

# **EFL teacher training needs and perceived preparedness to include dyslexic learners: The case of Greece, Cyprus and Poland**

**Joanna Nijakowska | Dina Tsagari | George Spanoudis**

## **Abstract**

This study examines the effect of demographic variables on the beliefs of teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) about their preparedness to include dyslexic learners in mainstream classrooms in Greece, Cyprus and Poland and identifies their professional development needs. Statistically significant MANOVA effects were obtained for country, training, teaching experience with dyslexic learners and school type. Unlike overall teaching experience and completed level of education (degree), the type of teaching experience with dyslexic EFL learners (direct contact and personal involvement in teaching) seems to shape the perception of teacher preparedness to successfully include these learners. Other interesting tendencies were identified such as between-country differences concerning sources of prior professional knowledge on EFL and dyslexia as well as preferences for particular modes of training. The paper highlights the demand for professional training on EFL and dyslexia as this was confirmed across the three countries.

*Keywords:* dyslexia, foreign language, teacher preparedness, teacher training, inclusive teaching practices

## **INTRODUCTION**

Dyslexia is a subtype of specific learning difficulties, referred to as SpLD (e.g. Kormos, 2017a). Dyslexic learners, together with students with other SpLD (e.g. attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder – ADHD, autistic spectrum disorder – ASD, dyspraxia, dyscalculia) belong to a group of learners with special educational needs (SEN) (Author1, 2010). In this paper we focus specifically on dyslexia in the context of L2 (foreign/additional language) instructed learning and teaching. Literacy acquisition in the L1 (native language) as well as L2 may pose considerable challenges for many students with dyslexia. For example, dyslexic individuals experience problems with L1 processing which vary in scope and intensity

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Nijakowska J, Tsagari D, Spanoudis G. English as a foreign language teacher training needs and perceived preparedness to include dyslexic learners: The case of Greece, Cyprus, and Poland. *Dyslexia*. 2018;24(4):357-379, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dys.1598>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

depending on the transparency of the orthographic system of a language. Such problems are mainly identified at the phonological level and manifested by poor word-level decoding and spelling. These are often coupled with difficulties in L2 literacy development. Actually, the underlying processes (e.g. phonological processing, processing speed, working memory, attention control) in L1 and L2 literacy development seem to be interrelated (e.g. Kormos, 2017a, 2017b; Kormos & Smith, 2012; Author1, 2010; Peer & Reid, 2016; Sparks, Patton, Ganschow, Humbach & Javorsky, 2006; Schneider & Crombie, 2003; Author2 & Author3, 2013).

Foreign language learners with dyslexia should benefit from a positive and motivating learning environment the same way as their peers with no specific learning difficulties. Therefore, they need to be exposed to differentiated, inclusive teaching practices and, if required, individualised support, which, in turn, can only be provided by well-trained teachers (Colleague & Author1, 2017). Inclusive teaching involves recognizing and meeting diverse learning needs and characteristics, creating and expanding opportunities for active learning and participation, thus securing equal rights of these students for high quality education (Forlin, 2013; Loreman, Deppeler & Harvey, 2011; Sharma, Forlin, Deppeler & Guang-xue, 2013). Therefore, appropriate inclusive teacher training and teacher preparedness to implement inclusive instructional practices are crucial (European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, 2012; Forlin, 2010, 2012; Hettiarachchi & Das, 2014; Robinson, 2017).

However, EFL teachers often lack the necessary knowledge and skills to adjust their teaching approach towards dyslexics. They report that they often find diversifying and adjusting teaching methods, tasks and modes of presentation or assessment troublesome (Author1, 2014). Foreign language teachers, including EFL teachers, also tend to have considerable concerns and demonstrate rather low levels of perceived self-efficacy with regard to implementing inclusive teaching practices with dyslexic foreign language learners

(Colleague & Author1, 2017). Training for inclusion of learners with dyslexia offered to EFL teachers in the European context is limited (Author1 & colleague, 2016; Author1, 2014, 2015; Author1 et al. 2016; Author2 & colleague, 2017).

The provision of adequate and sufficient initial and in-service teacher training on inclusion impacts positively on the teacher's perceived preparedness to teach in inclusive environments, indicating greater perceived confidence and self-efficacy in applying appropriate inclusive instructional classroom practices (Ahsan et al., 2013; Coady et al., 2016; Das, Gichuru & Singh, 2013; Florian & Rouse, 2009; Hettiarachchi & Das, 2014; Colleague & Author1, 2017). Low levels of perceived preparedness may trigger the development of negative beliefs about inclusion (e.g. Das, Kuyini & Desai, 2013). Research findings indicate that teachers with greater awareness of self-efficacy, lower levels of anxiety and positive beliefs and stance relating to individual learner differences and inclusion prove more successful in implementing inclusive instructional practices in their classrooms (e.g. De Neve, Devos & Tuytens, 2015; Sharma & Sokal, 2016).

