to teacher competence, results show a positive change in the repertoire of participant skills (Forlin, Loreman, Sharma & Earle, 2009). This implies decisive support for the principle of inclusion of SEN students in these centers and classrooms with efficient teachers using inclusive methodologies, and in which the effectiveness of collaboration and the management of disruptive conducts has been demonstrated (Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012), a change in teachers' attitude (Haq & Mundia, 2012) and dedicated heads is fundamental (Praisner, 2003).

4 RESEARCH PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVES

Based on considerations made by Mc Millan & Schumacher (2005) to formulate the problems of educational research and to position our research, we drew up the following question: *Do teachers in the geographical area under study develop inclusive education in their teaching-learning process?*

General objective of the research:

To determine whether teachers develop the inclusive principle in relation to students with specific educational needs.

Specific objectives:

To find out whether the teachers participating in the survey know about inclusive schooling.

To find out what methodology teachers use with the students in their classes who present specific educational needs.

To find out whether teachers consider they are sufficiently trained to deal with this type of student.

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Context and participants

The participants in the study are Primary and Infant school teachers from schools in the Sierra Sur area in the province of Jaen. This is a rural area and the livelihood of its population comes from working the land, the cultivation of olive groves and olive picking. To limit our research, only teachers working in schools situated in urban nuclei with a population of less than one thousand five hundred inhabitants participated. The aim of our research was to verify whether Inclusive Education was being put into practice for SEN students.

The study took place during the 2014-2015 school year with the participation of 123 teachers. However, for reasons explained above, the true sample was made up of 40 teachers. The distribution of participants in terms of segmentation variables provided the following data: "sex" "male" (N = 15, 37.5%), "female" (N = 25, 62.5%); "age" "between 20-30 years" (N = 4, 10.0%), "between 31-40 years" (N = 11, 27.5%), "between 41-50 years" (N = 12, 30.0%), "between 51-60 years" (N = 8, 20.0%), "over 60 years" (N = 5, 12.5%); "educational stage taught" "no response" (N = 1, 2.5%), "Infants" (N = 5, 12.5%), "first stage Primary Education" (N = 9, 22.5%), "second stage Primary Education" (N = 12, 30.0%), "third stage Primary Education" (N = 13, 32.5%); "teaching experience" "no response" (N = 3, 7.5%), "1-5 years" (N = 2, 5.0%), "6-10 years" (N = 10, 25.0%), "11-15 years" (N = 10, 25.0%), "16-20 years" (N = 7, 17.5%), "over 20 years" (N = 8, 20.0%); "teaching post" "tutor" (N = 23, 57.5%), "special needs teacher" (N = 5, 12.5%), "school counselor" (N = 4, 10.0%), "school management team" (N = 8, 20.0%).

5.2 Data collection instruments

To collect the data for our research, a questionnaire was designed based on three dimensions. The first dimension asks whether or not teachers know of the inclusive education concept. The second asks which methodology is used to this end and, lastly, the third dimension asks if teachers consider themselves sufficiently prepared to deal with these types of students.

The questionnaire chosen to carry out the research was a Likert type questionnaire as this adequately fulfilled our objectives and served as a link between the research objectives and the reality of the population under study (De Lara & Ballesteros, 2007). The scale takes into account four possible responses: 'unfavourable' (U=1), "less in favour", (LF = 2), "in favour" (F = 3) and "very much in favour" (VF = 4). The questionnaire also includes an initial section containing five segmentation and nominal-dichotomous variables: "sex", "age", "educational stage taught", "teaching experience" and "teaching post".

The validity of the content confirmed the thirty-eight initial items. To validate the construct a multivariate technique for factorial analysis was used to reduce, standardize and validate the data collected from the surveys completed by the teachers. Factorial analysis was undertaken using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) process. The number of factors was calculated using the Keiser-Meyer-Olkin latent root criterion. Subsequently, varimax rotation was applied with Kaiser Normalization, Table 1.

Table 1. Statistical summary of factorial analysis

Adequate sample size	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	0,131
Bartlett's sphericity test	Chi-squared test	1396,931
	Degree of Freedom	703
	Sigma	0
Explained variance total	Percentage	51430

In Table 2, subsequent to rotation, one can observe that the final solution of the factorial analysis contains 3 factors which integrate the thirty-eight original items proposed, which explain a very acceptable variance percentage (51.430%) given the minimum discrimination index at 0.5. Bartlett's sphericity test confirms the existence of underlying factors in the data matrix, due to the high level of significance obtained.

