

Rethinking teacher training from an inclusive and community dialogical perspective

Elsa Gabriel Morgado¹»^D João Bartolomeu Rodrigues²^D Levi Leonido³^D



Portuguese Catholic University, CEFH, Centre for Philosophical and Humanistic Studies, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal. Email: emorgado@ucp.pt

^sSchool of Human and Social Sciences, University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Communication and Society Research Centre, Portugal. Email: jbarto@utad.pt

Portuguese Catholic University, CITAR, Porto, Portugal. School of Human and Social Sciences, University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Portugal. Email: levileon@utad.pt

Abstract

This quantitative survey using a structured questionnaire with closed questions and a sample of 340 participants from 20 courses (bachelor's and master's degrees) at public higher education institutions in the Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro region of the Portuguese university (University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro) and polytechnic (Polytechnic Institute of Bragança) subsystem aims to list a group of proposals for reflection and future implementation that can fill or mitigate gaps and weaknesses identified in the disciplines of the curricula related to internships. The analysis of the data reveals indicators indicating the need for a (formal and conceptual) rethinking of inclusive intervention in the context of supervision in the field of teacher training. These indicators include problems with operating in a multifaceted educational setting, enhancing an interdisciplinary, integrated and inclusive approach, rearranging curriculum and reconsidering the functional profiles and competencies of teaching staff. Therefore, the construction of a professional culture that favors an integrative and inclusive approach through the assumption of a broad profile of professional competence capable of training the teacher in a multidimensional educational context is crucial. We evaluate the necessity of encouraging research of this type involving additional factors, populations and samples in order to enable the extrapolation of data and findings to a national level providing significance and technological foundations for decisions made within the context of public education policy.

Keywords: Higher education, Inclusion, Internship, Pedagogical supervision, Teacher training, Legal framework.

Citation Morgado, E. G., Rodrigues, J. B., & Leonido, L. (2024). Rethinking teacher training from an inclusive and community dialogical perspective. Journal of Education and E-Learning Research, 11(1), 219-228. 10.20448/jeelr.v11i1.5430 History: Received: 2 November 2023 Revised: 12 January 2024 Accepted: 15 February 2024 Published: 27 February 2024 Licensed: This work is licensed under a <u>Creative Commons</u> <u>Attribution 4.0 License</u>	 Funding: This study received no specific financial support. Institutional Review Board Statement: The Ethical Committee of the Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal has granted approval for this study. Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing. Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests. Authors' Contributions: Conceptualization, methodology, data curation, resources, writing-original draft, investigation, writing-review and editing, L. All authors have
	validation, visualization, writing-review and editing, L.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.
Contonta	

Conte	ents

Contents	
1. Introduction	
2. Theoretical Framework	
3. Pedagogical Practice and Initial Teacher Training	
4. Methodology	
5. Results	
6. Discussion	
7. Conclusions	
8. Future Perspectives	
References	

Contribution of this paper to the literature

The study combines in an unprecedented way, a reflection and perspective on two different subsystems in terms of rules and legislation that have the same training courses on offer in the area of (initial and advanced) teacher training, in particular induction to professional practice in the various specializations.

1. Introduction

The need for this research comes from the necessity to consider teacher preparation in light of the frequent legislative modifications implemented by the ministry over the past ten years specifically concerning teacher qualifications through the Legal Framework for Professional Qualifications for Teaching in pre-school education and basic and secondary education (Ordinance No. 260-A/2014, 2014). The Legal Regime of Higher Education Institutions (RJIES) provides different dynamics, structures of operation and tasks to every higher education institution including university higher education and polytechnic higher education. As a result, there is a need to consider how teacher training is conducted in these different types of institutions (Law No. 62/2007, 2007).

2. Theoretical Framework

The transfer of diverse experiences based on mutual understanding and a convergence of knowledge, frequently resulting in learning, significantly promotes personal and social development. It is not astonishing to accept the perspective that diversity is what brings people together: differences, when understood and properly incorporated are like a shapeless group of stones that add to the harmony that comes from a wonderful temple structure. The temple metaphor does not disappoint us, it helps us infer that acceptance of diversity is a sine qua non condition to favour the development of every man.

Adopting the hypothesis is extremely important when evaluated in the context of educational practice because we want to be as plural and diverse as possible, just like the result in painting of the mixture of colors on a painter's palette. When someone has the guts to translate theory into reality and adopt a selfless and accountable attitude, they ultimately leave an enduring impression on the teaching-learning process as actors. People live in a time when attending an allegedly inclusive and integrative school is highly valued. The education of students with special needs is conducted in regular classes under the slogan of a school for all (Buckley & Quinlivan, 2023; Correia, 2013; Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberg, 2010; Morgado, 2015; Sassaki, 2010; Shouse & Strutchens, 2020; UNESCO, 2009, 2015; Völlinger & Supanc, 2020) aiming to secure a quality education. In most cases but especially when it comes to integration and inclusion, the teacher plays a crucial role because of the demands and difficulties that a student with particular traits may have (Morgado, Silva, & Rodrigues, 2018).

The teachers' role must never be ignored or devalued as they are specifically educators. Education is defined as the awakening and development of all the innate capabilities of human beings to realise a personal project of life or preferentially, the integral development of the human person. Teachers can and should be the lever for the success of their students, overcoming difficulties and countless barriers that are often difficult to subdue in the path of fulfilling their duties particularly social and educational ones (Morgado et al., 2018). The complete educational activities and the teaching-learning process performed by the teacher and the school and upheld by the community (Beckford & Lekule, 2022; Correia, 2013; Cosgrove, Jewell, & Payne, 2020; Furlan, Faria, Lozano, Bazon, & Gomes, 2020; Hammond & Ingalls, 2003; Konečná, Smolka, Trčková, Václavíková, & Žáček, 2023; Leatherman, 2009; Mantoan, 2015; Navarro-Varas & Núñez-Pomar, 2018; Wilkins & Nietfeld, 2004) will only be fruitful if they know the critical and human mass they confront and for whom they culminate working. Otherwise, they may have to intervene.

Vilela-Ribeiro, Benite, and Vilela (2013) affirm that the ideal of an alleged inclusive society "goes beyond the limits of the ideals of a democratic society and fundamentally consists of a society striving to accommodate the differences of all subjects". The provision of sufficient and genuinely inclusive programmes (2020) is advantageous for everyone involved as it facilitates "the cultivation of constructive attitudes, advancements in academic and social competencies, readiness for community life, compulsion for social engagement and enhancement of the teacher's technical abilities" (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010; Correia, 2013; De Silva & Wijesekara, 2021; Dingle, Faver, Givner, & Haager, 2004; Downing & Peckham-Harding, 2007; Florian, 2014; Furlan et al., 2020; Haug, 2017; Medina, López, & De Britto, 2022; Perlado Lamo de Espinosa, Muñoz Martínez, & Torrego Seijo, 2021; Sarraj & Alshehri, 2021; Stainback & Stainback, 1999; Völlinger & Supanc, 2020, Vilela-Ribeiro et al., 2013). This global perspective depending on "respect and protection for these individuals still requires considerable room for improvement where these issues are simply forgotten or hidden by communities, families and political power" (Morgado, 2015).

Internships specifically curricular internships can be reasoned as privileged spaces of articulation between the theoretical and practical domains (Alarcão & Tavares, 2013; Albuquerque, Silva, Resende, Gonçalves, & Gomes, 2015; Álvarez, 2013; Baeten & Simons, 2014; Caine & Estefan, 2017; Caires & Almeida, 2003; Calvo & Almarza, 2018; Dall'Alba & Sandberg, 2016; He, 2017; Hernández-Sánchez & Gutiérrez-Martínez, 2018; Iza & Souza Neto, 2015; Navarro-Varas & Núñez-Pomar, 2018; Pimenta & Lima, 2019; Schön, 1983; Zeichner, 2010), permitting future teachers to confront the work reality and the profession. Explicitly, it enables them to realise some of the knowledge acquired in their initial training (Caires & Almeida, 2003; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006; Cyrino & Souza Neto, 2015; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987; Gonçalves & Marques, 2016; Ollila & Onnismaa, 2014; Pérez-Montoro, Guerrero-Solé, & Mauri-Castelló, 2017; Pimenta & Lima, 2019).