Answering the questions such as how to prepare EFL teachers to work with dyslexic students in inclusive classrooms, how to enhance their knowledge and skills, and how to boost their self-efficacy beliefs is crucial in the light of accumulating evidence confirming that many students with dyslexia experience difficulties in learning additional languages (for a review see Kormos, 2017a). The current study identifies and compares the influence of a number of demographic variables on the Cypriot, Polish and Greek EFL teachers' perceived preparedness to include dyslexic learners in mainstream classrooms. The study also examines the EFL teachers' professional training needs on dyslexia and inclusive instructional practices.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher beliefs underlie the decision making processes and can shape teacher behaviour in the classroom. They can be defined as premises or propositions (often implicit, unvoiced or not openly expressed) that teachers accept to be true. These propositions can be emotionally loaded, can trigger or inhibit teachers' actions, can carry an evaluative power and can be resistant to change (Borg, 2009, 2011; Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015). Borg (2015) stresses that teachers' beliefs are powerful in that they can impact particular teachers' instructional practices in an enduring and long-lasting way. What is more, they can effectively counterbalance the effects of teacher education in this respect. Deep-seated and unshakable beliefs can permeate not only teachers' actions but also their reactions and interpretations of new information and experiences, including educational changes (e.g. the ones induced by inclusion). Some of these beliefs can be formed even before teachers start their training and can be influenced by their own learning experience (e.g. Moodie, 2016). However, what teachers do in the classrooms is not always compatible with their stated beliefs (Basturkmen 2012; Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015). Importantly, there seem to exist a two-way interaction between teacher beliefs and teachers' instructional practices and their classroom behaviour. This means that teacher beliefs on teaching and learning can be altered by new experience and educational practice (Borg, 2015). This finding is especially comforting in light of the changes in a number of well-established and routine educational procedures forced by the promotion and diffusion of inclusive educational practices.

Teachers' self-perception of their ability to perform in the teaching/learning environment rather than the actual behaviour and level of competence forms the ground for teacher's self-efficacy beliefs (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). A teacher self-efficacy belief, powerful enough to influence both teachers' and students' actions and thoughts, can be defined as “ (...) a judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes

of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, p. 783).

There are a number of studies on teacher self-efficacy beliefs relating to implementing inclusive instructional practices in mainstream education which focus on in-service teachers (e.g. Forlin, Sharma & Loreman, 2014; Malinen, Savolainen & Xu, 2012; Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, 2007) as well as general and special education pre-service teachers (e.g. Leyser, Zeiger & Romi, 2011). Also, pre-service and in-service general education teacher concerns about inclusion of learners with SEN in mainstream classrooms (e.g. Ahsan, Deppeler & Sharma, 2013; Forlin & Cooper, 2013; Forlin, Sharma & Loreman, 2014; Sharma, Forlin & Loreman, 2008) and teacher attitudes (e.g. Ahmmed, Sharma & Deppeler, 2012; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Forlin, Loreman, Sharma & Earle, 2009; Hsien) to inclusion and to teaching in inclusive classrooms have been examined. However, few studies touch specifically upon teacher beliefs on the inclusion of students with SpLD, and dyslexia in particular, in the foreign language teaching and learning context (e.g. Colleague & Author1, 2017; Rusak, 2016).

Research findings repeatedly point to the fact that general education teachers with greater awareness of self-efficacy, more positive attitudes and fewer concerns tend to implement inclusive instructional practices in their classrooms successfully and effectively (De Neve, Devos, & Tuytens, 2015; Sharma & Sokal, 2016). Investigations of teacher self-efficacy beliefs confirmed that in-service teachers’ perceptions of how efficacious they are in implementing inclusive instructional practices are interlinked to both their attitudes towards inclusion and their classroom behaviour (Forlin, Sharma & Loreman, 2014; Malinen, Savolainen & Xu, 2012; Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012; Takahashi, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Studies verifying predictors of teacher self-efficacy in in-service mainstream teachers stress the role of experience in teaching students with SEN.

Malinen et al. (2013) in their general education in-service teacher cross-country study (China, Finland and South Africa), showed that experience in teaching students with diverse disabilities and special educational needs was the strongest predictor of teachers' self-efficacy in all countries. Leyser, Zeiger and Romi (2011) also demonstrated that other demographic variables, such as years of pre-service education and training in inclusive education, can shape self-efficacy beliefs of general as well as special education pre-service teachers.

