



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

CODEN: IJRSFP (USA)

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 9, Issue, 7(D), pp. 27939-27945, July, 2018

**International Journal of
Recent Scientific
Research**

DOI: 10.24327/IJRSR

Research Article

ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS TOWARDS THE EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF ATYPICAL DEVELOPMENT CHILDREN IN ORDINARY PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN SERBIA

Ruzica Petrovic and Vesna Trifunovic

Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Serbia

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0907.2362>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 15th April, 2018
Received in revised form 7th
May, 2018
Accepted 13th June, 2018
Published online 28th July, 2018

Key Words:

Education; social acceptance and integration; atypical development of children; grade teachers and teachers; primary schools in Serbia

ABSTRACT

The subject of this paper is to research the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers towards the practice and effects of educating and social acceptance children with atypical development patterns (AD) in primary schools in Serbia. The aim of the research is to examine the capacities of formal elementary education to (a) stimulate the cognitive development of atypically developing children based on individual programs adapted to their capacities; (b) encourage their inclusion in the social environment. The authors emphasize the role of grade teachers and teachers in creating a climate that will allow for the social integration of children with atypical development patterns as equal members of a class. Such engagement goes beyond the binding and formal requirements of educational practice and triggers humanity as a fundamental human moral property. The data were analysed by using descriptive and inferential statistics. A total of 120 grade teachers and teachers in primary schools in Serbia were interviewed, who teach according to individual programs suitable for AD children abilities. The basic assumption that grade teachers and teachers in primary schools in Serbia are not well prepared for quality implementation of the individualized education program (IEP) for AD children. The research findings have shown that 1) the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers in primary schools about the possibilities of education and social acceptance of AD children in primary schools do not differ; 2) grade teachers and teachers in primary schools do not differ in assessing the relationships between school children of atypical and typical development.

Copyright © Ruzica Petrovic and Vesna Trifunovic, 2018, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child signed in 1994 marks the dawn of an elevated degree of care towards children with disabilities and low socioeconomic and cultural status aimed at reducing discrimination and social inequality. In Serbia, the idea of equal rights of children to education got its academic form and legal foundation in 2009, by adopting the *Law on the Foundations of the Education System*. The adoption of this law was preceded by an intensive fulfillment of the request for assistance to children who remained outside the system of education and upbringing due to extreme poverty caused by being members of marginal groups. Since 2000, we have been facing strengthened social and institutional responsibility for the socially vulnerable children who needed to be provided with realistic conditions for the exercising of the right to education through the improvement of material living conditions and support provided by professional teams. Children belonging to that category of discriminated needed to be provided with

conditions for integration which also involved dealing with prejudices and finding ways to overcome them. The process of integration did not imply the elimination of socioeconomic differences but their mitigation to the extent that enabled a minimum of socially adaptive functioning.

Intensification of the education quality issue has opened up a new alternative to education even for atypical development children with a disorder in cognitive, intellectual, perceptual and attention functions, with physical disabilities (invalidity), with sensory function impairments (impaired vision, hearing, and balance) and behavior disorders. This education model found its legal basis in the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the international document of the United Nations, adopted in 1989, granting to children with developmental disabilities the same rights as to other children, the right to non-discrimination (Article 2), the right to live in their families (Article 9), the right to education (Articles 28 and 29), and so on.

*Corresponding author: **Ruzica Petrovic**
Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Serbia

After the United Nations General Assembly Special Session held in New York in 2002, at which the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child was ratified and the document entitled "A world fit for children" was adopted, the *Children's Rights Council* of the Government of the *Republic of Serbia* drafted the "*National Plan of Action for Children*" in February 2004. This strategic document identified the basic problems in exercising, protecting and promoting the rights of children with developmental disabilities in Serbia and adopted the educational model "Child-friendly school". It has initiated the operationalization of specific reform tasks: school preparation, creation of independent individualized programs, harmonization of study programs and curricula in the education of teachers and with new professional needs, professional education of personnel, preparation of the general public, combating prejudices about atypical development children (Polat, 2011), with the aim of creating a friendly environment in which every child can be granted education regardless of the type of developmental disability (Avramidis *et al.*, 2000).