The renowned lack of sensitivity and, on occasion, insufficient training for Special Educational Needs (SEN) in the classroom setting is taken into consideration by eminently diverse stakeholders within the school community. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine and understand the views of the groups that follow: Cooperating Teachers from the Higher Education Institutions (CTHEI), supervisors from Higher Education Institutions (SHEI) and Students Interns (SI) of two Portuguese public higher education institutions (Northeast Portugal). Therefore, the theoretical framework and introduction presented here are intended to substantiate the background and purposes of the research and to make clear the main object and the research questions raised in this research as mentioned in the summary, aims, overall, to fulfill the central objective and to assess by identifying a range of improvements and recommendations for future implementation within the framework of supervision particularly in the spectrum of specific training in the areas of the teachers taking part in this study (bachelor's and master's degrees). The goal is to provide a list of several enhancements resulting from the flaws found in this and other comparable research based on the questionnaire's questions and the expertise of specialists in the field who supervise others.

3. Pedagogical Practice and Initial Teacher Training

Pedagogical practices in initial teacher training have a critical role concerning questioning and experimenting with procedures and theories because they consider the educational institutions' projects, activities and plans and the related students. Zabalza (2004), Formosinho (2009), Grossman, Hammerness, and McDonald (2009), Hamilton-Jones and Vail (2014) expound on their crucial curricular meaning and Vonk (1985), Loiola and Tardif (2001), Cochran-Smith and Zeichner (2005), Darling-Hammond (2006), Flores and Day (2006), Johnson (2009), Zeichner (2010) and Benites, Sarti, and Souza Neto (2015) assert that they are central to teacher education.

Teachers are usually overwhelmed with many tasks and professional responsibilities commissioned to them and claimed by society (Antoniou, Kyriakides, & Creemers, 2017; Azevedo, 2012; Benites et al., 2015; Hargreaves, 1994, 2000, 2019; Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Marcelo García, 2011; Nias, 1996; Nóvoa, 2014; Pantic & Florian, 2015; Tardif, 2013). They assume varied responsibilities but they are getting less respected socially (Cyrino & Souza Neto, 2015; Nóvoa, 2014; Sarti, 2009). It is consistent with the activities that take place in the educational setting (classroom and school which is meant to be the final and ultimate social temple that accepts everyone without distinction. For this reason, they are referred to as "quasi-professionals" in some literary works (Azevedo, 2012).

Nonetheless, many opine that the teacher's role is paramount to the success of teaching (Alarcão & Tavares, 2013; Azevedo, 2012; Morgado, 2015; Morgado et al., 2018). The creation of teacher training is an important issue since it is the most delicate idea in light of current developments in the education sector. Given the significance attached to training institutions, it is clear that "here not only professionals are trained but a profession is produced" (Nóvoa, 2014) specifically regarding the momentousness attributed to training institutions in addition to individual training, regular schools jointly produce the teaching profession allowing their members' socialization and the professional culture's genesis (p.15).

The training of teachers has continually varied between academic models (focused on institutions and knowledge considered "fundamental") and down-to-earth models (concentrated on schools and methods considered "applied"). Therefore, overcoming this outdated dichotomy requires implementing professional models relying on cooperative solutions between universities and schools and strengthening tutoring and alternate locations. (Nóvoa, 2014).

Teacher education "is a fundamental part of the success of any reform of the education system" (Martinho, 2000). Hargreaves (1998); Hargreaves (2000) and Hargreaves (2019) warn that all teacher education (training for teaching) needs restructuring and reassessment as a whole. Zeichner (2010), Hawkins and Shohet (2012) and Bruno and Dell'Aversana (2018) suggest reformulating the curriculum of teacher training courses and introducing theoretical-practical training centred on professional performance. Azevedo (2012) focuses on "supervision" alluding to teacher education particularly pedagogical supervision. He states clearly that when they quote, "supervision can give today a crucial method for recognizing the professional autonomy of teachers, increasing professional knowledge and reporting improvement in the quality of teaching, if at the service of boosting reflective and collaborative ability" (Azevedo, 2012). Otherwise, "the internship comprises a training scenario where many elements and challenges faced by the teaching quality of higher education intertwine" (Zabalza, 2014).

Consecutively, Nóvoa (2014) notes that "it is evident that universities and schools are incapable of individually responding to these needs" (p. 24). Additionally, it is imperative to view teacher education as professional university education, i.e., preparation for the practice of a profession like architecture, engineering or medicine (Nóvoa, 2017). "Attending a training course for a human profession including teaching and medicine is different from any other course. After giving them the profession's knowledge, they may be assessed to see whether they meet the conditions and dispositions to be teachers" (Nóvoa, 2017).

meet the conditions and dispositions to be teachers" (Nóvoa, 2017). Zeichner, Payne, and Brayko (2015) report that "neither schools nor universities alone can train teachers and even together, schools and universities will not be able to train teachers well without resorting to the knowledge present in the communities the school has to serve" (p. 132). The findings of the present study readily agree with Nóvoa (2017) because he has posed that "the field of teacher education needs profound changes" (p. 1130).

Thus, this option might get practical support if it forms new mechanisms for regulating and supervising teacher training. Universities and schools should undergo a detailed process of autonomy allowing the celebration of agreements and protocols reflecting the diversity of interests and institutional facts.

4. Methodology

This research used a quantitative matrix. The participants were intern students (IS, n=245) from 20 courses in the domain of qualification for teaching who benefited from two subsystems of Portuguese higher education (University and Polytechnic), UTAD (12 courses) and IPB (8 courses), supervisors from Higher Education Institution (SHEI, n=38) and cooperating teachers from Higher Education Institutions (CTHEI, n=57). The total number of participants was 340. A closed-ended question (Google Drive) was the data collection technique. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to process the data.

The stages of the research took place sequentially as follows: 1. A survey of specific teacher training at the two educational institutions selected (based on the objective criteria initially formalized). 2. Preparation of the questionnaire. 3. Pre-testing. 4. Revision and drafting of the final version of the questionnaire. 5. Selection of contacts, sending and collection of data relating to the methodological instrument used and discussion of the results.

5. Results

The questions and respective answers were categorized based on their focus (by theme or subject) to have a more specific understanding of the data. In this case, Table 1 shows us the formative offer of the institutions involved in the study:

Table 1. Formative offer.					
UTAD courses	Ν	%			
Preschool	7	2.9			
Primary school	1	0.4			
Pre-school and primary school	16	6.5			
Teaching basic education's first and second cycles	14	5.7			
Teaching Portuguese and Spanish in basic and secondary education's third cycle	6	2.4			
Teaching English and German in basic and secondary education's third cycle	2	0.8			
The teaching of Mathematics in basic and secondary education's third cycle	1	0.4			
Biology and Geology teaching in basic education and secondary education third cycle	2	0.8			
Teaching Physics and Chemistry in basic education and secondary education's third	1	0.4			
cycle					
Teaching physical education in basic and secondary education (PETBSE)	62	25.3			
Theatre classes	12	4.9			
Computer teaching	11	4.5			
Total	135	100.0			
IPB courses	Ν	%			
Preschool	19	7.8			
Primary school	25	10.2			
Pre-school and primary school	9	3.7			
Teaching reading and writing	8	3.3			
Science teaching	9	3.7			
Teaching music education in basic education	14	5.7			
Teaching English and Spanish in basic education	7	2.9			
Teaching basic education's first and second cycles	19	7.8			
Total	110	100.0			

Teaching the First Cycle of Basic Education (IPB) was the least frequent course with no replies whereas PETBSE (UTAD) received 62 responses.