Overall, research studies have shown that the self-efficacy beliefs about inclusion and implementing inclusive instructional practices with SEN students which general education teachers affirm are related to and regulate their eagerness and devotion to teaching, their stamina and perseverance in handling difficulty and failure, as well as the way they respond to the demands of inclusive classroom environment. Teachers' effort, enthusiasm for professional development and reflection, quantity and quality of support they offer to their students with SEN are subject to the self-efficacy beliefs they adhere to. Generally, teachers with higher awareness of self-efficacy tend to demonstrate greater commitment to teaching, persistence, strength and resilience in the face of setbacks and understanding of individual differences and needs of their SEN learners. Investigations of pre-service and in-service foreign language teachers' beliefs have targeted multiple aspects of teacher classroom behaviour and instructional practices (e.g. Kissau, Algozzine & Yon; 2013; Kissau, Rodgers & Haudeck, 2014). However, research on EFL teacher self-efficacy beliefs with regards to inclusion, SEN, and SpLD, especially dyslexia, is still scarce (e.g. Colleague and Author1, 2017).

Research findings also affirm that teacher language-based content knowledge, background knowledge of inclusive practices, effective intervention programmes, and their underlying theoretical principles translate into teachers' self-confidence in the classroom (e.g. Brady et al., 2009; Kahn-Horwitz, 2015, 2016; McCutchen et al., 2002; McCutchen, Green, Abbott, & Sanders, 2009; Podhajski, Mather, Nathan, & Sammons, 2009). This background

knowledge and understanding of the nature of dyslexic learning difficulties, in turn, form the bases of the appropriate instruction offered to dyslexic individuals (Aladwani & Al Shaye, 2012; Bos, Mather, Dickson, Podhajski, & Chard, 2001; Moats & Foorman, 2003; Moats, 2009; Washburn, Joshi, & Binks-Cantrell, 2011a, b).

Limited teacher knowledge in the abovementioned areas can be at least partially attributed to insufficient and/or inadequate initial and in-service teacher training (Joshi et al., 2009; Goldfus, 2012). At the same time, the importance and effectiveness of adequate professional teacher training in increasing this background knowledge has been stressed in previous studies (e.g. Brady et al. 2009, Goldfus, 2012; Kahn-Horwitz, 2015, 2016; McCutchen et al., 2009; Podhajski et al., 2009). Considerable attention was given to researching general preservice and in-service teacher education towards inclusion (e.g. European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, 2012; Robinson, 2017) and verifying the effectiveness of various types of teacher training with a view to increasing teacher self-efficacy in implementing inclusive instructional practices, enhancing positive attitudes and reducing concerns towards inclusion (e.g. Campbell, Gilmore & Cuskelly, 2003; Chao, Forlin & Ho, 2016; Florian, 2012; Forlin, Sharma & Loreman, 2014; Lai, Li, Ji, Wong & Lo, 2016; Peebles & Mondaglio, 2014; Sharma & Sokal, 2015; Symeonidou & Phtiaka, 2009, 2014). However, few studies are available which focus on the EFL teacher knowledge of inclusive education principles, inclusive instructional practices, the nature of SEN, and SpLD (dyslexia in particular) as well as on EFL teachers' professional training needs. For instance, Russak (2016) examined EFL teachers' practices and attitudes towards the inclusion of pupils with SEN in Israel. The findings of this study indicate that the majority of EFL teachers felt that pupils with SEN should be placed and taught in special education environments with specialised materials rather than in regular mainstream education settings. Colleague and Author1 (2017) investigated the effectiveness of a massive open online course (MOOC) in terms of raising

foreign language teachers' self-efficacy and changing attitudes to using inclusive instructional practices with dyslexic students. Author1 (2014; 2015) examined foreign language teachers' professional training needs on inclusive practices and dyslexia and found out that EFL teachers have limited background knowledge concerning language learning processes of students with dyslexia and inclusive instructional practices and are not offered appropriate initial and in-service training opportunities. This state of affairs not only exerts impact on EFL teachers' beliefs about their preparedness for inclusion but also, potentially, threatens the provision of high quality inclusive foreign language teaching to dyslexic students. Further studies in the L2 context are needed to investigate the factors that influence teachers' ability to face the challenges of accommodating dyslexic EFL students in mainstream classes, teachers' professional training needs as well as the structure of the most effective professional training programmes regarding the nature of dyslexia and inclusive instructional practices in the EFL context.