Table 2. Statistical summary of the final factorial solution after rotation

	M	SD
D1. Domain linked to the inclusion of students with SEN.	12,15%	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.
D2. Domain linked to inclusion in schools.	8,79%	14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.
D3. Domain linked to inclusive methodology.	5,84%	24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38.

Cronbach's alpha regarding the whole scale was (0.815), with contributions from both halves, the even items presenting a score of 0.852 and the odd items a score of 0.852, suggesting equal reliability of both halves. The corrected item-total correlation ranged from (item 28 0.913 > 0.901, items 12, 21, 29) so the number of items was not reduced.

5.3 Results and discussion

Following the analysis of the data obtained relating to the three dimensions used in the questionnaire, we found the results below.

In relation to Dimension 1, "The inclusion of students with specific educational needs", one of the objectives of our research was to determine if teachers in rural areas developed inclusive education directed at students with special educational needs. As shown in Table 3, teachers working in this area do evidently practice inclusive education in which part-time integration in the ordinary classroom is the most favoured option with an average of 2.88. It must however be noted that, except in a few cases, response options to items included in this dimension do not obtain a clear majority percentage. The only question scoring a high percentage refers to whether students with a serious disability should be dealt with full-time in the special needs classroom, obtaining an average of 2.48. Although teachers consider they have sufficient training to manage these students academically, and address inclusion in their classrooms, they do

not clearly make the difference between the meaning of integration and the meaning of inclusion.

Table 3. Scores of the dimension related to inclusion of students with specific educational needs

Items	Frequency	Average	Average	Standard Deviation	Maximum / Minimum	Tendency
1. Students in rural schools must be in ordinary classrooms.	U	4	2.5	0.8	MAX: 4	2
	LF	17	3	7	MIN: 3	
	F	13				
	VF	6				
2. Students with SEN in a rural school must be in a special needs class.	U	7	2.2	0.8	MAX: 4	2
	LF	19	3	0	MIN: 2	
	F	12				
	VF	2				
3. Students with SEN in a rural school must be in both an ordinary and a special needs class.	U	1	2.8	0.8	MAX: 4	2
	LF	14	8	5	MIN: 2	
	F	14				
	VF	11				
4. Students with a serious disability must be in a special needs class full-time.	U	8	2.4	0.9	MAX: 4	3
	LF	8	8	0	MIN: 1	
	F	21				
	VF	3				
5. Students with SEN from a rural area must go to ordinary schools.	U	1	2.9	0.7	MAX: 4	3
	LF	9	5	4	MIN: 2	
	F	21				
	VF	9				
6. Whilst attending SEN students, other students are left unattended.	U	17	1.9	0.8	MAX: 4	1
	LF	10	0	7	MIN: 2	
	F	13				
	VF	0				
7. My rural school serves to integrate SEN students into their context.	U	1	2.7	0.8	MAX: 4	3
	LF	10	8	3	MIN: 3	
	F	22				
	VF	7				
8. My students' families have a positive concept of the fact that their children are learning with SEN students.	U	0	2.8	0.5	MAX: 4	3
	LF	9	8	6	MIN: 3	
	F	27				
	VF	4				
9. In my parent-teacher meetings we address the inclusion process of SEN students.	U	1	2.8	0.6	MAX: 4	3
	LF	8	5	2	MIN: 1	
	F	27				
	VF	4				
10. I consider I have sufficient training to develop inclusive education in the classroom.	U	1	2.7	0.6	MAX: 4	3
	LF	11	8	6	MIN: 2	
	F	24				
	VF	4				
11. I agree with the legislation that regulates the inclusion principle.	U	0	2.7	0.6	MAX: 4	3
	LF	17	0	8	MIN: 1	
	F	18				
	VF	5				
12. The concept of SEN in this rural area differs from the concept of SEN in other contexts.	U	5	2.4	0.7	MAX: 4	3
	LF	12	8	5	MIN: 2	
	F	22				
	VF	1				
13. The concept of inclusion is the same as the concept of integration.	U	8	2.2	0.8	MAX: 4	2
	LF	16	3	0	MIN: 1	
	F	15				
	VF	1				
Final sum factor 1			ΣAVERAGE=2.59	ΣDEVIATION=0.84	ΣTENDENCY=2.5	

The options show a heterogeneous performance (dispersion), as shown by various standard deviations, with "In Favour" (F) being the most common response. Only one item gets a low score with 1.90, this item is the one stating "whilst SEN students are being attended to, the others are left unattended"; however, the score average leads us to take into account the standard deviation (0.90), the maximum and minimum (1-4) and the tendency (3). These statistics show dispersion and heterogeneity of opinion for a given item.