Results of previous practice

Unfortunately, the incorporation of the new education model into the system of full-time education in Serbia was not preceded by a thorough and systematic institutional and professional preparation. It turned out that both schools and teachers entered this process quite unpreparedly, which resulted in a number of weaknesses and shortcomings in previous practice. Facing of the teachers with new pedagogical tasks for which the existing teaching contents and practice had not qualified them caused a need for reforming the study programs and adapting them to new requirements. Thus, through new accredited programs at Faculties of Education and Pedagogy, new study content was introduced that enabled research and study of even those areas of science that more closely introduced into the theory and practice of future teachers work with children with disabilities. Consequently, in the absence of a study program that educates "special teachers", the innovation of the existing ones has made it possible, though to a certain extent, to improve their quality in the part related to the specific education of atypical development children (Petrović, 2017).

The most important reformist part in the implementation of the project of the individual approach in atypical development children education was borne by teachers. They were expected to successfully carry out the tasks that are initial for working with typical development children such as using adequate teaching methods for knowledge reception, identifying the best affinities of children, creating a social environment that will stimulate cognitive and emotional development, fostering an interactive relationship that will promote tolerance, compassion and care for others (Maldonado-Carreño & Votruba-Drzal, 2011) and at the same time to take on all the delicacy of working with atypical development children from careful designing of individualized programs, continuous cooperation with parents and professional associates, recognition and encouragement of the development of preserved potentials to the creation of conditions for social interaction in which children will be accepted. Fulfillment of these tasks required great professional accountability and commitment as well as institutional and professional support (Rubie-Davies, 2007;

Vujačić, 2011; Sharma, & Desai, 2002, Macura-Milovanović, 2014). The complexity of this role made many teachers worry about and doubt that they could meet the educational standards for typical development children and at the same time respond to the implementation requirements for an individualized program specially designed for every atypical development child in a quality manner (Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. 1989; MacFarlane & Woolfson, 2013).

From the previous practice of the individualized education program implementation, we can differentiate three teachers' attitudes: positive, negative, and neutral. The research results show that those grade teachers and teachers with a good practice that includes working with one child in the classroom, a group with less than 20 children, constant support and organized assistance from special educators and teachers (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Booth, 2000) express positive attitudes. Their positive attitude is based on the belief that work with atypical development children affects the improvement in the quality level of their pedagogical and social competences as it stimulate them to find and apply new methods of work and learning styles in accordance with the needs of children (Kamens *et al.* 2003), trigger humanity in typical developmental children and improve their attitudes towards atypical development students through sympathy and care for their needs (Daniels & Stafford, 2002; Johnson & Johnson, 2000) as well as to adopt incentive measures for all children in the classroom (Janney & Snell, 2000).

However, the studies showing positive attitudes are outnumbered by the studies revealing negative or neutral attitudes of grade teachers and teachers. In scientific references, this is linked to radical changes caused by a rapid introduction of inclusive education without previous fundamental preparations (Gaad, 2001; Jordan, Schwartz & McGhie-Richmond, 2009; Boer, Wiborg, 2009; Pijl, & Minnaert, 2011, Thaver, Lim, & Liau, 2014).). On the institutional level, this led to a lack of adequate adaptation of spatial and technical conditions, specialized teaching resources, aids and didactic equipment; on the professional level, this conditioned insufficient educational training and practical experience of grade teachers and teachers; and on the self-reflective level, this generated their mistrust in own skills and competencies and care for the quality of work and achievements of both children with disabilities and children without disabilities, given the time and attention they could devote to them in such conditions (Ćuk, 2006). Studies have shown that one of the reasons that decisively influence attitudes is the kind of development disorder a child has. Grade teachers and teachers share a belief that involvement of atypical developmental children into the system of full-time education should be selective, that is, children with severe intellectual or behavioral disorders should be educated in special classes and participate in some joint activities together with children from ordinary classes (Đević, 2009). The paper also examines other reasons that influence teachers' opting for this model of teaching organization, as well as the reasons for the model of full inclusion in ordinary classes with children without developmental disorders.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The subject of this paper is to examine the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers about the practice and effects of educating atypical development (AD) children in primary schools in Serbia. The objective of the research is to examine the possibilities of formal primary education, first and foremost the opportunities of grade teachers and teachers in primary schools to (a) foster the cognitive development of atypical development children based on individualized programs adapted to their intellectual, physical, and sensory capacities, (b) encourage their inclusion in the social environment (class, school).