## METHOD

### **Research questions**

The aim of this exploratory study is to investigate the influence of a number of theoretically driven demographic variables on EFL teachers' beliefs concerning their TEPID – Teacher of English Preparedness to Include Dyslexics. To this end, six research questions concerning the following variables were examined: the country teachers work in, the level of training, the overall teaching experience, the type of experience relating to teaching dyslexic EFL learners, the completed level of teachers' education (degree) and the type of school teachers work at. The study also examines the differences between teachers' professional training needs on EFL and dyslexia across countries. The following research questions were addressed:



- 1) Do pre- and in-service EFL teachers from Greece, Cyprus and Poland differ with regard to beliefs about their preparedness to include EFL learners with dyslexia in mainstream classrooms (TEPID)?
- 2) Do pre-service EFL teachers (teacher trainees) differ from in-service EFL teachers on TEPID?
- 3) Does the overall teaching experience (operationalized as years of teaching) have an impact on the in-service EFL teachers' TEPID?
- 4) Does the type of experience relating to teaching dyslexic EFL learners have an impact on the in-service EFL teachers' TEPID?
- 5) Do in-service EFL teachers with higher levels of education (degrees) differ from teachers with lower levels of education (degrees) on TEPID?
- 6) Does the type of school in-service EFL teachers work at have an impact on TEPID?
- 7) Is there a difference between in-service teachers' professional training needs on EFL and dyslexia across countries?

## **Participants**

Overall data was collected from 832 respondents. Only complete responses from 546 participants (155 Greek-Cypriot, 233 Greek and 158 Polish teachers) with an average age of 30 years were taken into analysis. The sample included 52 (9.5%) males and 494 (90.5%) females. A total of 546 EFL teachers (80% EFL in-service and 20% pre-service teachers) completed the survey questionnaires. 29.1% of teachers hold BA degree, 52.7% an MA and 6.2% hold a PhD. Most of the study participants (54.2%) had over 10 years of teaching experience, while 9% had no teaching experience. The majority of respondents (66.9%) had some teaching experience with dyslexic learners, which involved teaching regular classes with some students with dyslexia (45.2%), teaching special classes for students with dyslexia (9.7%)

and conducting one-to-one sessions with dyslexic learners (12%). Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the study population.

Table 1. Demographics of the study population

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N =546</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>Level of training</b>		
pre-service	109	20
in-service	437	80
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	52	9.5
Female	494	90.5
<b>Age (years)</b>		
25 or below	125	22.9
26-35	141	25.8
35-45	185	33.9
46 or above	95	17.4
<b>Nationality</b>		
Greece	233	42.7
Cyprus	155	28.4
Poland	158	28.9
<b>Completed level of EFL teachers' education (degree)</b>		
Secondary School	53	9.7
Bachelor's Degree	159	29.1
Master's Degree	288	52.7
PhD	34	6.2
Other	12	2.2
<b>Overall teaching experience</b>		
No teaching experience	49	9.0
1-5 years of teaching experience	126	23.1
6-10 years of teaching experience	75	13.7
More than 10 years of teaching experience	296	54.2
<b>Experience teaching dyslexic EFL learners*</b>		
Classes without students with dyslexia	239	26.9
Classes with some students with dyslexia	402	45.2
Special classes for students with dyslexia	86	9.7
One-to-one sessions with dyslexic children	107	12
Not applicable**	69	11.2
More than one category***	56	6.3
<b>Level of school teachers work at*</b>		
Kindergarten	38	4.3
Primary school	217	24.6
Lower secondary school	116	13.2
Upper secondary school	122	13.8
College, University	56	6.4
Language school	115	13.0
One-to-one tuition	180	20.4
Not applicable**	48	7.8
More than one category***	38	4.3
<b>Age of students (in years)*</b>		
Under 5	31	3.7
6-12	313	37.4
13-15	204	24.3
16-18	142	16.9
Older than 18	115	13.7
Not applicable**	38	8.2

Note: \*in this question the respondents had a possibility to choose more than one category.

Note: \*\* we decided to omit from further analysis the 'Not applicable' item responses, after we checked and found that they are randomly distributed and are not concentrated among a specific part of our sample.

Note: \*\*\*number of respondents who selected more than one category in this question.