Regarding Dimension 2: “Inclusion in your school”, Table 4 shows considerable dispersion in the responses given. Though we can deduce that inclusive education is put into practice, opinions in favour and opinions against obtain similar scores, as can be observed in item 14 with an average of 2.38. Despite attempts at activating student integrative processes within normalized contexts, the inclusive process strictly speaking has not been fully adopted by schools to date. The first five items address school organizational set up in relation to SEN students; despite the fact that most frequent responses are related to inclusion, with averages adding up to 2.95 for item 5 and 2.15 for item 2, responses against or less in favour achieve a similar score.

Table 4. Scores of the Dimension related to inclusion in own school

Items	Frequency	Average	Average	Standard Deviation	Maximum / Minimum	Tendency
14. My rural school develops inclusive education with SEN students in ordinary classrooms full-time.	U	4	2.38	0.66	MAX: 4	3
	LF	17			MIN: 2	
	F	19				
	VF	0				
15. The SEN students in my rural school are in the special needs classroom full-time.	U	9	2.15	0.86	MAX: 4	2
	LF	16			MIN: 3	
	F	14				
	VF	1				
16. Only students with a severe disability are in the special needs classroom.	U	1	2.38	0.70	MAX: 4	3
	LF	14			MIN: 3	
	F	14				
	VF	11				
17. Remedial work in my rural school is carried out in the ordinary classroom.	U	3	2.55	0.74	MAX: 4	3
	LF	15			MIN: 3	
	F	19				
	VF	3				
18. In my rural school programming is carried out jointly by the special needs staff and the teaching staff of SEN students.	U	1	2.95	0.74	MAX: 4	3
	LF	9			MIN: 2	
	F	21				
	VF	9				
19. My rural school’s Educational Project is based on inclusive education.	U	1	2.93	0.85	MAX: 4	3
	LF	10			MIN: 1	
	F	19				
	VF	10				
20. The aim of the Special Needs Plan in my rural school is inclusive education.	U	0	2.95	0.83	MAX: 4	3
	LF	10			MIN: 3	
	F	22				
	VF	8				
21. The key stages programmes in my rural school respond to the needs of SEN students.	U	0	3.05	0.63	MAX: 4	3
	LF	7			MIN: 2	
	F	24				
	VF	9				
22. The school management team of my rural school supports inclusive education.	U	1	2.85	0.89	MAX: 4	3
	LF	13			MIN: 1	
	F	16				
	VF	10				
23. Sufficient training in inclusive education is offered by the education authorities to teachers in rural schools.	U	2	2.73	0.75	MAX: 4	3
	LF	9			MIN: 2	
	F	26				
	VF	3				
Final sum factor 2			ΣAVERAGE=2.6	ΣDEVIATION.=0.76	ΣTENDENCY=2.9	

In relation to school documents and the implication of the management staff in initiating the inclusive teaching-learning process, it should be noted that, according to survey responses, educational intervention planning is sufficient at different levels of curricular development, regarding both the regulations developed by the education authority and the various documents which make reference to these students.

Scores are less heterogeneous (less dispersion) compared to previous ones, as can be seen in the different standard deviations. The option with most responses is “favourable” (F). However, average scores lead us to take into account the standard deviation of 0.76, the maximum and minimum (3-4, 2-4) and the tendency (3), statistics which show some heterogeneity in responses.

In light of the results obtained, there is still work to be done in the development of inclusive education in general terms and subsequently “develop inclusive education for SEN students full-time in ordinary classrooms”, and “avoid students with a serious disability being attended full-time in a special needs classroom”.

In relation to Dimension 3: “Inclusive Methodology”, and as shown in Table 5, teachers apply a methodology directed towards inclusive education, despite the fact that the majority of teachers use only one textbook for all students, the average score being 2.50; the establishment of cooperative learning, so very important for the academic development of SEN students, is significant, as is the development of project work as a methodological strategy which favours the teaching-learning process, not forgetting that the use of ICT is present in the majority of teachers’ repertoire of resources.