In accordance with the subject and objective of the paper, the following *tasks* have been set:

1. to determine whether primary schools own a normative framework, human, material and technical resources for the implementation of the individualized education program (IEP) for atypical development (AD) children.
2. to determine the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers in primary schools about the cognitive and social achievements of atypical development children in the so-called special schools and special classes in the so-called ordinary schools;
3. to determine whether grade teachers and teachers in primary schools are adequately prepared to work with atypical development children;
4. to examine the opinion of grade teachers and teachers in primary schools about the relationship of typical development children with their peers with atypical development patterns.

The following hypotheses have been suggested

The basic hypothesis - This paper starts from the basic assumption that grade teachers and teachers in primary schools in Serbia are not adequately prepared and sufficiently competent for the quality implementation of the individualized education program (IEP) in working with atypical development (AD) children; therefore the effects of this program in the domain of cognitive and social achievements of AD children are lower than expected.

Specific hypotheses

1. In Serbia, there is a so-called umbrella normative framework that systematically regulates the action of primary schools in the domain of the implementation of the individualized education program (IEP) for atypical development (AD) children. However, they are faced with a lack of sufficient material and technical means for its support and adequately prepared staff - program holders.
2. It is assumed that the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers in primary schools about the cognitive and social achievements of atypical development children in the so-called special schools and special classes in the so-called ordinary schools differ from one another.
3. It is assumed that grade teachers are more prepared i.e. more competent to work with atypical development children than teachers in primary schools - they have a better foundational preparation for work with AD children.
4. It is assumed that grade teachers and teachers in primary schools differently assess the quality of the relationship

between typical development children and their peers with atypical development pattern.

The data were analysed by using descriptive and inferential statistics. For the purposes of this research, an instrument was prepared – a questionnaire for grade teachers and teachers in primary schools. The research was carried out in November 2017 on the territory of the Republic of Serbia. The sample consists of 115 grade teachers and teachers in primary schools. The sample structure was chosen with regard to working with students by age (the first question that can be considered as an independent variable): 40 grade teachers (34.7% of the respondents) teach children of younger school age from the 1st to the 4th grade of primary school; 75 teachers (65.2% of the respondents) teach children of older school age of from 5th to 8th grade. The χ^2 test was used for statistical conclusions. The degree of connection of individual variables was determined by the contingency coefficient (C).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of domestic norms regulating the field of education in the Republic of Serbia shows that there is the so-called umbrella normative framework that systematically regulates the action of primary schools in the domain of the implementation of the individualized education program (IEP) for atypical development (AD) children. These are the Document of the Serbian Government - National Plan of Action for Children (2004) and the Law on the Foundations of the Education System (2009, 2013). The documents are at the same time harmonized with the international conventions and documents that consider and standardize the rights of the child in the sphere of institutionalized education (UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child, 1994; UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989; UN Document - A world fit for children, 2002).

The research results also show that the teachers involved in the study believe that schools do not have sufficient material and technical means to support IEP and that the holders of this program are not adequately prepared to work with atypical development children (Table 1).

Table 1 Technical and professional working conditions for the implementation of the Individualized education program

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Yes, I fully agree, the school has provided both technical and professional conditions	22	19.0
	I partly agree, there is professional training (seminars) but also a lack of material and technical means for the IEP implementation	66	56.9
	I do not agree, there is a lack of both professional training and technical resources	24	20.7
	Total	112	96.6
Missing	System	4	3.4
Total		116	100.0

The data presented in Table 1 show that the lowest percentage of teachers, 19.0 % of them, think that schools *fully* provided technical and professional working conditions for the implementation of the Individualized Education Program; slightly higher percentage, 20.7%, points out that the stated conditions are not met; most teachers, 56.9% think that professional training is organized in schools, but they lack material and technical means for the IEP implementation.

The collected data show that the first specific hypothesis: *in primary schools, there is a normative framework, human, material and technical resources for the implementation of the individualized educational program (IEP) for atypical development (AD) children*, is partially confirmed.