## **Instrument**

Motivated by the DysTEFL-Needs Analysis Questionnaire (Autor1, 2014), a new questionnaire was developed. The DysTEFL-Needs Analysis Questionnaire Revised (DysTEFL-NAQ-R) measures the pre- and in-service EFL teacher beliefs about their preparedness to include dyslexic EFL learners in mainstream classrooms (TEPID) and verifies EFL teacher professional training needs on dyslexia and inclusive instructional practices. The questionnaire (see Appendix) comprises three parts. Part A includes nine background questions about demographic information relating to the participants' age, gender, level of training, degree, country where they teach or study to become teachers, overall teaching experience, type of experience in teaching students with dyslexia, type of school they teach at and their students' age (more than one answer could be selected to the last three questions). Part B relates to EFL teachers' beliefs about their preparedness to include dyslexic EFL learners in mainstream classrooms and was operationalized in the TEPID scale consisting of 24 items measured on a six-point Likert scale (1 = *definitely not true of me* and 6 = *definitely true of me*). Finally, Part C comprises four questions relating to prior training on dyslexia and inclusive instructional practices, as well as professional training needs. Participants could select more than one option in the questions concerning the preferred format of the training, content/topics, tasks and activities.

## **Procedure**

In order to ensure the instrument's reliability and validity three external evaluators, who were experts in the field of dyslexia, teaching foreign languages and inclusive education, were asked to evaluate the appropriateness of the instrument. After the evaluators' comments, several changes were made that led to a reduced number of items and made the instrument more reader-friendly. Following this, the questionnaire was piloted (Cohen et al., 2013) with one hundred experienced and pre-service EFL teachers who did not take part in the subsequent study (20% in Poland, 40% in Greece, and 40% in Cyprus). The pilot group possessed similar characteristics with the participants of the main study. The reliabilities for the individual statements of the TEPID scale ranged from .80 to .93, indicating a high level of internal consistency of the statements (Dörnyei, 2010, p. 94). Finally, the questionnaire was

administered online using the Survey Monkey tool through local EFL teachers' associations, conferences and events and personal networks. A letter to teachers was appended at the beginning of the survey informing teachers of the purpose of the study and clarifying that participation was voluntary and anonymous.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### **Data Screening**

SPSS 22 was used for the statistical analysis. At first, the data were cleaned and screened for missing data patterns and univariate outliers. Only completed questionnaires were used in the analysis. The minimum amount of data for factor analysis was satisfied, with a final sample size of at least 155 participants per ethnic group, with over 6 cases per variable.

### **Factor analyses and measurement invariance analysis of the TEPID scale**

The factorability of the 24 TEPID scale items was examined across the three samples. By performing a principal components analysis (PCA) on all data across the three samples, a two-factor solution was derived (Author1, Author2 & Author3, submitted for publication). Two factors which underlie the construct of TEPID relate to: 1) beliefs about possessed knowledge of dyslexia and self-efficacy in implementing inclusive instructional practices with dyslexic learners and to 2) beliefs about general inclusion principles towards dyslexic FL learners. We labelled the factors as follows: 1) 'knowledge and skills' and 2) 'stance towards inclusion'. The factor analysis also revealed that two items from the scale (items 1 and 11) were not functioning as expected. This was because they did not load onto any of the two factors that the remaining 22 items loaded onto but instead they loaded onto two additional factors with a very similar factor loading. These items were removed from further analysis.

For the Cypriot sample, the initial eigenvalues showed that the first factor explained 44.9% of the variance and the second factor 11.9% of the variance. The two factor oblimin solution explained overall 56.8% of the variance. For the Greek sample, the initial eigenvalues showed that the first factor explained 43.8% of the variance and the second factor 10.8% of the variance. Overall, the two factor solution explained 54.6% of the variance. For the Polish sample, the initial eigenvalues showed that the first factor explained 48.5% of the variance and the second factor 11.3% of the variance. Again the two factor solution explained 59.8% of the variance.

Measurement invariance analysis (MI) supported the assumption of metric measurement equivalence of the TEPID scale scores across countries having provided no

evidence that the factor structure and factor loadings varied significantly among the groups. The achieved level of measurement invariance confirms the generalizability of the TEPID across all subgroups and allows valid comparisons between groups. Composite scores were computed for each of the two factors, based on the mean of the items which had their primary loadings on each factor. The skewness and kurtosis were well within a tolerable range for assuming a normal distribution and the examination of the histograms suggested that the distributions looked approximately normal. Although an oblimin rotation was used, only weak correlations between the composite scores existed ranging from .03 to .38 across the three samples. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the two factors were 0.96 and 0.82, respectively.

### **Effect of demographic variables on TEPID**

A series of one-way MANOVAs were conducted to verify the influence of a number of demographic variables on EFL teachers' beliefs relating to their preparedness to include EFL learners with dyslexia.