Complementary academic training	SI	SHEI		CTHEI	
	Ν	%	Ν	%	
With university training in special education	7	18.4	18	31.6	
Without a university in special education	31	81.6	39	68.4	
Total	38	100	57	100	
Experience in this role	SI	ΗEI	CTI	HEI	
-	Ν	%	Ν	%	
Up to 5 years	10	26.3	18	31.6	
Between 6 and 10 years	8	21.1	12	21.1	
>10 years	20	52.6	27	47.4	
Total	38	100	57	100	

Table 2. Academic training and professional experience (SHEI and CTHEI)

CTHEI assumed that they possessed no higher education in special education (68.4% [n=39]) (see Table 2). The SHEI acknowledged that they did not invest in this type of training (81.6% [n=31]). The inadequate preparation of higher education teachers assuming supervisory roles in the special education area was beyond infamous. When it came to experience in this capacity, the majority of SHEI (52.6% [n=20]) were teachers with years of substantial and extensive expertise supervising students or interns. The majority of respondents to the CTHEI (47.4% [n=27]) have been in supervisory roles for more than ten years.

Table 3. Interest in the subject.										
Students intern (At a higher education SI										
institution)	Ν	%								
Shows interest in and knowledge of the topic 234 95.5										
Shows no interest in and knowledge of the topic	11	4.5								
Total	245	100.0								
Source Morgado et al. (2017).										

According to the data in Table 3, the interest of the interns participating in this investigation is almost unanimous. 95.5% ([n=234]) of them consider they have concerns and information on the subject.

Table 4. State-of-the-art.