Table 5. Scores of the Dimension related to inclusive methodology

Items	Frequency	Average	Average	Standard Deviation	Maximum / Minimum	Tendency
24. My teaching programme takes into account the learning processes of all my students.	U	1	2.85	0.77	MAX: 4	3
	LF	12			MIN: 3	
	F	19				
	VF	8				
25. Students are taught through cooperative learning.	U	0	2.83	0.71	MAX: 4	3
	LF	14			MIN: 2	
	F	19				
	VF	7				
26. Assessment helps us take into account the abilities of all students.	U	0	2.88	1.85	MAX: 4	2
	LF	13			MIN: 2	
	F	18				
	VF	9				
27. I use materials which take into account mixed abilities.	U	2	2.98	0.80	MAX: 4	3
	LF	7			MIN: 3	
	F	21				
	VF	10				
28. I use the same text book for all students.	U	8	2.50	0.93	MAX: 4	3
	LF	8			MIN: 2	
	F	20				
	VF	4				
29. The competence-based model favours learning in an inclusive classroom.	U	0	2.95	0.67	MAX: 4	3
	LF	10			MIN: 2	
	F	22				
	VF	8				
30. Project or task based methodology is suitable for the inclusive classroom.	U	0	2.95	0.71	MAX: 4	3
	LF	11			MIN: 3	
	F	20				
	VF	9				
31. The diversity of my students is a source of richness in the learning process.	U	0	2.98	0.69	MAX: 4	3
	LF	10			MIN: 3	
	F	21				
	VF	9				
32. I use ICT as an inclusive methodology in my classroom.	U	0	3.15	0.58	MAX: 4	3
	LF	4			MIN: 2	
	F	26				
	VF	10				
33. I use my teaching experience to promote practices which favour the inclusive principle.	U	0	3.13	0.60	MAX: 4	3
	LF	5			MIN: 1	
	F	25				
	VF	10				
34. The teachers in my rural school	U	0	3.05	0.59	MAX: 4	3

	LF	F	VF	U	3.00	0.64	MAX: 4	MIN: 3	3
develop their own resources to favour inclusion.e.	6	26	8	0			MIN: 2		
35. My rural school has sufficient material resources to favour inclusion.	8	24	8	1	3.03	0.62	MAX: 4	MIN: 1	3
36. My rural school has sufficient human resources to favour inclusion.	4	28	7	4	2.80	0.88	MAX: 4	MIN: 2	3
37. I periodically participate in training courses on Special Educational Needs.	8	20	8	1	3.05	0.78	MAX: 4	MIN: 2	3
38. I consider Curricular Adaptations necessary in my classroom.	8	19	12						
Final sum factor 3	ΣAVERAGE=2.94 ΣDEVIATION=0.78 ΣTENDENCY=2.93								

The last four items in this dimension address the availability of both material and human resources to satisfy educational needs of these students, and results show that teachers clearly believe that schools in rural areas rely on sufficient resources; the option in favour is still the most frequently chosen, however percentages are well above those given previously. Curiously, a large number of teachers participate periodically in courses on special educational needs, with an average result of 2.80.

Option scores are relatively heterogeneous as can be observed in the standard variations (1).

6 CONCLUSIONS

After more than two decades of legislative and administrative efforts to define teachers' roles, inclusive education still hasn't become common practice in our classrooms. We are only pretending to apply inclusion and we must remove the obstacles that deform the original idea leading to mere classroom simulation (López et al., 2014). However this simulation of inclusion has crept into daily practice in rural contexts. Many SEN student families, together with educational authorities, have made substantial efforts, but this is not enough. Teachers have failed to develop and implement teaching-learning processes directed towards inclusion from the educational proposals established in their classroom practice, because teaching skills, time, material resources and personal support for inclusion are considered insufficient. Moreover, perceptions about inclusion, skills, availability of resources and support differ according to the teaching hierarchy. Awareness is gradually lost as the level rises (Chiner & Cardona, 2013).

Concerning our research objectives and results obtained, our data reaches similar conclusions to that of other international studies (Ainscow, 2001; Levison, Sutton & Winstead, 2009; Jeffery & Troman, 2013; Adderley et al., 2015), and many other national studies (Arranz Márquez, 2008, Llorent García & López Azuaga, 2012). Greater teacher implication is necessary in order to apply inclusive education on a wider scale. From what can be observed in our research, rural teachers display willingness but perhaps lack initiative. Considerable efforts are still being made by teachers to implement this educational process, but what is needed is a methodological change, abandoning traditional teaching practices which impede inclusion and normalization of SEN students.

