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RESUMO: O objetivo deste estudo foi analisar as percepções de professores de educação física do sistema regular de ensino diante da inclusão de alunos com deficiência. Para tanto, 90 professores de educação física escolar responderam a uma escala com 18 afirmações. Pode-se observar que a percepção geral dos professores pesquisados foi negativa para com a inclusão. O pessimismo mais forte dos professores foi por não se sentirem preparados para lidar com alunos com deficiência. Os professores com menor tempo de experiência mostraram visões mais positivas no que se refere aos benefícios de todos os alunos com a inclusão.


1 INTRODUCTION

Especially since the end of the 1980s, much has been discussed on the inclusion movement that the Federal Government has attempted to implement at the regular educational system (BRAZIL, 1988, LDB, 1996, NAP, 2001). The teachers, who then saw children with disabilities as very distant reality, are now mobilized to make courses and be upgraded to receive them.

Perhaps for confusing disability with disease, perhaps for comfort or total lack of information, the fact is that many teachers still currently deprive their students with disabilities the opportunity to experience crucial motor and recreational experiences, which inevitably will bring up consequences sometimes irreparable. In fact, it is not enough just to create legal instruments to ensure the enrollment of them "all" at school. More than that, we need to change attitudes, behaviors, and stigmatized visions.

After the signing of the Declaration of Salamanca in 1994, Brazil has experienced a time of major revisions in the area of care towards children with disabilities and a major discussion concerns the training of teachers. As for some educators, it would not be necessary to train teachers in special education for disabled children, as this task would be for everybody, considering the inclusion movement.

To Baumel and Castro (2003), the main idea of the Declaration of Salamanca was its "inclusive approach", considering that regular schools, after achieving education for all,
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should be the starting point for the creation of cohesive communities and a society that is able to include. In this new concept, the school, instead of facing the differences and difficulties, considers them as opportunities for creating a richer educational environment for everybody. Pedrinelli (2002) states that teachers who do not promote the inclusion in their classes have one of two characteristics: either an "segregated" attitude, for understanding that because of the difficulty or difference in learning, students with disabilities should be in segregated contexts, or the belief that they are devoid of knowledge to act with what is different, not knowing how and what to do. Baumel and Castro (2003) emphasize that we must establish for teachers a process of professional development, innovating the teaching practice with new possibilities of materials and resources for teaching all students. In addition, they emphasize the importance of the continuing search for personal and professional development of the teacher.

According to Mantoan (2003), the proposed inclusion requires that the school is identified with certain educational principles and attitudes which teachers are consistent with. The training of teachers is the first step for school inclusion to be successful. In general, it is a factor that will ensure the progress, quality and maintenance of all students in school, since, the teacher will be responsible for assessing what type of intervention will promote the development of students, the impact of the inclusion to students without disabilities, whether there are changes in the learning performance of children and how this performance can be strengthened (FARIAS, 2003).

Rodrigues (2003) states that physical education has remained outside the inclusion movement, dominating the national discourse since the 90s. Although many children with disabilities can have access to regular schools, in many cases they are exempted from physical education classes, often for insecurity by the part of the teacher. According to the author, physical education is a right, not a disposable option. Thus, no student can be exempted from the discipline, even in its theoretical aspect.

Considering the relevance and currentness of the topic, the purpose of this study was to analyze the perception of physical education teachers in the regular educational system before the inclusion of students with disabilities in their classes. This study also aimed to compare the perceptions of time-proven experience and gender of the teacher.

2 METHOD

This study was a descriptive research, in which characteristics of the individuals involved without the interference of the researcher were raised in a cross-sectional way.
SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES

To conduct this study, we counted on the participation of 90 physical education teachers of the regular educational system of the city of São Paulo, both private schools and state public schools. All teachers were trained in physical education and were classified by gender (59 female and 31 male), time of experience in teaching (13 less than two years of experience, 32 experienced between two and ten years, and 45 experienced more than ten years) and type of school (61 public schools and 29 private schools). Schools found in this phase were chosen at random in the south and west regions of the city of São Paulo. We assessed teachers who worked in only one school so that the data could be more specific.