Table 2 shows the answers of primary school teachers to the question: Which children do you implement the Individualized education program with? The respondents had a multiple choice option - to choose more than one offered answer category, which suggests that teachers work with students who belong to different categories of children with atypical development patterns, at least when it comes to their developmental disabilities. For this reason, the sum of these categories exceeds 100%.

Table 2 Individualized education program

I use the individualized program with children who have:	Frequency	Percent
<i>cognitive developmental disabilities</i>	96	82.8
<i>hearing impairment</i>	13	11.2
<i>physical disabilities</i>	11	9.5
<i>visual impairment</i>	9	7.8
<i>behavior disorders</i>	64	55.2

The data show that the largest percentage of teachers meet school children with *cognitive developmental disabilities* in their daily professional engagement, as much as 82.2% of teachers; they are followed by teachers who need to adapt the IEP to children with *behavior disorders*, 55.2% of teachers; 11.2% of primary school teachers use IEP with children with *hearing impairment*; 9.5% of primary school teachers use IEP to work with children with *physical disabilities*, and 7.8% of teachers use it to work with children with *visual impairment*.

primary school on several levels - (a) the number and type of general education subjects; (b) the number and type of vocational subjects; (c) the number of methodologies; (d) professional practice - the researchers started from the assumption that the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers in primary schools about the ways of educating atypical development children differ from one another.

Table 3 shows the attitudes of the respondents (grade teachers and teachers) about the possibility for AD children to be educated in special schools where the entire educational process would be adapted to their specific needs.

The obtained data show that 45.0% of grade teachers working in 1-4 grades and 43.2% of teachers working in 5 - 8 grades of primary school *fully agree* with the view that AD children would have better cognitive and social achievements in the so-called special schools than in the current education model.

On the other hand, 52.5% of grade teachers working in 1-4 grades and 51.4% of teachers working in 5 - 8 grade of primary school *partly agree* with the view that AD children would have better cognitive and social achievements in the so-called special schools and consider that the plan of their integration into a wider social community would face difficulties.

Calculated χ^2 (Chi-Square Test) = .525 at the significance level $p = .769$ ($df = 2$) is not statistically significant and shows that grade teachers working with children of the younger school age (from 1st to 4th grade) and teachers in primary schools working with children of the older school age (from 5th to 8th grade) do not differ in their acceptance of the possibility to educate AD children in the so-called special schools and the effects of such education.

Table 3 Education of AD children in the so-called special schools

		It would be better if AD children were educated in special schools			Total
		I fully agree, I think that they would have better cognitive and social achievements in these schools.	I partly agree, I think that in these schools they would have better cognitive achievements but lack the opportunity to be socially integrated into a wider community	I do not know	
1-4 grade	Count	18	21	1	40
	%	45.0%	52.5%	2.5%	100.0%
5-8 grade	Count	32	38	4	74
	%	43.2%	51.4%	5.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	50	59	5	114
	%	43.9%	51.8%	4.4%	100.0%

Table 4 Same school - different classes

		Better overall results would be achieved if AD children were educated in special classes in ordinary schools, with the possibility of participating in individual teaching and extracurricular activities together with children from ordinary classes			Total
		I fully agree, that would be the best model for AD children and children with the so-called typical development	I partly agree, because AD children would not be able to participate in a large number of activities (teaching and extracurricular) due to their specialties	I do not know	
1-4 grade	Count	27	11	2	40
	%	67.5%	27.5%	5.0%	100.0%
5-8 grade	Count	47	20	8	75
	%	62.7%	26.7%	10.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	74	31	10	115
	%	64.3%	27.0%	8.7%	100.0%

Considering that the preparation of grade teachers to work with children of younger school age from 1st to 4th grade of primary school differs from the preparation of teachers for working with children of the older school age from 5th to 8th grade of

Respondents' answers to the question whether better overall results would be achieved if AD children were educated in special classes in ordinary schools, with the possibility of participating in individual teaching and extracurricular

activities together with children from ordinary classes, are given are in Table 4.

Most respondents consider that the education model for AD children in special classes in ordinary schools that would include both joint extracurricular and some teaching activities with children from ordinary classes would be the best model of their education.