A one-way multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was conducted to answer the first research question (RQ1) and to check whether there would be differences between country levels (Greece, Cyprus, Poland) and teachers' beliefs about their preparedness to include EFL learners with dyslexia in mainstream classrooms. The Box's M value of 28.77 was associated with a  $p$  value of .006, which was interpreted as non-significant based on Huberty and Petoskey's (2000) guidelines (i.e.,  $p < .005$ ). Thus, the covariance matrices between the ethnic groups were assumed to be equal for the purposes of the MANOVA. This means that participating teachers conceptualized both underlying TEPID factors similarly. A statistically significant MANOVA effect was obtained, Wilks'  $\lambda = .91$ ,  $F(6, 1054) = 8.80$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta squared = .05. The multivariate effect size implies that only 5% of the variance in the dependent variables was accounted for by country level.

Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for each factor were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA indicating that the two factors were significantly different for teachers from the three countries [ $F(2,529) = 8.34$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .031$ ,  $F(2,529) = 7.26$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .027$ ,  $F(2,529) = 9.39$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .034$ , respectively]. Using the Bonferroni method for controlling Type I error rates for multiple comparisons, each ANOVA was tested at the .05 level. Post hoc analysis for each factor consisted of conducting pairwise comparisons to determine which ethnic group's beliefs on preparedness to include students with dyslexia were higher. Each pairwise comparison was tested at the .025/3, or .008, significance level. The analyses showed that there was a significant pairwise difference between Greek teachers and

the other two nationalities across the first and second factor with respect to beliefs about their preparedness to include foreign language learners with dyslexia in mainstream classrooms (see Table 2). This suggests that Greek pre- and in-service teachers, unlike their Polish and Cypriot colleagues, tended to express more optimistic and positive beliefs concerning their preparedness to include EFL dyslexic learners. This held true with regard to their perceived knowledge of the nature of dyslexia, self-efficacy in employing inclusive instructional practices, as well as their attitude towards general principles of inclusion. This is an important finding which requires further exploration in order to identify the reasons why Greek EFL teachers perceive themselves to be more competent and better prepared to include dyslexics. In an earlier study Author1 (2014) also found significant country (where teachers teach or study to teach) effect in relation to received training on dyslexia and inclusive practices, indicating considerable differences in availability and quality of both initial and in-service EFL teacher training schemes across six European countries

A second one-way MANOVA was employed to examine whether pre-service teachers (teacher trainees) differ from in-service teachers in their beliefs about their preparedness to include foreign language learners with dyslexia in mainstream classrooms (RQ2). A non-significant Box's  $M$  was conducted, indicating that the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrix assumption was not violated. A statistically significant MANOVA effect was obtained, Wilks'  $\lambda = .93$ ,  $F(3, 528) = 12.31$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta squared = .065. The multivariate effect size implies that only 6.5% of the variance in the dependent variables was accounted for by the level of teacher training (pre- or in-service). Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for each factor were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA indicating that the first and second factors were significantly different for pre- and in-service teachers [ $F(1, 530) = 27.76$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .050$ ,  $F(1, 530) = 17.38$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .032$ , respectively].

As shown in Table 2, in-service teachers across three countries believe that they are capable of accommodating the learning needs of EFL learners with dyslexia better than pre-service teachers. This finding may indicate that lower level of perceived preparedness among pre-service EFL teachers may be linked to very limited direct contact and teaching experience, as well as to a type of teaching experience with dyslexic EFL learners rather than overall teaching experience (operationalised as years in teaching profession), the completed level of education or the type of school teachers work at. This assumption could be supported by our findings concerning RQ 3, 4, 5 and 6, which are discussed below. It is also consistent with other studies. For instance, Sharma et al. (2008) verified the effects of training regarding inclusive education on trainee teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive practices, as

well as their sentiments about disabled individuals. They demonstrated that course participants who were given the opportunity to experience direct and systematic contact with people with disabilities in order to better understand the nature of their disabling conditions, had a different attitude. These participants also had the chance to manage directly the concerns they had via the assignments set in the course. Overall, they had more positive and favorable feelings concerning the inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream classrooms compared to trainees who were not provided with similar training conditions.

In a similar vein, Campbell et al. (2003) demonstrated that trainee teachers' attitudes towards inclusion were boosted as a result of training when the course incorporated structured and direct contact with people with disabilities (structured fieldwork experiences or experiential learning). Leysner, Zeiger and Romi (2011) confirmed that experience with children with special educational needs can shape self-efficacy beliefs of pre-service teachers in the context of general and special education. Peebles and Mondaglio (2014) found that both the inclusion course and the field experience (working with and planning for individual and small groups of learners) produced significant gains in pre-service teachers' self-efficacy. Moreover, Ahsan, Deppeler and Sharma (2013) proved that appropriate curriculum (course) content was more important for teacher preparedness than the length of the program. However, mere attendance of an inclusive pre-service teacher education course does not guarantee the development of positive attitudes and beliefs about inclusive practices (Angelides, Stylianou & Gibbs, 2006; Forlin et al., 2010). It is the quality of curriculum content, practicum opportunities and experience with children with disabilities that contribute considerably to better preparedness of pre-service teachers for inclusive classrooms.