A scale for teachers in regular public and private education was applied. The intention was to evaluate which perceptions physical education teachers had when facing students with disabilities included in regular classes and what type of support they received for optimizing their work with this special population. The scale was adapted from models already validated by Sideridis and Chandler (1997) and Kozub and Porretta (1998) and is found at Annex 1. For the construction of the scale used in this study, thirty statements were developed, which were subsequently shown to five professional experts in the field of special education and adapted physical education. After the suggestions were verified, the number of statements was reduced to 18.

The 18 claims were then shown in the applied scale, to which five levels of answers were used: not applicable, I totally disagree, I disagree almost entirely, and I agree almost entirely. The "not applicable" alternative should be answered by teachers when they do not have concrete opinions on some of the statements. The statements addressed the opinions of teachers about the presence of students with disabilities in physical education classes, as well as the support received from the direction of the school. It was also focused on the preparation that the teacher found necessary to deal with these students and the criteria for the assessment of "special" cases. The statements one through ten were related to the way teachers stands in front of the inclusion of students with disabilities in their classes, numbers 11 through 14 were relate to how teachers understand the benefits of inclusion for all students; finally, numbers 15 through 18 addressed the opinion of teachers regarding the structure and encouragement offered by schools.
Teachers responded to the scale in an individual way, without the interference of the researchers. They did not need to identify themselves, nor their schools. The responses obtained in the scales were tabulated and related to gender and time of experience of teachers. The answers of statements 15 through 18 were compared also regarding the type of school (public or private) in which the teacher worked. The results were arranged by simple frequency tables and cross frequency tables. In order to check whether there were differences among the proportions obtained for each statement, we used the Chi-Square test and the level of significance adopted was 0.05.

This study was conducted with the approval of the Research Ethics Committee of Physical Education and Sports School of University of São Paulo.

### 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Teachers were categorized according to gender, type of school (public or private) and time of experience in teaching. There was no association in the distribution of teachers regarding gender and type of school, between time of experience and type of school or between time of experience and gender (p = 0.973, 0.424 and 0.386, respectively).

As for the scale applied to teachers (Annex 1), the statements, except for numbers 10 and 14, played situations that expressed a positive and optimistic attitude about the presence of students with disabilities in the classroom. When reading each statement, teacher expressed themselves by using one of the following responses: 0 for not applicable, 1 for I totally disagree with the statement, 2 for I disagree almost entirely with the statement, 3 for I agree almost completely with the statement; and 4 for I fully agree with the statement. Thus, the lower the value indicated by the teacher, the less optimism regarding the proposed statement. In questions 10 and 14, which put negative statements, the situation was reversed, i.e. the lower the weight reported by teachers, the bigger their optimism. Table 1 shows an overview of the distribution of responses from teachers in 18 questions.

| TABLE 1 - General summary of answers on the scale applied to teachers. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Answers** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **Total** | **Result** | **P** |
| **Test χ²** | | | | | | | | | |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>31.1%</th>
<th>35.6%</th>
<th>30.0%</th>
<th>3.3%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>23,2</th>
<th>0.000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference (p<0.05)

In order to check whether there were significant differences (p <0.05) among the proportions, we used the Chi-Square test. It was observed that the difference was significant
in almost all issues, except for numbers 5 and 9 (to like having students with disabilities and to motivate all students, respectively), in which there was a homogenous distribution of responses. In question number 8 (to meet the proposed program of instruction), the test was close to the limit (p-value = 0.048), indicating a tendency towards uniformity among the answers. The issues on which teachers showed greater optimism about the presence of students with disabilities in regular physical education classes were numbers 6 and 12, which respectively stated that the teacher wanted to participate in courses to increase their knowledge about teaching methods for students with disabilities and that the teacher felt that students without disabilities would benefit from the inclusion of disabled peers in the classroom.