	ship (Before									
									practice (ITP)	
									chniques, plan	
				prepa	ring the in	nterns for	their inte	rnship	(STP) in the	ir curren
	(post-gradu				r 1		-			
Yes	T	N	lo		laybe	Don't	-		o answer	Tota
282	82.9%	21	6.2%	28	8.2%	6	1.8%	3	0.9%	340
									extracurricula	
(semina	ars, lectures	, training	sessions	, etc.) a	bout STP	or inclusion	on or excl	usion in	education in	general?
Never		Ra	rely	Ade	quately	Severa	al times	V	Vhenever	Tota
					1 0		1 = 00/		necessary	2.1.0
65	19.1%	119	35.0%	72	21.2%	61	17.9%	23	6.8%	340
									extracurricula	
				s, etc.)	about wri	ting a diss	sertation t	o defen	d in public, a	require
	nent of the i	1				a	1			
Never		Ra	rely	Ade	quately	Severa	ltimes		Vhenever	Tota
101	25.00/	0.1	22.00/	74	21.8%	20	5.9%	n 34	ecessary 10.0%	340
121	35.6%	91	26.8%							
	Do you bel on when con							lerns of	nly value the	e issue o
	on when con	1	with a rea			1			-	T ()
Yes	15 00/	No	25 20/	73 N	laybe 21.5%	Don't 6	know 1.8%	N 13	o answer 3.8%	
$\frac{155}{011}$	45.6%	93	27.2%			-	-	-		
			e issue oi	inclus	ion in the o	classroom (only relate	ed to int	tegrating lear	ners wit
	nto regular c	1	т		r 1	D //	1			T (
Yes	00.5%			20	laybe 5.9%	Don't	клоw 1.8%	3	o answer 0.9%	
80	23.5%	231	67.9%			*	-	-		
			eld of sp	ecial e					benefit from dress situatio	
classro	of training i om demand	ing this t	eld of sp ype of tra lo	ecial e aining?	ducation; Iaybe		y may be	tter ado	dress situatio	
classro Yes 311	om demand 91.5%	ing this t	eld of sp ype of tra lo 1.8%	ecial e aining? <u>N</u> 20	ducation; laybe 5.9%	thus, they Don't	y may be know	tter ado N 3	dress situatio	ns in th Tota 340
classro Yes 311 Q13: I	om demand 91.5% Do you thin	ing this t N 6 k it is ad	eld of sp ype of tra No 1.8% vantageo	ecial e aining? <u>N</u> 20 Dus to l	ducation; laybe 5.9% nave a sup	thus, they Don't ervisor or	y may be know cooperatin	tter ade N 3 ng teach	dress situatio	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e	ing this t N 6 k it is ad	eld of sp ype of tra No 1.8% vantageo	ecial e aining? <u>N</u> 20 Dus to l	ducation; laybe 5.9% nave a sup	thus, they Don't ervisor or	y may be know cooperatin	tter ade N 3 ng teach	dress situatio	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on?	ing this t 6 k it is ad ducation	eld of sp ype of tra No 1.8% vantageo when t	ecial e aining? <u>N</u> 20 Dus to l raining	ducation; Iaybe 5.9% nave a sup intern st	thus, they Don't ervisor or udents, sp	y may be know cooperatin pecifically	tter ade N 3 ng teach	dress situatio	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes	ing this t 6 k it is ad ducation	eld of sp ype of tra No 1.8% vantaged when t	ecial e aining? <u>N</u> 20 ous to l raining <u>N</u>	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% nave a sup intern st Iaybe	thus, they Don't ervisor or	y may be know cooperatin pecifically	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusio 299	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9%	ing this t	eld of sp ype of tra No 1.8% vantaged when t No 1.8%	ecial e aining? 20 ous to l raining <u>N</u> 32	Aducation; Iaybe 5.9% nave a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4%	thus, they Don't - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with traini omoting away o answer 0.9%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusio 299 Q14:]	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often	ing this t	eld of sp ype of tra 1.8% vantaged when t Jo 1.8% ssue of	ecial e aining? 20 Dus to l raining <u>M</u> 32 inclusic	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl	thus, they Don't eervisor or cudents, sj Don't usion disc	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusio 299 Q14: I prepar	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9%	ing this t	eld of sp ype of tra No 1.8% vantageo when t No 1.8% ssue of eaching of	ecial e aining? <u>N</u> 20 ous to l raining <u>N</u> 32 inclusic of the in	Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st 9.4% on or excl iterns' less	thus, they Don't ervisor or udents, sp Don't usion disc ons?	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C	tter add 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting awar o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusic 299 Q14: I prepar Never	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni	ing this t I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	eld of sp ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely	ecial e aining? <u>20</u> ous to l raining <u>32</u> inclusic of the in <u>Ade</u>	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% nave a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately	thus, they Don't Pervisor or Sudents, sp Don't Usion disc ons? Severa	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C il times	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a When	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) do never necessar	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusio 299 Q14:] prepar- Never 48	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni 14.1%	ing this t	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0%	ecial e aining? <u>20</u> ous to l raining <u>N</u> <u>32</u> inclusic of the in <u>Ade</u> 78	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9%	thus, they Don't Pervisor or Sudents, sp Don't Usion disc ons? Severa 48	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C il times 14.1%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a When 30	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr hever necessar 8.8%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusio 299 Q14:] prepar- Never 48	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni	ing this t	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0%	ecial e aining? <u>20</u> ous to l raining <u>N</u> <u>32</u> inclusic of the in <u>Ade</u> 78	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9%	thus, they Don't Pervisor or Sudents, sp Don't Usion disc ons? Severa 48	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C il times 14.1%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a When 30	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr hever necessar 8.8%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusio 299 Q14: 1 prepar Never 48 Q15: I	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni 14.1%	ing this t	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0%	ecial e aining? N 20 ous to l raining 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9%	thus, they Don't Don't Udents, sp Don't Usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C il times 14.1%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr hever necessar 8.8%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness th Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusic 299 Q14: 1 prepar Never 48 Q15: I	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni 14.1%	ing this t	eld of sp ype of tra lo 1.8% vantageo when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra	ecial e aining? N 20 ous to l raining 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a	Iaybe 5.9% bave a sup intern st 1aybe 9.4% on or excl aterns' less quately 22.9% and technic	thus, they Don't Don't Udents, sp Don't Usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C l times 14.1% cd in an inc	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) do never necessar 8.8% lassroom?	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusio 299 Q14: D prepar- 48 Q15: I Yes 190 Q16: I	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation 6 is the i ing and t 136 v and use 78 k that th	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra lo 22.9% ne curricu	ecial e aining? N 20 Jous to l raining M 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a tegies a M 48	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup- intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% higher educ	thus, they Don't Don't - vervisor or cudents, sp Don't - usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie Don't 12 cation) for	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C il times 14.1% id in an inc know 3.5% teacher t	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a When 30 clusive c N 12 raining	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) do never necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 Utification
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusic 299 Q14: D prepar- 48 Q15: I Yes 190 Q16: I include	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin es adequate	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation 6 is the i ing and t Ra 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t No 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra No 22.9% ne curricu r units to	vector examining? M 20 Dues to large maining raining N 32 inclusic inclusic f the in Ade 78 tegies a N 48 N ulum (hop prepare	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup- intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% higher educ	thus, they Don't Don't - vervisor or cudents, sp Don't - usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie Don't 12 cation) for	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C il times 14.1% id in an inc know 3.5% teacher t	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a When 30 clusive c N 12 raining	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr ever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness th Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 Utification
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusic 299 Q14: 1 prepar, 48 Q15: I Yes 190 Q16: I include	om demand 91.5% Do you thin of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation 6 is the i ing and t Ra 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t No 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra No 22.9% ne curricu r units to	vector examining? M 20 Dues to large maining raining N 32 inclusic inclusic f the in Ade 78 tegies a N 48 N ulum (hop prepare	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup- intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% higher educ	thus, they Don't Don't - vervisor or cudents, sp Don't - usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie Don't 12 cation) for	y may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C il times 14.1% id in an inc know 3.5% teacher t	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a When 30 clusive c N 12 raining	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) do never necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 Utification
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusic 299 Q14: I prepar 48 Q15: I Yes 190 Q16: I include the int	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin es adequate	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation 6 is the i 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula in inclusi	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t No 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra No 22.9% ne curricu r units to	ecial e aining? N 20 Dus to l raining M 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a tegies a M 48 ulum (h o prepare	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% higher educe re a future Iaybe	thus, they Don't Don't - vervisor or cudents, sp Don't - usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie Don't 12 cation) for	y may be know cooperating pecifically know ussed (C 1 times 14.1% ed in an inco know 3.5% teacher t pobserve, know	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with train omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) do never necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th 340 dification (as part of
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusic 299 Q14: I prepar 48 Q15: I Yes 190 Q16: I include the int	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin es adequate	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation 6 is the i 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula in inclusi	eld of sp ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of eaching of eaching of eaching of 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne	ecial e aining? N 20 Dus to l raining M 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a tegies a M 48 ulum (h o prepare	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% higher educe	thus, they Don't Don't Overvisor or cudents, sp Don't Usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to	y may be know cooperating pecifically know ussed (C 1 times 14.1% cd in an inco know 3.5% teacher t pobserve,	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainio omoting awar o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr ever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 Utification
Classro Yes 311 Q13: I field c inclusic 299 Q14: I prepar A8 Q15: I Yes 190 Q16: I include the intu Yes 74	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 555.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8%	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation N 6 is the i ing and t 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula in inclusi 203	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne No 59.7%	ecial e aining? 20 Dus to l raining 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a tegies a lum (h o prepare er? <u>M</u> 51	Aducation; Iaybe 5.9% nave a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl aterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% re a future Iaybe 15.0%	thus, they Don't Don't Don't Don't Usion disc Ons? Severa 48 Jues applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6	y may be know cooperating pecifically know ussed (C 1 times 14.1% id in an ind know 3.5% teacher t pobserve, know 1.8%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainiomoting awar o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr ever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene (o answer	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 Unification (as part of 340
$\begin{array}{c} \text{classro}\\ \text{Yes}\\ 311\\ \text{Q13: I}\\ \text{field } c\\ \text{inclusic}\\ \hline 299\\ \text{Q13: I}\\ \hline 190\\ \text{Q14: I}\\ \hline 190\\ \text{Q15: I}\\ \hline 190\\ \text{Q16: I}\\ \text{include}\\ \text{the int}\\ \hline 190\\ \text{Q16: I}\\ \hline 190\\ \text{Q17: I}\\ \hline 74\\ \text{Q17: I}\\ \hline \end{array}$	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 555.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8%	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation 6 is the i 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula in inclusir 203 k a man	eld of sp ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne lo 59.7% ual for s	vector existing N 20 Dous to l raining raining N 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a tegies a N 48 ulum (h: prepare N 51 simple	Aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup- intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl aterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% higher educ re a future Iaybe 15.0% diagnostics	thus, they Don't Don't Cudents, sp Don't Usion disc Ons? Severa 48 Jues applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6 s, planning	y may be know cooperating pecifically know ussed (C l times 14.1% d in an ind know 3.5% teacher t o observe, know 1.8% g and mon	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainion omoting awar o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr hever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene 0 answer 1.8%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 Unification (as part of 340
$\begin{array}{c} \text{classro}\\ \text{Yes}\\ \hline 311\\ \text{Q13: I}\\ \text{field c}\\ \text{inclusio}\\ \hline 299\\ \text{Q14: I}\\ \text{prepar}\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q15: I}\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q15: I}\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q15: I}\\ \hline 190\\ \text{Q16: I}\\ \text{include}\\ \text{the int}\\ \hline 74\\ \text{Q17: I}\\ \text{teach s}\\ \hline \end{array}$	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni 14.1% Do you know 555.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8% Do you thin	ing this t	eld of sp ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne lo 59.7% ual for s	ecial e aining? M 20 20 20 20 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a tegies a 10 48 10 (h 21 21 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	ducation; Iaybe 5.9% nave a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% tigher educ re a future Iaybe 15.0% diagnostics ely regard Iaybe	thus, they Don't Don't Cudents, sp Don't Usion disc Ons? Severa 48 Jues applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6 s, planning	x may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C d times 14.1% rd in an inc know 3.5% teacher t observe, know 1.8% g and mon- on?	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6 itoring	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainion omoting awar o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr hever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene 0 answer 1.8%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota
$\begin{array}{c} classro\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 311\\ Q13: I\\ field c\\ inclusic\\ \hline 299\\ Q14: I\\ prepar\\ \hline 48\\ Q15: I\\ \hline 190\\ Q16: I\\ include\\ the interver\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 74\\ Q17: I\\ \hline 2000 \\ \hline 74\\ Q17: I\\ \hline 1000 \\ \hline 74\\ \hline 2000 \\ \hline 74\\ \hline$	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ration, planni 14.1% Do you know 555.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8% Do you thin	ing this t	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra lo 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne lo 59.7% ual for s ies more	ecial e aining? M 20 20 20 20 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a tegies a 10 48 10 (h 21 21 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	ducation; Iaybe 5.9% nave a supplication of exclusion	thus, they Don't Don't Don't Usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6 s, planning ing inclusie	x may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C d times 14.1% rd in an inc know 3.5% teacher t observe, know 1.8% g and mon- on?	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6 itoring	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainio omoting away o answer 0.9% and SHEI) do never necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene 0 answer 1.8% would help p	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota Jota
$\begin{array}{c} classro\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 311\\ \hline Q13: I\\ field c\\ inclusio\\ \hline 299\\ \hline Q14: I\\ \hline \\ prepart\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Prepart\\ \hline \\ \hline$	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8% Do you thin staff to fulfil 72.9%	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation N 6 is the i ing and t Ra 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula in inclusir N 203 k a man their dut 8	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra lo 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne lo 59.7% ual for s ies more lo 2.4%	vector N 20 N 20 Sus to large number N 32 Sus to large inclusic Inclusic of the in Ade 78 Ade 10 Prepare er? N 51 Simple effectiv N 78 78	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% igher educ re a future Iaybe 15.0% diagnostics rely regard Iaybe 22.9%	thus, they Don't Don't Don't Usion or Usion discons? Severa 48 Ques applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6 s, planning ing inclusio Don't 3	x may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C d times 14.1% rd in an inco know 3.5% teacher t pobserve, know 1.8% g and monon? know 0.9%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6 itoring N 3	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainion o answer 0.9% nd SHEI) du hever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene 0 answer 1.8% would help p o answer 0.9%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 Uring th y Tota 340 Uring th y Tota 340 Uring th y Tota 340 Uring th y Tota 340 Uring th y Tota 340 Uring th Subsetement (as part of 340 Uring th Subsetement (as part of 340 Uring th Subsetement Subsetement Tota 340 Uring th Subsetement Subsetement Subsetement Subsetement Subsetement Subsetement Subsetement Subsetement Tota 340 Uring th Subsetement Subsetement Uring th Subsetement Subsetem
$\begin{array}{c} classro\\ \hline Classro\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 311\\ \hline Q13: I\\ \hline field cinclusion \hline 299\\ \hline Q14: I\\ \hline prepart \hline 48\\ \hline Q15: I\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 190\\ \hline Q16: I\\ \hline include the interval \hline Yes\\ \hline 74\\ \hline Q17: I\\ \hline teach s\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 248\\ \hline Q18: I\\ \hline \end{array}$	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8% Do you thin staff to fulfil 72.9%	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation N 6 is the i ing and t Ra 136 v and use 78 k that th curricula un inclusiv N 203 k a man their dut 8 v e there	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra lo 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne lo 59.7% ual for s ies more lo 2.4%	vector N 20 N 20 Sus to large number N 32 Sus to large inclusic Inclusic of the in Ade 78 Ade 10 Prepare er? N 51 Simple effectiv N 78 78	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% igher educ re a future Iaybe 15.0% diagnostics rely regard Iaybe 22.9%	thus, they Don't Don't Don't Usion or Usion discons? Severa 48 Ques applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6 s, planning ing inclusio Don't 3	x may be know cooperatin pecifically know cussed (C d times 14.1% rd in an inco know 3.5% teacher t pobserve, know 1.8% g and monon? know 0.9%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6 itoring N 3	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainio omoting awa o answer 0.9% and SHEI) dr ever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene (0 answer 1.8% would help p	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th ty Tota 340 Uring th ty Tota 340 Uring th ty Tota 340 Uring th Tota 340 Uring th
$\begin{array}{c} classro\\ \hline classro\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 311\\ \hline Q13: I\\ field c\\ inclusic\\ \hline 299\\ \hline Q14: I\\ prepar\\ \hline 48\\ \hline Q14: I\\ prepar\\ \hline 48\\ \hline Q15: I\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 190\\ \hline Q16: I\\ include\\ the intex\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 74\\ \hline Q16: I\\ teach s\\ \hline Yes\\ \hline 248\\ \hline Q18: I\\ and inc\\ \hline \end{array}$	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8% Do you thinl staff to fulfil 72.9% Do you belie	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation N 6 is the i ing and t 136 v and use N 78 k that th curricula m inclusir N 203 k a man their dut 8 ve there pach?	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra lo 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne lo 59.7% ual for s ies more lo 2.4%	becial e aining? 20 vs to l raining M 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a M 48 ulum (h p prepar M 51 simple effectiv 78 n update	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% higher educ re a future Iaybe 15.0% diagnostics rely regard Iaybe 22.9% ted materia	thus, they Don't Don't Don't Don't Usion disc ons? Severa 48 ques applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6 s, planning ing inclusie Don't 3 al to assist	y may be know cooperating pecifically know ussed (C l times 14.1% d in an ind know 3.5% teacher t b observe, know 1.8% g and mon- on? know 0.9%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6 itoring N 3 anning v	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainion o answer 0.9% nd SHEI) du hever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene 0 answer 1.8% would help p o answer 0.9%	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th y Tota 340 uring th y Tota
$\begin{array}{c} \text{classro}\\ \text{Yes}\\ \hline 311\\ \text{Q13: I}\\ \text{field } c\\ \text{inclusio}\\ \hline 299\\ \text{Q13: I}\\ \text{field } c\\ \text{inclusio}\\ \hline 299\\ \text{Q13: I}\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q14: I}\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q15: I}\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q15: I}\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q16: I}\\ \text{include}\\ \text{the int}\\ \hline 48\\ \hline 48\\ \text{Q16: I}\\ \text{include}\\ \hline 48\\ \hline 48\\ \hline 216: I\\ \hline 48\\ \hline 248\\ \hline 248\\ \hline 218: I\\ \hline \end{array}$	om demand 91.5% Do you thinl of special e on? Yes 87.9% How often ation, planni 14.1% Do you know 55.9% Do you thin es adequate ernship) in a 21.8% Do you thinl staff to fulfil 72.9% Do you belie	ing this t N 6 k it is ad ducation N 6 is the i ing and t 136 v and use N 78 k that th curricula m inclusir N 203 k a man their dut 8 ve there pach?	eld of sr ype of tra lo 1.8% vantaged when t lo 1.8% ssue of eaching of rely 40.0% any stra 22.9% ne curricu r units to ve manne lo 59.7% ual for s ies more lo 2.4% is enough	becial e aining? 20 vs to l raining M 32 inclusic of the in Ade 78 tegies a M 48 ulum (h p prepar M 51 simple effectiv 78 n update	aducation; Iaybe 5.9% have a sup intern st Iaybe 9.4% on or excl iterns' less quately 22.9% and technic Iaybe 14.1% igher educ re a future Iaybe 15.0% diagnostics rely regard Iaybe 22.9%	thus, they Don't Don't Don't Usion or Usion discons? Severa 48 Ques applie Don't 12 cation) for teacher to Don't 6 s, planning ing inclusio Don't 3	y may be know cooperating pecifically know ussed (C l times 14.1% d in an ind know 3.5% teacher t b observe, know 1.8% g and mon- on? know 0.9%	tter add N 3 ng teach for pro N 3 THEI a Wher 30 clusive c N 12 raining assess a N 6 itoring N 3 anning v	dress situatio o answer 0.9% her with trainion o answer 0.9% nd SHEI) drever necessar 8.8% lassroom? o answer 3.5% (teaching qua nd intervene 0 answer 1.8% would help p o answer 0.9% with a more in	ns in th Tota 340 ing in th reness t Tota 340 uring th ty Tota 340 Uring th ty Tota 340 Uring th ty Tota 340 Uring th Tota 340 Uring th