As much as 67.5% of grade teachers working with children of the younger school age from 1st to 4th grade and 62.7% of teachers working with children of the older school age from the 5th to 8th grade of primary school *fully agree* with the stated attitude.

A group of 27.0% of the respondents partially agrees with the stated attitude as they consider that children with atypical development could not be able to participate in a large number of activities (both teaching and extracurricular); 8.7 % of respondents said that they *did not know* if a better overall result would be achieved if AD children were educated in special classes in the so-called ordinary schools.

Calculated χ^2 (Chi-Square Test) = 1.065 at the significance level $p = .587$ ($df = 2$) is not statistically significant and shows that grade teachers and teachers in primary schools working on different levels of educations (from 1st to 4th grade and from 5th to 8th grade, respectively) do not differ in assessing the achievement of AD children if they are to be educated in special classes in the so-called ordinary primary schools.

The obtained data show that the second specific hypothesis: the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers of primary schools about the cognitive and social achievements of atypical development children in the so-called special schools and special classes in the so-called ordinary schools differ from one another is not confirmed.

Grade teachers working with children of the younger school age (1st - 4th grade) and primary school teachers working with children of the older school age (5th - 8th grade) undergo through different preparation for active participation in the educational process - their basic education differs. By reviewing the accredited study programs of faculties for the education of grade teachers and teachers for individual subjects, the impression is gained that grade teachers are offered more knowledge in the group of pedagogical-psychological-methodological subjects than teachers.

Basic education, therefore, provides grade teachers with an opportunity to more comprehensively view the development of a school child, its overall cognitive progress, integration into a class collective, unlike teachers who are mainly directed to monitoring achievements within a single subject.

It was expected that respondents had different attitudes about their own preparedness to work with AD children. Their answers to the question whether they acquired appropriate competencies for working with AD children within their academic education and professional development are given in Table 5.

The obtained data show that very few respondents consider themselves fully prepared to work with atypical development children. *I am fully trained, I have all the necessary knowledge and skills*, is considered by only 7.5% of grade teachers who work from 1st to 4th grade and 4.1% of teachers work from 5th to 8th grade.

The most numerous group of respondents, 60.5%, points out that *has certain knowledge and skills for working with AD children, but does not feel fully prepared to work with them*.

Table 5 Education for working with atypical development children

		I am specially educated and professionally trained to work with AD children			
		I am fully trained, I have all the necessary knowledge and skills	I partly agree, I have certain knowledge and skills but I do not feel fully prepared to work with AD children	I do not agree, I am not enough educated and professionally trained, but I manage by educating myself informally for working with AD children	Total
1-4 grade	Count	3	25	12	40
	%	7.5%	62.5%	30.0%	100.0%
5-8 grade	Count	3	44	27	74
	%	4.1%	59.5%	36.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	6	69	39	114
	%	5.3%	60.5%	34.2%	100.0%

Table 6 Relationships between school children

		What are the attitudes of TD children towards AD children?			
		They have a negative attitude (they consider them inferior, judge them, ignore them, avoid communication with them)	They are indifferent (they do not have a preconceived attitude, they do not have prejudices, this is an unfamiliar experience for them)	They have an open approach (accept diversity, are willing to accept them)	Total
1-4 grade	Count	5	20	13	38
	%	13.2%	52.6%	34.2%	100.0%
5-8 grade	Count	15	28	29	72
	%	20.8%	38.9%	40.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	20	48	42	110
	%	18.2%	43.6%	38.2%	100.0%

The third group of respondents, 34.2% of them, thinks that they are *not educated and trained enough, but, points out that they educate themselves informally to work with AD children.*

Calculated χ^2 (Chi-Square Test) = .945 at the significance level $p = .624$ ($df = 2$) is not statistically significant and shows that grade teachers working from 1st to 4th grade and teachers working from 5th to 8th grade in primary schools do not differ in assessing own preparedness for work with atypical development children

The obtained data show third specific hypothesis: *grade teachers believe they are more prepared, i.e. more competent to work with atypical development children than teachers in primary schools*, is not confirmed.

The respondents assessed the attitudes of children of the so-called typical development towards children of atypical development. The answers obtained are shown in Table 6.