Thus, we find that, although almost half the teachers surveyed (47.8%) showed not to like the idea of having students with disabilities in their classes (statement number 5), 86.7% showed an intention to take courses to acquire more knowledge on how to proceed with such students and 83.3% agreed that students without disabilities would benefit from the inclusion movement.

The fact that most teachers demonstrate the intention to take courses in the area of adapted physical education may be a consequence of the obligation that forces schools to include students with disabilities. On the other hand, taking courses and learning more about the potential of these students, may cause many teachers to make their attitudes more positive and receptive. Rizzo (1985), researching among 194 physical education teachers, found that those who participated in courses in the area of adapted physical education were more optimistic regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classes.

When examining various articles published over the past two decades addressing the attitudes of physical education teachers towards the inclusion of students with disabilities, Hutzler (2003) noted some points that influenced such behavior. He highlighted that the female professional, who participated in courses in the area of adapted physical activity and those with previous experience in working with young people with disabilities showed, in general, a more positive attitude when receiving students with disabilities in their regular classes.

The statements in which the teachers showed a greater pessimism were numbers 2, 7 and 15 through 18. The statements 2 and 7 treated, respectively, of how much teachers believed that their knowledge made them ready to work with students with disabilities and of how much they believed they would use the same criteria to evaluate students with and without disabilities. Out of the surveyed teachers, 66.6% showed pessimism related to their
preparation for working with students with disabilities and 63.9% said they do not use or would not use the same criteria to assess students with disabilities that they used for the other students. Other researches in the literature also reported the perception of the physical education teachers in relation to their lack of preparation for dealing with students with disabilities. Probably, this lack of preparation puts teachers out of their comfort zone or makes them show no optimism in developing their work with this population. As for evaluation criteria, specifically for the lack of knowledge, teachers believe they cannot be much demanding with their students with disabilities. The research also shows that teachers tend to be less perceptive when grading these students (KOZUB; PORRETA, 1998; LAMASTER, GALL, KINCHIN; SIEDENTOP, 1998).

Still addressing grading and the preparation of physical education teachers in relation to students with disabilities, Gorgatti, Penteado, Ping Junior and De Rose (2004) applied a scale to 10 physical education teachers who worked with disabled children. The study found that all surveyed teachers claimed to use different criteria to evaluate students with disabilities. Other issues were also highlighted in the research: 50% of the teachers stressed that they did not like working with students with disabilities and that they had no knowledge for that, but 80% believe that the inclusion movement in physical education classes was beneficial for all students and those with disabilities were well accepted by their peers; finally, 90% of teachers said that their schools were not prepared to receive students with disabilities, either by lack of structural adjustment, or by lack of material support or a multidisciplinary team.

Aguiar and Duarte (2005), after interviewing 67 physical education teachers in public schools of São Paulo State, mostly with over 10 years of experience, found that the majority (62.7%) of surveyed teachers did not feel prepared to deal with students with disabilities. Still, the majority of surveyed teachers said they try to get new information on the needs of such students through lectures or independent reading. Although 97% of teachers show they realize the possible benefits arising from the practice of school inclusion, they also stated that some conditions were still needed for the process to be successful. Some requirements raised regarded the continuous training of teachers, adequacy of space and material resources and support by multidisciplinary team.

3.1 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS OF PREPARING (STATEMENTS 15 TO 18)
In these statements, teachers were supposed to opine on how their school was adequately prepared to receive students with disabilities, regarding space, materials, support services and other resources. In all four statements, there was a general tendency for pessimism by the teachers, showing that they believe that, in general, their schools are ill-prepared and lacking adequate space and material resources appropriate to work with all students. As these statements concerned specifically the structure and the adjustment of school for the success of the inclusion, the answers were compared to teachers of private and public teaching networks, using again the Chi-Square test.