Table 4 presents the state-of-the art of the theme. The answer to question 7 by the respondents was obvious (82.9% [n=282]) concerning the relevance of the Curricular Unit (CU) in the Introduction to Teaching Practice (ITP) because they were CU preparatory for the internship (usually for STP). Question 8 revealed that the HEIs did not quit urging many training or extracurricular initiatives to assist or strengthen these study focus areas. However, the figures implied that the most representative answer (35.5% [n=119]) displayed the fragility of the same training offers. Institutions rarely conducted these initiatives for 119 respondents. The HEIs paid little or no attention (in extracurricular terms) to the training and preparation of students to elaborate on internship reports of a dissertation nature. 35.6% ([n=121]) opined never, or 26.8% ([n=91]) rarely, did these formations occur (question 9).

45.6% [n=155] suggested that the elements involved in the STP process (interns, co-operators, and supervisors) thought highly of inclusion only in specific cases (question 10).

An evident trend in responding to question 11 was present with 67.9% ([n=231]), not agreeing that inclusion meant integrating students with SEN into regular classes. If so, only 23.5% ([n=80]) assumed that this relationship existed.

In responding to question 12, no doubt existed about the need for the SHEI, the CTHEI and the SI (91.5% [n=311]) to include more comprehensive training. Thus, it covered the special education area to reinforce their capacity for action and intervention in the classroom context. Similarly, it deepened the training and premonitoring of students before entering the period specified for the STP.

In question 13, everyone thought they should gain from this specific training; the overwhelming majority (87.9% [n=299]) felt this situation might be an asset for everyone and the whole process.