More specifically, we can observe how the results of the dimension which questions the need for the inclusion of SEN

students, do not obtain conclusive scores, despite the fact that according rural school teacher, this was a priori a favourable context.

Moreover, teachers participating in our research only provide formal and theoretical responses regarding the implementation of inclusion in their schools. Inclusion in the classroom has not yet been generalized to all students. The highest scores obtained in our questionnaire were those relating to formal aspects such as programming, proposals made for the benefit of education authorities and the use of the special needs classroom as a solution to equality in education.

In the section on methodology, as teachers point out, it is clear that textbooks set work guidelines in the classroom, something totally incompatible with competence learning. It is interesting to see how curricular adaptations still fit in and constitute one of the highest scoring items. If, as teachers confirm, teaching staff receives sufficient training and they both have the necessary human and material resources, it seems somewhat contradictory that no definitive change in methodology has materialized in the classroom. Likewise, textbooks offer no contextualized learning situations and, as has been demonstrated elsewhere (Pro & Rodríguez, 2010), contextualization processes allow improvement in the quality of learning. Likewise, they state that ICT is used alongside textbooks and curricular adaptations; however, no practices which would free us from their use are implemented (Molina & Pano, 2013).

Therefore, we propose to develop inclusive education, delving deeper into the following aspects which in the end are the basis of inclusive methodology:

- Plan the educational process taking into account the learning processes of all the students in the class (Llorent García & López Azuaga, 2012).

- Develop the teaching-learning process from a cooperative perspective, as established by authors such as Dyson (2010).

- Assessment should respect the abilities of all students, including those with SEN (Raffo, 2009).

- It is important to use resources taking into account attention to diversity (Torres González, 2012) to improve school relations (Herrera & Bravo, 2012).

- According to Perrenoud (2004), the competence learning model favours work in the ordinary classroom, as well as in the classroom where the inclusive education model is developed.

- Task and project work (Pacte, 2000) is a suitable methodology in the inclusive classroom alongside ICT in all its dimensions: games (Herrero et al., 2014), curricular proposals, etc.

- Use students' differences as a source of richness in teaching practice (Llorent & López, 2012).

Putting the inclusive process into practice is a controversial and complex issue, which is sometimes misunderstood (Ainscow, Both & Dyson, 2006), and in many cases is even a source of tension. As observed in the section "Context and participants", the final sample was made up of 40 participants, which demonstrates limited teacher involvement in inclusion processes and the old idea that inclusion is the responsibility only of special needs departments. In order to progress and deal adequately with diversity, teachers must be trained to do so and, following the approaches of Vigo & Soriano (2014), what is

strange to us must be made familiar and what is familiar to us must be made strange. Making the work we do seem strange to us, leads us to think and reflect; and making what we consider normal/strange, forms part of the process of change. In this representation, creativity directs the interpretation of the educational response towards the particular characteristics and student needs towards a more intelligent way of working (Jeffrey & Troman, 2013), starting with the strengthening of alternative educational practices and ways of looking at disability as an alternative, not a failure. Experimentation with creative practices in education (Beach & Bagley, 2012; Broderick, et al., 2010; Craft & Jeffrey, 2008; Jeffrey & Troman, 2009; Woods, 2002; Woods & Jeffrey, 1996) could contribute to understanding and developing education adapted to everyone, overcoming the complexity of any educational situation.

Chappell & Craft (2011), state that creative learning is the foundation on which to develop a process of change in schooling which could lead to education for all regardless of individual learning characteristics. But first, as we have mentioned earlier, a series of difficulties must be overcome to put inclusive education into practice, such as lack of initial and ongoing training for teachers, insufficient coordination between teaching programmes and real demands, or the maintenance of general horizontal guidelines focused on a homogeneous and unifying process.

Furthermore, in rural contexts, where the figure of the head is so important, his or her leadership is essential to support the inclusive rural school and the special needs staff (Jones, Forlim & Gillies, 2013) while involving all teachers including specialists and non-specialists.