The results showed that for statements 15 and 18, there were no significant differences among the answers of teachers from public and private teaching networks (p = 0.184 and 0.372, respectively). These statements were related to the teachers' perception about the existence of sufficient material in their school for classes and the structural adaptations for the accessibility of all students. In other words, not only teachers from public networks, but also those from private network judged similarly their schools regarding materials for class and accessibility. In the material item, although private network teachers showed a more optimistic tendency than the public network ones, this difference was not significant.

As for statements 16 and 17, which concerned, respectively, support services (physician, speech therapist, psychologist, and others) and the resources to acquire the necessary materials, the differences were significant (p = 0.008 for statement 16 and 0.001 for statement 17). Thus, it was observed that private network teachers stated that their schools had more resources to purchase materials and a greater team of professionals to provide appropriate support to students with disabilities. Public network teachers, on the other hand, were more pessimistic regarding their schools in these two factors.

Other surveys recently conducted have also shown that, in addition to appropriate professional preparation, teachers feel insecure in many situations concerning the inclusion of students with disabilities in their classes by the lack of available space and material resources. Besides, teachers expressed a general need for the presence of a multidisciplinary support team, consisting of psychologists, speech therapists, among others. There is also the matter of the possibility of the presence of an assistant professor during class, and a small number of students per class (AMMAH; HODGE, 2006; GOLDER, NORWICH; BAYLISS, 2005; SKARBREVIK, 2005).

In this study, it was observed that, in general, there was no association among factors and answers. However, there are two exceptions: the association between type of school and the answers 16 and 17, which has been previously exposed, and the association between time
of experience and answers 13 and 14 (p = 0.028 and 0.018, respectively), emphasizing, in the latter case, that the least experienced teachers were more optimistic concerning the presence of students with disabilities in their classes. Statements 13 and 14 concerned the perception of teachers on how students with disabilities were socially accepted by their peers at school. This finding is consistent with other studies in the literature, reporting that younger and less experienced teachers tend to be more receptive regarding the idea of including children with disabilities in their physical education classes (RIZZO, 1985).

In a survey about the professional preparation of physical education teachers in the years 1980 and 1988, Melograno and Loovis (1991) observed a certain lack of preparation in relation to students with disabilities. More than half of the surveyed teachers (51%), on two occasions, emphasized that they did not receive any support or encouragement from the direction of the school so they could work with students under these conditions. In both situations, the majority of physical education teachers (75%) believed that students with disabilities were excluded from the education process because of the "nature of their disability" and their "functional capacity".

After ascertaining the viability of the inclusion movement in physical education, LaMaster, Gall, Kinchin and Siedentop (1998) interviewed six teachers from the regular educational network that had in their rooms students with some kind of disability. The results indicated that the teaching styles and the ways to promote the inclusion of students varied considerably, but all professionals stated that they felt some degree of frustration and guilt for not being able to achieve a better job with children with disabilities. Such negative feelings were attributed to the little support received from the school direction and lack of specific knowledge on disabilities. The teachers said they had a poor professional preparation in this respect and were not encouraged to take specialization courses. According to the authors, the feelings of guilt and frustration certainly came to light only because they are competent professionals who love their profession, as many could simply exempt students with disabilities from physical education practice.

Also seeking to investigate the attitudes of physical education teachers regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classes, Palla and Castro (2004) applied a scale to 46 teachers and 91 students of physical education. They found that a major obstacle to the inclusion is the lack of practical experience of teachers and students concerning students with disabilities. Overall, it could be seen in this study that even if the teachers show positive attitudes towards the inclusion, they believed it was required continuing education,
greater number of hours in teaching and training during college on the subject of adapted physical education and partnerships among public and private sectors to generate funds.