In question 14, 40% ([n=134]) of the respondents considered the inadequate address of the inclusion/exclusion issue/theme by the CTHEI and SHEI in preparing, planning and monitoring supervised classes inadequate. More than half (55.9% [n=190]) were supposed to perceive and use strategies applicable in inclusive classrooms (classrooms where cases are flagged and there are projects and intervention plans to this end) (question 15).

It was evident from question 16 that the majority (59.7% [n=203]) opined that the number of ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) in the qualification for teaching courses syllabuses was not adequate to equip future teachers with the required tools to acquire an inclusive professional practice.

In question 17, the overwhelming majority (72.9% [n=248]) stated that a manual would affect teachers to execute their functions. The existing support material in this area (question 18) was inadequate (45.9% [n=156]), only 20% ([n=68]) thought that the updated material was adequate.

Q19: In your opinion, how should learners with SEN be integrated?	Ν	%	
Standard curriculum	112	32.9	
Own and adapt the curriculum	197	57.9	
Alternative curriculum	31	9.1	
Total	340	100	
Q20: In your opinion, which of the following options should a school take when there are learners with SEN?	N	%	
Learner-centred perspective	311	91.5	
Curriculum-centred perspective	29	8.5	
Total	340	100	
Q21: In the classroom, have you ever had contact with any learners with the following SEN (choose only the most relevant situation)?	Ν	%	
Hearing deficiency	13	3.8	
Motor impairment	28	8.2	
Visual impairment	18	5.3	
A slight learning disability	41	12.1	
Moderate learning disability	62	18.2	
Severe learning disability	32	9.4	
Multiple disabilities	32	9.4	
Serious behavioural issues	24	7.1	
Never had contact with any learner with SEN in the classroom	58	17.1	
Other	32	9.4	
Total	340	100	
Q22: If you consider inclusion to go beyond learners with SEN, in which of the following situations (Choose only the most relevant one) do you think an inclusive strategy might have a decisive and positive outcome?	Ν	%	
Among learners of gipsy ethnicity	34	10.0	
Among learners of different religions	3	0.9	
Among learners with drug- or alcohol-related problems	27	7.9	
Among foreign learners with difficulties adapting to the culture and language	27	7.9	
Among learners with clear socio-economic difficulties	23	6.8	
In all the situations listed above	209	61.5	
Others	17	5.0	
Total	340	100	

According to the data in Table 5, concerning question 19, the majority of respondents (57.9% $\lceil n=197 \rceil$) consider that students with SEN should pursue a curriculum adapted to their needs. However, it is important to keep in mind that 32.9% ([n=112]) of respondents believed that students with special education should be included in the regular curriculum as corroborated by other writers.

The respondents agreed practically unanimously (question 20) that it was more beneficial for the student with SEN to follow a perspective focused on the student (91.5% [n=311]). Two essential points were relevant for question 21. Firstly, the majority (18.2% [n=62]) acknowledged that their contact with students with SEN specifically occurred for students with moderate learning difficulties. Secondly, the second largest portion (17.1% [n=58] had no interaction with an SEN student in the classroom.

A significant number of respondents (61.5% [n=209]) believe that inclusive action should guarantee, develop, and execute more resolute and satisfactory practices when it comes to plans on this issue (question no. 21).

Table 6. Central question.										
Q23: Do you feel personally and professionally prepared to help learners with SEN?										
Yes	Yes No Maybe Don't know No answer Total									
80	23.5%	155	45.6%	81	23.8%	21	6.2%	3	0.9%	340

Table 6 presents the central question of this research (question 23). In this case, it was evident that an essential portion (45.6% [n=155]) felt unprepared for this challenge of working with SEN students.

6. Discussion

We can conclude that the teachers have relevant experience in terms of supervision (SHEI 52.6% [n=20] and CTHEI 47.4% [n=27]) but they consider that in the area of special education their specific training is scarce and should be increased (SHEI 81.6% [n=31]; CTHEI 68.4% [n=39]) (Morgado et al., 2017). The primary shortcoming was the lack of preparation for higher education teachers to take on supervisory roles (Alila, Uusiautti, & Määttä, 2016; Markelz, Riden, & Scheeler, 2017). Hence, they were not able to assist with theoretical preparation which is a crucial practice for trainee students nor could they increase awareness because they lack ed this knowledge. This training must be a part of future teacher supervisor preparation so that teachers can support their students' behaviour in special education intervention contexts.

Thus, most intern students (95.5% [n=234]) (see Table 3) assumed that they were keen on the subject and had relevant information. Moreover, it became more evident that the anticipated interest (because these interns coped with some cases and situations; they were not adequately ready to give the proper response and follow-up) reinforced that some had already gathered relevant information on the subject (Buckley & Quinlivan, 2023; Byrd & Alexander, 2020). Special education and inclusion interest and expertise can be combined in a unique way and students' concurrent broader beginning training in the field led to the SHEI receiving the right training to satisfy this demand and the lack of enthusiasm among intern students (Hoppey & Mickelson, 2017; Sundqvist, Björk-Åman, & Ström, 2023).

Table 4 suggests that the inclusion of this particular preparation in the programmes, contents and objectives of the institutions' linked course units (CU) was not common (McLeskey & Waldron, 2011; Takala, Nordmark, & Allard, 2019). Therefore, it might imply that no prior training to this end was required; solutions or strategies should be sought when confronted with these circumstances. Additionally, initial training could be void or inceptive in this case and the supervisor's preparation and follow-up failed to address these problems or issues. Hence, in equipping or monitoring the interns in the internship stages (observation¹, shared accountability² and accountability³), this matter was not part of the priorities of those overseeing and collaborating in the STP.

However, one may also attempt to understand whether, as in the initial training of the majority of respondents, special education and inclusion were not sufficiently strengthened concurrently and whether an inadequate interaction with pedagogical-didactic materials and instruments would account for the lack of particular content in the area (Opoku, Cuskelly, & Pedersen, 2021; Rasmitadila, Humaira, Prasetyo, Hasnin, & Rachmadtullah, 2023). The practicality of these recommended roles was exceptional. The challenges resulting from these choices regarding the whole school community were apparent supporting the respondents' unambiguous stance on the issue. Table 5 showed that the participants considered interacting directly with students who had moderate to serious difficulties with learning. The action depending on inclusive strategies could pose a critically broader, more decisive and reasonable role. However, they believed that students with SEN should incorporate their own and adapted curriculum from a student-centered perspective. One can do a lot for preparing and training in special education regarding teacher training (now called the area of qualification for teaching) (Alshahrani & Abu-Alghayth, 2023; Li & Ruppar, 2021; Rasmitadila et al., 2023; Saloviita, 2018; Sarraj & Alshehri, 2021; Winter, 2006).

7. Conclusion

The educational setting and higher education institutions must engage in a thoughtful and cooperative discourse in order to develop a comprehensive and well-articulated understanding of training. It is impossible to separate the continuing social and cultural changes from the professional training of teachers. These transformations constantly present global and conceptually broad challenges that are simultaneously more unique, specific and imminent in the short and long run. The teaching personnel's objectives, functions, roles and relevant performances continually pose daily challenges and exercises. The multitude of factors and challenges emphasize the need to unavoidably stimulate the professionals training.

This study's results produce some indicators depicting a contribution to reflection and enrichment in the quality of action and training in the milieu of special education. Accordingly, the relevance of favoring suggests developing a broad profile of professional competence rendering each teacher capable of acting in a multidimensional educational context. Professional culture-building may alleviate an integrative and inclusive curriculum approach. Moreover, the training and didactic perspective advancement can improve the disciplinary connection and sharing, encouraging fruitful discussions and devising new training profiles. It is crucial that the school, considering the sophistication and complexity of the present times revitalize its perspective on facts, reinforcing an inclusive approach and intervention pedagogically and claiming values without renouncing anybody.