Nevertheless, in the light of our study, a more in-depth look into other areas of research would be necessary for rural contexts, particularly in aspects such as transferring support given to SEN students by special needs staff into the ordinary classroom, the use of ICT as a methodological proposal to move forward in inclusive strategies, and how the close relationship with citizens in this rural context and the subsequent greater heterogeneity in the classroom should be taken advantage of, so that inclusion rather than integration is favoured.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, B. (2012). International Comparative studies in teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and teacher education*, 28(7), 641-648. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2012.02.003
- Adderley, R. J., Hope, M. A., Hughes, G. C., Jones, L., Messiou, K., & Shaw, P. A. (2015). Exploring inclusive practices in primary schools: focusing on children's voices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 30(1), 106-121. doi:10.1080/08856257.2014.964580
- Ainscow, M. (2001). Desarrollo de la práctica. In M. Ainscow (Ed.), *Desarrollo de escuelas inclusivas. Ideas, propuestas y experiencias para mejorar las instituciones escolares* (pp. 109-142). Madrid: Narcea.
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, D. (2006). *Improving school, Developing Inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Alonso, M. J., & Araoz, I. (2011). *El impacto de la Convención Internacional sobre los derechos de las personas con Discapacidad en la legislación educativa española*. Madrid: Ediciones Cinto. Retrieved from http://www.convenciondiscapacidad.es/ColeccionONU_new/Impacto%20de%20la%20C.6.pdf
- Alvarez, J. L., & Gonzalez, H. (2008). La investigación en educación intercultural. *Revista de ciencias de la educación: Órgano del Instituto Calasanz de Ciencias de la Educación*, 215, 263-278.
- Arranz, M. L. (2008). *Proceso y procedimientos de evaluación inclusivos en contextos educativos*. Informa-Centros. Proyecto de Investigación Educativa. Consejería de la Comunidad de Madrid.
- Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). las actitudes de los profesores hacia la integración/inclusión: una revisión de la literatura. *Revista Europea de la educación para necesidades especiales*, 17(2), 129-147.
- Barton, L. (2009). Estudios sobre discapacidad y la búsqueda de la inclusividad. Observaciones. *Revista de Educación*, 349, 137-152.
- Beach, D., & Bagley, C. (2012). The weakening role of education studies and the retraditionalisation of Swedish teacher education. *Oxford Educational Review*, 38, 287-303. doi:10.1080/03054985.2012.692054
- Boix, R. (2011). ¿Qué queda de la escuela rural? Algunas reflexiones sobre la realidad pedagógica del aula multigrado. *Profesorado: Revista de Curriculum y Formación del Profesorado*, 15(2), 13-23.
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *The Index of Inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools*. London: CSIE.
- Broderick, A., Mehta-Parekh, H., & Reid, D. K. (2010). Differentiating instruction for disabled students in inclusive classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 44(3), 194-202. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4403_3
- Bustos, A. (2010). Aproximación a las aulas de escuela rural: heterogeneidad y aprendizaje en los grupos multigrado. *Revista de Educación*, 352, 353-378.
- Carro, A., Lima, J. A., Hernández, F., & León, A. K. (2014). Educar sin excluir. Una experiencia de educación inclusiva en el estado de Tlaxcala, México. *Revista nacional e internacional de educación inclusiva*, 1(7), 140-162.