A little over 13 percent of grade teachers working in 1st to 4th grade of primary schools (13.2%) believe that typical development children come to school with a formed *negative attitude towards atypical development children (they consider them inferior, judge them, ignore them, avoid communication with them)*. The highest percentage of grade teachers (52.6%) believe that typical development children are *indifferent* to their atypical development peers - *indifferent, have no preconceived attitude, do not have prejudices, it is an unknown experience for them*. A group of 34.2% of grade teachers assessed that the so-called typical development children have *an open approach towards atypical development children, accept diversity, are tolerant, and willing to accept them*.

More than 20 percent of teachers working in 5 - 8 grades in primary schools (20.8 %) believe that typical development children come to school with a formed *negative attitude towards atypical development children (they consider them inferior, judge them, ignore them, avoid communication with them)*. A group of 38.9% of teachers believes that children of the so-called typical development are *indifferent* to peers with atypical development patterns and 40.3% of the respondents think that typical developments children are more open, accept diversity, are tolerant and ready to accept atypical development children.

Calculated χ^2 (Chi-Square Test) = 2.122 at the significance level $p = .3466$ ($df = 2$) is not statistically significant and shows that grade teachers working from 1st to 4th grade and teachers working from 5th to 8th grade in primary schools do not differ in assessing relationships of typical and atypical development children.

The obtained data show that the fourth specific hypothesis: *grade teachers and teachers in primary schools differ in their assessment attitudes of typical development children towards their peers of atypical development*, is not confirmed.

The respondents assessed whether there had been positive changes in the attitudes and behavior of typical and atypical development children during many years of joint participation in education. The respondents had the multiple choice option - to choose more than one offered response category, which means that they recognize changes in different aspects among

students. For this reason, the sum of these categories exceeds 100%.

The respondents have assessed that the following changes occurred: (a) children of atypical development are now better accepted by their peers than before (59.5%); (b) mutual communication is better, more frequent (39.7); (c) there has been an improvement of cooperation within the mandatory school activities (20.7); (d) typical development children and atypical development children with are socializing after school (9.5).

CONCLUSION

The conducted study on the attitudes of grade teachers and teachers towards the education of atypical development children in ordinary primary schools in Serbia is the revelation of a segment of the multidimensional and complex problem of work with atypical development children in the school context. Accepted legal solutions at the state level provide an institutional framework for the inclusion of AD children into the educational process at various levels in the so-called ordinary schools attended by children reaching the given degree of education. There is a legal obligation and institutional support for primary schools (grade teachers and teachers) to prepare Individualized educational programs that would correspond to the developmental abilities and needs of AD children. However, in addition to positive legal solutions, it is necessary to provide material and technical conditions for the education of AD children (numerous specific aids that enable ordinary attendance and following of classes) and human resources, i.e. educated staff that will adequately lead the educational process and provide the opportunity for AD children to develop their capabilities. The preparation of grade teachers and teachers to work with AD children is one of the burning issues of educational practice as accredited study programs at faculties of education and pedagogy do not provide a sufficient extent of basic education for the challenges this work brings. In addition, the existing organization of school work i.e. the so-called grade-class system, a large number of children in classes, and increasingly complex administrative requirements that are placed before teachers practically do not leave enough time and space for them to implement a comprehensive curriculum.

Since 2000, institutional solutions in the field of atypical development children education in Serbia have followed the concepts of the so-called European Education Area, the basis of which is the need to establish a certain system of standards. The real effects of the adopted novelties were not reflected on more deeply – hence the easy rejection of the opportunities for professionals working with atypical development children (defectologists, speech therapists, and many others) to retain an important role in their education. That is the reason why a huge burden and responsibility for the individual development of AD children has been transferred to grade teachers and teachers who need to acquire knowledge and different skills necessary for the implementation of the AD children education process ‘on the move’.

Interestingly, the conducted research did not reveal statistically significant differences between grade teachers and teachers in assessing their own competencies for work with AD children,

or in assessing the relationship between school children of the so-called typical and atypical developmental and assessing the effects of different AD children education models. Presented calculated values of the chi-square test show that there is no statistically significant difference in the attitudes of the respondents considering whether they teach in younger or older grades of primary school - between grade teachers who work with children of the younger school age from 1st to 4th grade and teachers who work with the older school age in 5th to 8th grade of primary school. In other words, the zero hypothesis is confirmed as it, as an assumption, always assumes that the difference is equal to zero (that is, there is no difference). In order for the difference to be statistically significant, this value of the significance level must be less than 0.05 ($n < 0.05$), which was not the case in any hypothesis in the performed research. The obtained data indicate the final conclusion that the basic preparation of grade teachers and teachers cannot account for their attitudes towards the education and social acceptance of atypical development children in ordinary primary schools.