8. Future Perspectives

The aim of this research is to gather and assess as much as possible the impact of the measures and legislative framework on the daily lives of teachers who, directly or indirectly are increasingly called upon to carry out more tasks, take on more responsibilities and perhaps devote much time and energy to matters that are neither central nor decisive in their performance in the school and academic context, namely in their teaching practice. Strategies, studies and research are carried out and developed so that the future professional who takes on supervisory duties can benefit from more in-depth and capable training and which this specific case can be based on a legal framework that protects and supports their autonomy on the one hand and on the other, can equip them with pedagogical-didactic tools capable of providing excellent public service.

¹ This phase is intended for observing classes (by the trainee student) taught by CTHEI.

² This phase is intended for observing classes (by the trainee student) taught by fellow trainees. Everybody watches everybody's classes.

³ At this stage, the trainee student autonomously assumes the classes.

References

- Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14(4), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903
- Alarcão, I., & Tavares, J. (2013). Supervision of pedagogical practice a development and learning perspective. Coimbra: Almedina Bookstore. Albuquerque, A., Silva, E., Resende, R., Gonçalves, F., & Gomes, R. (2015). Pedagogical supervision in physical education- the perspective of
- Alida, S., Uusiautti, S., & Määttä, K. (2016). The principles and practices of supervision that supports the development of inclusive
- Alia, S., Ouslautti, S., & Maatta, K. (2016). The principles and practices of supervision that supports the development of inclusive teacherhood. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(3), 297-306. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v5n3p297
 Alshahrani, B., & Abu-Alghayth, K. (2023). Teachers' professional development for inclusive education, a perspective from saudi mixed
- methods study. Information Sciences Letters, 12(3), 1497-1504. https://doi.org/10.18576/isl/120337
- Álvarez, J. M. (2013). Construction of a teaching identity in a supervised internship context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 79-88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.09.002
- Antoniou, P., Kyriakides, L., & Creemers, B. (2017). The professional identity of teachers in cyprus primary schools: A case study. Educational Studies, 43(5), 483-498. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2017.1345105
- Azevedo, J. (2012). Presentation note. Revista Portuguesa de Investigação Educacional, 12(11), 3-5.
- Baeten, M., & Simons, M. (2014). Student teachers' team teaching: Models, effects, and conditions for implementation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 41, 92–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.03.010
- Beckford, C. L., & Lekule, C. (2022). International community service-learning experiences in a canadian teacher education program: Implications for praxis in pre-service teacher preparation. Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education, 6(1), 126–140. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-3877-0.ch013
- Benites, L. C., Sarti, F. M., & Souza Neto, S. (2015). From teacher masters to field formers in the supervised internship. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 45(155), 100-117. https://doi.org/10.1590/198053142928
- Bruno, A., & Dell'Aversana, G. (2018). Reflective practicum in higher education: The influence of the learning environment on the quality of learning. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43(3), 345-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1344823
- Buckley, L.-A., & Quinlivan, S. (2023). Inclusive learning in Ireland: A case study. International Journal of Discrimination and the Law, 23(1-2), 103-125. https://doi.org/10.1177/13582291231169397
- Byrd, R. D., & Alexander, M. (2020). Investigating special education teachers' knowledge and skills: Preparing general teacher preparation for professional development. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 4(2), 72–82. https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.2020059790
- Caine, V., & Estefan, A. (2017). The role of internships in developing employability skills for tourism and hospitality graduates. Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 20, 81-91.
- Caires, S., & Almeida, L. S. (2003). Experiences and perceptions during practicum: A study with preservice teachers. *Psico-USF*, 8(2), 145-153. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-82712003000200006
- Calvo, R., & Almarza, A. (2018). Improving employability through internships in higher education. Journal of Education and Work, 31(3), 225-240.
 Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(6), 473-490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Correia, L. M. (2013). Inclusion and special educational needs a guide for educators and teachers. CORREIA: Porto Editora.
- Cosgrove, M. P., Jewell, C. P., & Payne, J. M. (2020). Supervision in higher education: A review of the literature. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 42(3), 257-274.
- Cyrino, M., & Souza Neto, S. (2015). The pre-service teacher in the undergraduate course of education: Elements for the formation process. Acta Scientiarum Education, 37(4), 401-413.
- Dall'Alba, G., & Sandberg, J. (2016). Learning through practising: Coherence making in professional learning. *Journal of Education and Work*, 29(1), 1-18.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 57(3), 300-314. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105285962
- De Silva, N. L. C. C., & Wijesekara, R. D. W. (2021). Challenges and opportunities in providing inclusive education in higher education institutions: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(1), 96-112.
- Dingle, M., Faver, M. A., Givner, C. C., & Haager, D. (2004). Essential special and general education teacher competencies for preparing teachers for inclusive settings. *Issue in Teacher Education*, 13(1), 35–50.
- Downing, J. E., & Peckham-Harding, K. D. (2007). Inclusive education: What makes it a good education for students with moderate to severe disabilities? *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 32(1), 16–30. https://doi.org/10.2511/rpsd.32.1.16
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? *Review of Educational Research*, 62, 171-179. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(87)90019-9
- Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(2), 219-232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.09.002
- Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? European Journal of Special Needs Education, 29(3), 286-294. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933551
- Formosinho, J. (2009). Academization of teacher training in J. Formosinho (Coord.), Teacher training: Professional learning and teaching action. In (pp. 73-92). Porto: Porto Editora.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberg, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 20(1), 9–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410903535380
- Furlan, E. G. M., Faria, P. C., Lozano, P., Bazon, F. V. M., & Gomes, C. (2020). Inclusion in higher education: Training and teaching experience. Avaliação, 25(2), 416-438. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s1414-4077/s1414-40772020000200010
- Gonçalves, C. R., & Marques, R. A. (2016). Contributing to a sustainable future: The role of internships in higher education. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 112, 3593-3603. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.109
- Grossman, P. L., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(2), 273-289. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875340
 Hamilton-Jones, B. M., & Vail, C. O. (2014). Preparing special educators for collaboration in the classroom: Pre-service teachers' beliefs and
- Hamilton-Jones, B. M., & Vail, C. O. (2014). Preparing special educators for collaboration in the classroom: Pre-service teachers' beliefs and perspectives. *International Journal of Special Education*, 29(1), 76-86.
 Hammond, H., & Ingalls, L. (2003). Teachers' attitudes toward inclusion: Survey results from elementary school teachers in three
- Hammond, H., & Ingalls, L. (2003). Teachers' attitudes toward inclusion: Survey results from elementary school teachers in three southwestern rural school districts. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 22(2), 24–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/875687050302200204
 Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. London: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing tachers, enanging times. Feaching and Teacher Education, 14(8), 835-854. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00025-0

- Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice*, 6(2), 151-182. https://doi.org/10.1080/713698714
- Hargreaves, A. (2019). Teacher collaboration: 30 years of research on its nature, forms, limitations and effects. *Teachers and Teaching*, 25(5), 603-621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2019.1639499
- Haug, P. (2017). Understanding inclusive education: Ideals and reality. Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research, 19(3), 206-217. https://doi.org/10.1080/15017419.2016.1224778
- Hawkins, P., & Shohet, R. (2012). Supervision in the helping professions (4th ed.). London: Open University Press.
- He, Y. (2017). Student perspectives on internships: Implications for experiential learning in higher education. *Education+Training*, 59(4), 386-399. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-02-2016-0024