- CERMI (2010). *Los jóvenes con discapacidad en España. Informe de situación 2010*. Madrid: Cinca. Retrieved from http://www.intersocial.es/images/stories/pdf/jovenes_con_discapacidad.pdf
- Chappell, K., & Craft, A. (2011). Creative learning conversations: producing living dialogic spaces. *Educational Research*, 53(3), 363-385. doi:10.1080/00131881.2011.598663
- Chiner, E., & Cardona, M. C. (2013). Inclusive education in Spain: how do skills, resources, and supports affect regular education teachers' perceptions of inclusion? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(5), 526-541. doi:10.1080/13603116.2012.689864
- Craft, A., & Jeffrey, B. (2008). Creativity and performativity in teaching and learning: Tension, dilemmas, constraints, accommodations and synthesis. *British Educational Research Association*, 34(5), 577-584. doi:10.1080/01411920802223842
- De Lara, E., & Ballesteros, B. (2007). *Métodos de investigación en Educación Social*. Madrid: UNED.
- Dyson, A. (2010). Changes in special education theory from an English perspective. *Revista Internacional de Educación Inclusiva*, 3(1), 69-84.
- Fernández, A. (2011). La escuela inclusiva: realidad intercultural. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 55(2).
- Forlin, C., Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Earle, C. (2009). Demographic differences in changing pre-service teachers' attitudes, sentiments and concerns about inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13(2), 195-209. doi: 10.1080/13603110701365356
- Gelis, J. F. (2004). La escuela rural en España: apuntes sobre las potencialidades pedagógicas, relacionales y humanas de la misma. *Revista Digital eRural, Educación, cultura y desarrollo rural*, 2(3), 1-13.
- Glazzard, J. (2013). A critical interrogation of the contemporary discourses associated with inclusive education in England. *Journal of Research in Special Education Needs*, 13(3), 182-188. doi:10.1111/1471-3802.12018
- Glazzard, J., & Dale, K. (2013). Trainee teachers with dyslexia: personal narratives of resilience. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 13(1), 26-37. doi:10.1111/j.1471-3802.2012.01254.x
- Glazzard, J. (2014). From Integration to Inclusive Education in England: Illuminating the Issues Through A Life History Account. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 9(1).
- Haq, F. S., & Mundia, L. (2012). Comparison of Brunei preservice student teachers' attitudes to inclusive education and specific disabilities: Implications for teacher education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 105(5), 366-374. doi:10.1080/00220671.2011.627399
- Harris, R., Miske, S., & Attig, G. (2004). *Embracing Diversity: Toolkit for Creating Inclusive Learning-Friendly Environments*. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Herrera, L., & Bravo, I. (2012). Predictive value of social skills in living together at primary school. Analysis in a cultural diversity context. *New Approaches in Educational Research. NAER*, 1, 13-21. doi:10.7821/naer.1.1.13-21
- Herrero, D., del Castillo, H., Monjelat, N., García-Varela, A. B., Checa, M., & Gómez, P. (2014). Evolution and natural selection: learning by playing and reflecting. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 1(3), 26-33. doi:10.7821/naer.3.1.26-33
- Izcozovich, G. (2012). Inclusión educativa en contextos de segregación espacial. *Alas para la equidad. Órgano Informativo del Consejo Nacional de Fomento Educativo de México*, 4(38).
- Jeffrey, B., & Troman, G. (2009, September). Creative and Performativity practices in primary schools: a Foucauldian perspective. In *BERA annual Conference 2009*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of BERA, Manchester.