3.2 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SEX AND TIME OF EXPERIENCE

In this study, although it is possible to verify that there are differences in the distribution of answers, it is difficult to indicate the direction and measure the size of these differences. So, they chose by the use of ordinal structure of the answers and the use of a strategy to analyze the scales, giving points for each answer and analyzing the average of these points. The answers were coded as follows:

- 1 – I totally disagree with the statement - 2 points
- 2 – I disagree almost entirely with the statement - 1 point
- Not applicable - 0 points
- 3 – I almost completely agree with the statement + 1 points
- 4 – I fully agree with the statement + 2 points

To facilitate the understanding of the results, it was agreed that positive values suggest preparation, interest and optimism about the inclusion of children with disabilities in regular physical education classes. For this, the answers to statements 10 and 14 were reversed. Tables 2 and 3 show, respectively, the average scores of answers to the statements, according to the gender of teachers and time of experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be observed that, in general, the tendency is slightly negative, indicating a degree of pessimism and disbelief by the part of teachers. This pessimism is independent on the gender of teachers, but shows little variation when considering their time of experience. In a wide way, teachers with less time of experience in school show some positive tendency when compared to other teachers, more experienced. Regardless of association with gender or time of experience of teachers, statements 15 through 18 were those in which the teachers were most pessimistic. However, in statements 6 and 12, teachers showed a strong tendency for optimism.

**TABLE 3** – Coded answers by time of experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Less than 2 years</th>
<th>02-10 years</th>
<th>Over 10 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 14</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 15</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 18</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, it appears that most relevant data collected with the scale were related to three aspects: 1) the perception of teachers about the lack of preparation in schools, 2) their desire to participate in courses to learn how to better deal with students with disabilities, and 3) the benefits that inclusion brings to students without disabilities.

Once again, it is emphasized that the effective implementation of the concept of everybody having access to the school seems to be seriously threatened by lack of preparation from both, schools and teachers. As seen above, the physical education course in college often fails to prepare future professionals to the inclusion possibility (CRUZ, FERREIRA, 2005). In curricula of older physical education teachers, there probably wasn't even a discipline for this purpose, as this is a most recent area (Pedrinelli; VERENGUER, 2005). Thus, especially for teachers with more training time, the idea of including students with disabilities in their classes seems to be a proposal doomed to failure and disruption. Modifying this concept goes beyond any courses or lectures. Changing attitudes certainly goes through continuous preparation, support services and support partnerships with teachers of special schools, who now have more experience in working with children with disabilities separately.

Shall we not forget about schools either. A negative perspective that most teachers show about their schools shows they need to modify their structures so deep in order to become accessible to all students. This amendment goes far beyond the architectural issue. It certainly passes by the need for multidisciplinary support for the acquisition of appropriate materials and by encouraging the continuous training of professionals who work in it.

4 CONCLUSION

Regarding the attitude of physical education teachers of regular schools before the inclusion of students with disabilities in their classes, it is concluded that the general tendency of surveyed teachers was negative. This pessimism is independent of gender or of time of experience of teachers. The strongest pessimism of the teachers was related to the fact that they don't feel prepared to deal with students who have disabilities. Teachers with less time of experience were more optimistic concerning the benefits of all students in the inclusion movement. As for the evaluation of schools, public school teachers believe that they will have major problems, especially for the lack of suitable materials and multidisciplinary support.

Thus, we find that there are still many barriers to be overcome regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities in Brazilian schools. It is also clear that the idea of the simple
enactment of laws does not guarantee access of everybody to school. It is essential in this process that teachers are adequately prepared and informed about the opportunities of students with disabilities and that they receive all the support from the school and from the government in this matter. Otherwise, the inclusion will be only an idea much viable on paper, but with no real implementation.

Teachers’ Perceptions Regarding the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Physical Education Classes

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to verify regular schooling teacher’s attitudes toward inclusion children with disabilities in the classes. For that, 90 physical education teachers, from private and public schools, answered to a scale with 18 affirmations. It was observed by results that general tendency of teachers was negative toward inclusion. This pessimism wasn’t related to teachers sex and time experience. Stronger teachers pessimism was about their lack of preparing to work with handicapped students. Teachers with less experience time showed more optimism about the benefits of all students in inclusion settings.