- Hernández-Sánchez, B. R., & Gutiérrez-Martínez, J. M. (2018). Perceptions of the development of employability skills during internships: The role of gender and previous professional experience. Journal of Education and Work, 31(2), 115-127.
- Hoppey, D., & Mickelson, A. M. (2017). Partnership and co-teaching: Preparing preservice teachers to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. *Action in Teacher Education*, 39(2), 187–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1273149
 Iza, D. F. V., & Souza Neto, S. (2015). The challenges of supervised physical education curricular practicum in the partnership between
- university and school. Movimento, 21(1), 111-124.
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective. New York: Routledge.
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(3), 741-756. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019237
- Konečná, P., Smolka, P., Trčková, K., Václavíková, Z., & Žáček, M. (2023). Innovation of pedagogical practices of future teachers. Education Sciences, 13(4), 355. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040355
- Law no. 62/2007. (2007). 10 september. Diário da República, Série, 1(174), 6358-6389.
- Leatherman, J. (2009). Teachers' voices concerning collaborative teams within an inclusive elementary school. *Teaching Education*, 20(2), 189-202. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210902718104
- Li, L., & Ruppar, A. (2021). Conceptualizing teacher agency for inclusive education: A systematic and international review. Teacher Education and Special Education, 44(1), 42-59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406420926976
- Loiola, F. A., & Tardif, M. (2001). Pedagogical training of university professors and conceptions of teaching. Revue des Sciences de l'Education, 27(2), 305-326. https://doi.org/10.52950/te.2023.11.1.001
- Mantoan, M. T. E. (2015). School inclusion: What is it? Why? How to make? São Paulo: Summus Editorial.
- Marcelo García, C. (2011). Evaluation of teacher professional development. Spain: Davinci Publishing.
- Markelz, A., Riden, B., & Scheeler, M. C. (2017). Generalization training in special education teacher preparation: Does it exist? Teacher Education and Special Education, 40(3), 179-193. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417703752
- (2000). The of M. history Martinho, M. education in teacher training. MÁTHESIS. Α. .9. 279-296. https://doi.org/10.34632/mathesis.2000.3853
- McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2011). Educational programs for elementary students with learning disabilities: Can they be both effective and inclusive? Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26(1), 48-57. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2010.00324.x
- Medina, N. S., López, M. A. A., & De Britto, J. C. (2022). Collaborative synergy in inclusive classrooms: An experience of interactive groups with with intellectual disabilities. Revista de Investigación students enEducación, 20(2),91-108.
- https://doi.org/10.35869/reined.v20i2.4218
 Morgado, E., Cardoso, M., Rodrigues, J., & Silva, L. (2017). The universe of supervision: An inclusive approach within the teacher training domain in J. Mena, A. García-Valcarcel, F. J. G. Peñalvo, & M. M. Pozo (Eds.), Search and research: Teacher education for contemporary contexts. In (pp. 7-15). Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Morgado, E. M. G. (2015). The universe of supervision: An inclusive approach in the fields of teacher training and professional integration. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation UTAD University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro.
 Morgado, E. M. G., Silva, L. L. F., & Rodrigues, J. B. (2018). The universe of supervision: An inclusive approach in the field of professional
- Norgado, E. M. O., Shva, E. F., & Rodrigues, S. B. (2018). The universe of supervision. An inclusive approach in the next of processional integration. *Pró-Posições*, 29(3), 492-516. https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1980-6248-2016-0048
 Navarro-Varas, L., & Núñez-Poma, J. M. (2018). Bridging the gap between university and employment: A proposal for promoting employability in higher education through internships. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(3), 433-445. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1158328
- Nias, J. (1996). Thinking about feeling: The emotions in teaching. Cambridge Journal of Education, 26(3), 293-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764960260301
- Nóvoa, A. (2014). The past and present of teachers in A. Nóvoa (Org.), Profession teacher. In (pp. 9-32). Porto: Porto Editora. A. (2017). To firm the position as a teacher, Nóvoa, to affirm the teaching profession. Cad Pesqui, 47(166), 1106-1133. https://doi.org/10.1590/198053144843
- Ollila, S., & Onnismaa, M. (2014). The role of internships in promoting graduates' employability. Education+Training, 56(1), 32-44.
- Opoku, M. P., Cuskelly, M., & Pedersen, S. J. (2021). Attitudes and self-efficacy as significant predictors of intention of secondary school teachers towards the implementation of inclusive education in Ghana. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 36, 673-691. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-020-00490-5
- no. 260-A/2014. (2014). República, Ordinance Diário da 1st supplement, series I No. 241. Retrieved from https://diariodarepublica.pt/dr/detalhe/portaria/260-a-2014-65891082.
- Pantic, N., & Florian, L. (2015). Developing teachers as agents of inclusion and social justice. *Education Inquiry*, 6(3), 333-351. https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v6.27311
- Pérez-Montoro, M., Guerrero-Solé, F., & Mauri-Castelló, A. (2017). Assessing the impact of internships on graduates' employability in the field of library and information science. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 49(3), 253-264.
- Perlado Lamo de Espinosa, I., Muñoz Martínez, Y., & Torrego Seijo, J. C. (2021). Students with special educational needs and cooperative learning in the ordinary classroom: Some learnings from teaching practice. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 21(3), 211-221. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12511
- Pimenta, S. G., & Lima, M. S. L. (2019). supervised internship and the programa institucional teaching initiation scholarship: Two faces of the same coin? Revista Brasileira de Educação, 24, e240001. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-24782019240001
- Rasmitadila, Humaira, M. A., Prasetyo, T., Hasnin, H. D., & Rachmadtullah, R. (2023). Teacher perceptions of inclusive education training: Implementation of an inclusive elementary schoolmentoring program based on collaborative partnership. Journal of Education and E-Learning Research, 10(4), 682–688. https://doi.org/10.20448/jeelr.v10i4.5054
- Saloviita, T. (2018). How common are inclusive educational practices among finnish teachers? International Journal of Inclusive Education, 22(5), 560-575. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1390001
- Sarraj, S. E., & Alshehri, S. S. (2021). Inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education: Perspectives and challenges. International Journal of Higher Education, 10(1), 197-207. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n1p197
- Sarti, F. M. (2009). Intergerational partnership and teacher education. Education Rev. 25(2), 133-152. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-46982009000200006
- Sassaki, R. K. (2010). Inclusion building a society for all. Rio de Janeiro: WVA.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.
- Shouse, C. R., & Strutchens, S. R. (2020). The role of teacher education in preparing educators for inclusive classrooms. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24(8), 863-880. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1461057

- Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1999). Inclusion a guide for educators. Porto Alegre: Artmed. Sundqvist, C., Björk-Åman, C., & Ström, K. (2023). Co-teaching during teacher training periods: Experiences of finnish special education and general education teacher candidates. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 67(1), 20-34. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2021.1983648 Takala, M., Nordmark, M., & Allard, K. (2019). A comparison of university curriculum in special teacher education in Finland and Sweden. general
- Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education, 3(2), 20–36. https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.2659
- Tardif, M. (2013). The professionalization of education thirty years later: Two steps forward, three steps back. *Education Social*, 34(123), 551-571. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302013000200013
- UNESCO. (2009). 48th international conference on education 48th session inclusive education: The way of the future. Geneva: UNESCO International Bureau of Education.
- UNESCO. (2015). Empowering teachers to promote inclusive education a case study of approaches to training and support for inclusive teacher practice. Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education.
- Vilela-Ribeiro, E. B., Benite, A. M. C., & Vilela, E. B. (2013). Classroom and diversity. Revista Educação Especial, 26(45), 145-160. https://doi.org/10.5902/1984686X3209

- Völlinger, V. A., & Supanc, M. (2020). Student teachers' attitudes towards cooperative learning in inclusive education. European Journal of
- Psychology of Education, 35(3), 727-749. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-019-00435-7 H. (1985). The gap between theory and practice. European Journal of Teacher Education, 8(3), 307-317. https://doi.org/10.1080/0261976850080308 Vonk,
- Wilkins, T., & Nietfeld, J. L. (2004). The effect of a school-wide inclusion training programme upon teachers' attitudes about inclusion.
- Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 4(3), 115-121. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2004.00026.x E. (2006). Preparing new teachers for inclusive schools and classroom. Support for Learning, 21(2), 85-91. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9604.2006.00409.x Winter,
- Zabalza, M. A. (2004). Curricular design and development. Madrid: Narcea.
- Zabalza, M. A. (2014). Internship and practices in professional contexts in university education. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and fieldexperiences in college and university-based teacher education. Revista Educação, 35(3), 479-504. https://doi.org/10.5902/198464442357
- Zeichner, K., Payne, K., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 66(2), 122-135.

Asian Online Journal Publishing Group is not responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability, etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content. Any queries should be directed to the corresponding author of the article.