A third one-way MANOVA was used to answer whether the overall teaching experience influences the in-service EFL teachers' beliefs on preparedness to include students with dyslexia (RQ3). A statistically non-significant MANOVA effect was obtained, Wilks'  $\lambda = .97$ ,  $F(9, 1032) = 0.12$ ,  $p = .12$ . Irrespective of the years of teaching experience in-service EFL teachers had, their responses did not vary on both factors. This is taken to mean that overall teaching experience does not impact on the in-service EFL teachers' beliefs about their preparedness to include EFL learners with dyslexia in mainstream classrooms. This echoes a similar finding of a study investigating EFL teacher preparedness and training needs on EFL, dyslexia and inclusive practices (Author1, 2014) where the effect of the overall teaching experience proved non-significant. Apparently, it is not the general teaching experience but rather the specific teaching experience with EFL dyslexic learners that seems to improve EFL teacher preparedness to include these learners.

A fourth one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine the hypothesis that the in-service teachers' type of experience regarding teaching dyslexic EFL learners had an impact on their beliefs about preparedness to successfully include these learners (RQ4). A non-significant Box's  $M$  indicated that the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrix assumption was not violated. A statistically significant MANOVA effect was obtained, Wilks'  $\lambda = .84$ ,  $F(12, 1119) = 6.35$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta squared = .056. The multivariate effect size implies that only 5.6% of the variance in the dependent variables was accounted for by the in-service teachers' type of experience regarding teaching dyslexic EFL learners. Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for each factor were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA indicating that both factors were significantly different for the types of experience of in-service teachers relating to teaching dyslexic learners [ $F(4,425) = 14.77$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .12$ ,  $F(4,425) = 2.98$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .027$ , respectively]. A series of post-hoc analyses (Bonferroni test) were performed to examine individual mean difference comparisons across all five types of experience concerning working with students with dyslexia and both TEPID factors. The results revealed that all post-hoc mean comparisons were statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) for the first factor. In all cases, except for the 'More than one category', the trend of the effect was linear. That is, as shown in Table 2, on average, in-service teachers who taught classes without dyslexic students scored lower than the teachers who worked with dyslexics in the classes they taught. These in turn scored lower than those who taught special classes for dyslexia, and, finally, these teachers scored lower than the ones who worked on individual bases with dyslexic learners in one-to-one sessions. The same pattern of significant pairwise comparisons was observed in the second factor. This means that the type and quality (the level of individualization and differentiation) of experience relating to teaching EFL dyslexic learners has a significant impact on EFL in-service teachers' perceptions of their level of preparedness for inclusion of these learners. Active personal participation in inclusive activities, individual and direct contact and authentic first-hand teaching experience with dyslexic EFL learners promote better understanding of these learners' needs and translate into increased preparedness to successfully include them in mainstream FL education. This is in line with the findings of previous studies verifying the predictors of teacher self-efficacy in in-service teachers which stress the role of experience in teaching students with disabilities. For instance, Malinen et al. (2013) showed that experience in teaching students with disabilities was the strongest predictor of in-service teachers' self-efficacy in inclusive settings. One of the implications of this study was that successful development of teachers' efficacy in inclusive teaching is subject to the



amount and quality of opportunities to be involved in inclusive activities with special SEN learners.

A fifth one-way MANOVA was conducted to answer the fifth research question (RQ5) whether in-service teachers with higher levels of education (degree) differ from teachers with lower levels of education in their beliefs on accommodating the learning needs of students with dyslexia. A statistically non-significant MANOVA effect was obtained, Wilks'  $\lambda = .97$ ,  $F(9, 1032) = 0.12$ ,  $p = .24$ . This means that irrespective of their level of education, respondents did not differ in their perceived levels of preparedness for inclusion of dyslexic EFL students.