Keywords: Social inequity. Special, education. Disabled children. Prejudice.

Percepciones De Profesores Delante De La Inclusión De Alumnos Con Deficiencia En Lecciones De Educación Física

RESUMEN: El objetivo de este estudio fue analizar las percepciones de profesores de educación física del sistema regular de enseñanza delante de la inclusión de alumnos con deficiencia. Para tanto, 90 profesores de educación física escolar respondieron a una escala con 18 afirmaciones. Se puede observar que la percepción general de los profesores fue negativa para con la inclusión. El pesimismo más fuerte de los profesores fue por no sentirse preparados para lidar con alumnos con deficiencias. Los profesores con pequeño tiempo de experiencia mostraron visiones más positivas en el que se refiere a los beneficios de los alumnos con la inclusión.
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**ANNEX 1 - Scales applied to physical education teachers**

Dear professor:

This questionnaire aims to assess what the expectations and experiences of the physical education teacher in relation to the presence of students with disabilities in their regular classes are. You do not need to identify yourself; mark only one alternative in each statement, corresponding to what best expresses your level of agreement. I appreciate your cooperation.

The scale used is the following:

0 - Not applicable
1 - I totally disagree with the assertion
2 - I disagree almost entirely with the statement
3 - I agree almost completely with the statement
4 - I fully agree with the statement
Please complete the following fields:

I - PERSONAL DATA
a) Age:

b) Gender: ( ) Female ( ) Male

II - PROFESSIONAL DATA
a) Type of school: ( ) Public ( ) private
b) time of experience in school physical education:
   ( ) Less than two years ( ) 2 to 10 years ( ) more than 10 years

III - WORKING WITH STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
a) Further experiences with students with disabilities:
   ( ) Yes ( ) No

b) What are the types of disability presented by your students?
   ( ) Visual ( ) hearing ( ) mental ( ) motor
   ( ) Multiple (describe them) _______________

c) I participated in courses in physical education adapted for people with disabilities?
   ( ) Yes ( ) No

1- I feel I have sufficient knowledge to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities.

   □ 0  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4

2- With the knowledge I have, I feel prepared to work with students with disabilities.

   □ 0  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4

3- I feel that I am or will be able to solve problems or control the behavior of students with disabilities.

   □ 0  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4

4- I feel that I am or will be able to remedy the deficits of the student with learning disabilities.

   □ 0  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4

5- I like or would like to have students with disabilities in my class.

   □ 0  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4

6- I want to participate in courses and seminars to increase my knowledge about the teaching methods for students with disabilities.
7- I rate or evaluate my students with disabilities with the same procedures used for students without disabilities.

8- I feel that I am or will be able to fulfill the instruction program offered even with the presence of students with disabilities.

9- I feel I can or will be able to motivate the student with disabilities the same way as those without disabilities.

10- I feel that the treatment of students with disabilities in my classroom is different.

11- I feel that students with disabilities will benefit from the interaction offered by a program in a regular class.

12- I feel that students without disabilities will benefit from the inclusion of peers with disabilities in regular classes.

13- I feel that students with disabilities are socially accepted by their peers without disabilities.

14- I feel that students with disabilities are humiliated by their peers without disabilities in regular classroom.

15- I feel that there are sufficient instructional materials for me to teach students with disabilities.

16- I feel all support services offered by the school are sufficient for me to teach students with disabilities (physician, psychologist, speech therapist, assistants).
17- I feel I have sufficient resources at school to acquire materials needed to plan classes and work with students with disabilities.

☐ 0    ☐ 1    ☐ 2    ☐ 3    ☐ 4

18- The facilities of the school in which I work are adapted to receive a student with disabilities.

☐ 0    ☐ 1    ☐ 2    ☐ 3    ☐ 4