- Retrieved from: <http://oro.open.ac.uk/21364/2/BJ-Cr%2BPerf-BERA09-Ed-online.pdf>.
- Jeffrey, B., & Troman, G. (2013). Managing creative teaching and performative practices. *Thinking skills and creativity*, 9(0), 24-34. doi:10.1016/j.tsc.2013.01.003
- Jones, P., Forlim, Ch., & Gillies, A. (2013). The Contribution of Facilitated Leadership to Systems Development for Greater Inclusive. *Practices international journal of whole schooling*, 9(1), 60-74.
- Kim, Y. W. (2013). Inclusive Education in Korea: Policy, Practice, and Challenges. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 10(2), 79-81. doi:10.1111/jppi.12034
- Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación (Boletín Oficial del Estado, 04/05/2006).
- León, N. (2010). *De la educación especial al paradigma de la cultura de la diversidad y la educación inclusiva el caso del instituto Herbert*. Sevilla: Universidad Internacional de Andalucía.
- Levison, B. A. U., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education Policy as a practice of Power. Theoretical Tools, *Emographic Methods, Democratic Options. Educational Policy*, 23(6), 767-795. doi:10.1177/0895904808320676
- Llorent, V. J., & López Azuaga, R. (2012). Demandas de la formación del profesorado. El desarrollo de la educación inclusiva en la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria. *Revista electrónica interuniversitaria de formación del profesorado*, 15(3), 27-34.
- López Melero, M. (2004). *Construyendo una escuela sin exclusiones. Una forma de trabajar en el aula con proyectos de investigación*. Málaga: Aljibe.
- López-Torrijo, M., & Mengual-Andrés, S. (2014). Students with Severe, Permanent Disabilities and Their Educational Inclusion in Spain. *International Education Studies*, 7(2), 91. doi:10.5539/ies.v7n2p91
- López, V., Julio, C., Morales, M., Rojas, C., & Pérez, M. V. (2014). Barreras culturales para la inclusión: políticas y prácticas de integración en Chile. *Revista de Educación*, 363(1), 256-281. doi:10.4438/1988-592XRE-2012-363-180
- Mc Millan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2005). *Investigación educativa*. Madrid: Pearson Education.
- Molina, M^a D., & Panoa, A. (2013, November). Incidencia del uso de las TIC en las aulas de NEE. In *I Encontro Internacional e Educação Especial: Contributos para a Intervenção*. Coimbra, Portugal.
- Monge, M., & Monge, M. A. (2009). Innovación educativa cuerpos, mentes y aprendizajes diversos: La clase de Educación Física como modelo de una educación inclusiva en Costa Rica. *Ágora para la Educación Física y el Deporte*, 9, 1115-1136.
- Muntaner, J. J. (2010). De la integración a la inclusión: un nuevo modelo educativo. In P. Arnáiz Sánchez, M. D. Hurtado, & F. J. Soto (Coords.), *25 años de integración escolar en España: Tecnología e Inclusión en el ámbito educativo, laboral y comunitario*. Murcia: Consejería de Educación, Formación y Empleo, 2-24. Retrieved from <http://congreso.tecnoneet.org/actas2010/docs/jjmuntaner.pdf>.
- Muntaner, J. J. (2013). Calidad de vida en la escuela inclusiva. *Revista Iberoamericana de educación*, 63, 35-49.
- Orden del 25 de julio, por la que se regula la atención a la diversidad del alumnado que cursa educación básica en los centros docentes públicos de Andalucía (Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía, número 167, de 22/08/2008).
- PACTE (2000). Acquiring translation competence: Hypotheses and methodological problems of a research project. In A. Beeby, D. Ensinger, & M. Presas (Eds.), *Investigating translation* (pp. 99-106). Amsterdam/Filadelfia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Palomares, A., & González, A. C. (2012). La educación inclusiva del alumnado con necesidades especiales en la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria en la Región de Murcia. *Educar*, 48(2), 267-283.
- Perrenoud, Ph. (2004). *Diez nuevas competencias para enseñar*. Barcelona: Grao.
- Praisner, C. (2003). Attitudes of Elementary School Principals toward the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 69(2), 135-146. doi:10.1177/001440290306900201
- Pro, A., & Rodríguez, J. (2010). Aprender competencias en una propuesta para la enseñanza de los circuitos eléctricos en Educación Primaria. *Revista Enseñanza de las Ciencias*, 28(3), 385-404.
- Raffo, C. (2009). Education and Poverty: Mapping the Terrain and Making the Links to Educational Policy. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13 (4), 341-358. doi:10.1080/13603110802124462
- Real Decreto 334/1985, de 6 de marzo, de ordenación de la Educación Especial (Boletín Oficial del Estado, 16/03/1985).
- Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlín, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Education Needs*, 12(1), 12-21. doi:10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x
- Torres, J. A. (2012). Estructuras organizativas para una escuela inclusive: promoviendo comunidades de aprendizaje. *Educatio siglo XXI*, 30(1), 45-70.
- Townsend, J., & Fu, D. (2001). Paw's story: A loatian refugee's lonely entry into American literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45(2), 104-114.
- Trianes, M., Blanca, M., García, J., & Sánchez, A. (2003). Competencia social en alumnos con necesidades educativas especiales: Nivel de inteligencia, edad y género. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*, 56(3), 325-338.
- UNESCO (2008). *48th session of the international conference on education. Inclusive education: The way of the future*. Genova: UNESCO.
- Vega, A., & Garín, S. (2012). Nuevos maestros y maestras para una eficaz educación inclusiva. *Indivisa*, 13, 104-120.
- Verdugo, M. A. (2009). El cambio escolar desde una perspectiva de calidad de vida. *Revista de Educación*, 349, 23-43.
- Vigo, B., & Soriano, J. (2014). Prácticas de enseñanza y aprendizaje creativo para una educación inclusiva en la formación inicial del profesorado. Experiencias de investigación. *Revista nacional e internacional de educación inclusiva*, 7(1), 30-45.
- Woods, P. (2002). Teaching and learning in the new millenium. In C. Day, & C. Sugrue (Eds.), *Developing teaching and teachers: international research perspectives* (pp. 73-91). London: Falmer.
- Woods, P., & Jeffrey, B. (1996). *Teachable moments. The art of teaching in primary schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.