Literature

- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000), A survey of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority. *Educational Psychology*, 20, 191-195
- Avramidis, E., Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes toward integration-inclusion, a review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17 (2), 129-147
- Boer, A., de Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: a review of literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(3), 331-353.
- Booth, T. (2000). Progress in inclusive education. *Meeting Special and Diverse Educational Needs: Making Inclusive Education a Reality*, Helsinki
- Ćuk, M. (2006). *The need of teaching and professional staff for empowering in working with children with disabilities*. Novi Sad: Our School
- Gaad, E. N. (2001). Educating children with Down's syndrome in the United Arab Emirates. *British Journal of Special Education*, 28 (4), 196-203.
- Daniels, E. & Stafford, K. (2002). Creating inclusive classroom. Washington: *Children's Resources International*
- Document of the Government of the Republic of Serbia - National Plan of Action for Children* (2004)
- Djević, R. (2009). Preparedness of primary school teachers to accept students with developmental disabilities. *Proceedings of Institute for Educational Research*, 41, 370-380.
- Jordan, A., Schwartz, E. and McGhie-Richmond, D. (2009). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 25, No 4: 535-42.
- Janney R. & Snell, M. (2000): *Modifying Schoolwork*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (2000): Making classrooms more cooperative, *Education and human development*, Vol. 20, No.1, 117-132.
- Kamens, M.W. (2003). Inclusive classrooms: what practicing teachers want to know. *Action Teach Education*, Vol. 25, No. 2 1, 20-26.
- Law on the Foundations of the Education System* (2009)
- Law on the Foundations of the Education System* (2013)
- Maldonado-Carreño, C., & Votruba-Drzal, E. (2011). Teacher-child relationships and the development of academic and behavioral skills during elementary school: A within-and-between-child analysis. *Child Development*, 82 (2), 601-616
- MacFarlane, K., & Woolfson, L. M. (2013). Teacher attitudes and behavior toward the inclusion of children with social, emotional and behavioral difficulties in mainstream schools: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Teaching and teacher education*, 29, 46-52.
- Peček, M., Macura-Milovanović, S. (2014). Do admission criteria for teacher education institutions matter? A comparative study on beliefs of student teachers from Serbia and Slovenia about inclusive practices. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice* 21 (3), 260-276
- Petrović, R. (2017). *Contributions to the philosophy of education*, Jagodina, Faculty of Pedagogical Sciences, University of Kragujevac
- Polat, F. (2011). Inclusion in education: A step towards social justice. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31 (1), 51-58
- Rubie-Davies, C.M. (2007). Classroom interactions: Exploring the practices of high- and low-expectation teachers, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, No.77, 290-306.
- Sharma, U., & Desai, I. (2002). Measuring concerns about integrated education in India. *Asia and Pacific Journal on Disability*, 5(1), 2-14.
- Stainback, W. & S. Stainback (Eds.) (1989). *Support Networks for Inclusive Schooling*. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing
- Thaver, T., Lim, L., & Liau, A. (2014). Teacher variables as predictors of Singaporean pre-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education. *European Journal of Research on Social Studies*, 1(1), 1-8
- United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child* (1994)
- United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* (1989)
- UN document - A world fit for children* (2002)
- Vujačić, M. (2011). *Teachers' roles in inclusive education*. *Pedagogy*, 66 (3), 386-393.
- Wiborg, S. (2009) *Education and Social Integration: Comprehensive Schooling in Europe (Secondary Education in a Changing World)* Published by Palgrave Macmillan

How to cite this article:

Ruzica Petrovic and Vesna Trifunovic. 2018, Attitudes of Teachers Towards The Education And Social Acceptance of Atypical Development Children In Ordinary Primary Schools In Serbia. *Int J Recent Sci Res.* 9(7), pp. 27939-27945.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0907.2362>