A sixth one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine whether the type of school in-service teachers work at has an impact on TEPID (RQ6). In order to make the analysis more cohesive we merged the categories of the 'Level of school teachers work at' variable. The new variable included five categories: elementary (kindergarten and primary school), secondary (lower and upper secondary school), university (college and university), language school, and one-to-one tuition. A non-significant Box's  $M$  indicated that the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrix assumption was not violated. A significant MANOVA effect was obtained, Wilks'  $\lambda = .96$ ,  $F(8, 904) = 2.14$ ,  $p = .03$ , partial eta squared = .019. The multivariate effect size implies that only 1.9 % of the variance in the dependent variables was accounted for the level of school where teachers work. Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for each factor were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA indicating that the first factor, but not the second, was significantly different for the type of school in-service teachers worked at [ $F(4,453) = 3.86$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $F(4,453) = 1.78$ ,  $p = .13$ ,  $\eta^2 = .01$ , respectively]. A series of post-hoc analyses (Bonferroni test) were performed to examine individual mean difference comparisons across all five types of schools teacher worked at with dyslexic students on the first factor. The results revealed a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the in-service EFL teachers who worked at kindergarten and/or primary schools and teachers who worked on one-to-one tuition basis. The respondents who worked at kindergarten and/or primary schools tended to perceive themselves to be less prepared to include dyslexic learners in the classes they teach in terms of knowledge on the nature of dyslexia and ability to implement inclusive instruction practices and strategies than teachers working with older students at lower and upper secondary schools, colleges, and universities, as well as in private schools (the differences here were not statistically significant though). Teachers at kindergarten and/or primary schools also perceived their preparedness lower than EFL teachers who offer one-to-one tuition to dyslexics (the difference was statistically significant). This might be potentially explained by the nature, type and quality of the teaching experience related to teaching on one-

to-one basis (focus on one student, full attention to individual learning needs and difficulties, tailored-made teaching), which is consistent with the findings relating to RQ4.

Table 2. Means, standard deviations and significant multivariate effects of six independent variables on the two factors.

Variables	Levels	F1		F2		F
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<b>Country</b>	Cyprus	63.33	16.59	31.73	3.46	8.80**
	Greece	69.08	14.61	32.72	2.69	
	Poland	63.00	19.06	31.67	3.15	
<b>Level of training</b>	Pre-service	58.01	17.59	31.01	3.50	12.31**
	In-service	67.52	16.07	32.41	2.93	
<b>Overall teaching experience (in-service teachers)</b>	No experience	56.00	23.94	32.40	3.28	1.56
	1-5 years of experience	67.51	15.31	32.12	3.58	
	6-10 years of experience	66.62	14.98	31.92	2.92	
	> 10 years of experience	67.95	16.39	32.60	2.72	
<b>Type of experience teaching dyslexic EFL learners (in-service teachers)</b>	Classes without students with dyslexia	55.85	15.67	31.57	3.45	6.35**
	Classes with some students with dyslexia	66.68	16.41	32.24	2.74	
	Special classes for students with dyslexia	70.56	11.96	32.66	2.73	
	One-to-one sessions with dyslexic children	74.55	12.90	33.13	2.92	
	More than one category	50.83	17.21	31.33	4.80	
<b>Completed level of teachers' education (degree) (in-service teachers)</b>	Secondary	12.06	31.37	3.42	7.75	1.28
	Bachelor	16.66	32.87	2.71	8.12	
	Master	15.51	32.31	3.03	8.04	
	PhD	18.50	31.72	2.55	8.03	
<b>Type of school teachers work at (in-service teachers) ***</b>	Kindergarten or/and primary school	62.15	16.87	31.39	4.61	2.14*
	Lower- or/and upper secondary school	67.24	15.29	32.24	3.51	
	College, University	64.91	19.67	32.09	2.89	
	Language school	70.12	13.69	32.51	2.50	
	One-to-one tuition	69.30	15.89	32.55	3.22	

Note: \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\*in this variable the 'more than one category' level disappears, because of merging the first four choices (kindergarten with primary school and lower with upper secondary school).

### Professional training needs

Four questions were administered regarding professional training on EFL and dyslexia. The first question refers to prior training and presents teachers' further training needs. It includes four statements and asks participants to indicate to what extent these statements are true on a Likert scale of 1 (*definitely not true of me*) - 6 (*definitely true of me*). The remaining three questions focused on course content and format (they all allowed the selection of multiple answers). The analysis included only the in-service EFL teachers.

As shown in Table 3, more than half of the teachers indicated that they did not gain their knowledge on EFL and dyslexia during courses offered to them by colleges, universities and teacher training institutions (33% of teachers strongly supported this statement), which may suggest that the training offered to these teachers was insufficient and/or inadequate). Only 10.4% strongly agreed with the statement that they gained knowledge on EFL and dyslexia during the courses provided as part of their initial or continuing professional development. The majority of respondents admitted that they were self-educated in the area of teaching English as a foreign language to dyslexic learners and learned from available resources. Most teachers (94.4%) felt they needed more information on the language teaching methods effective with dyslexic learners, while 62.5% were determined to learn more. 90.7% of teachers showed some interest in further training on EFL, dyslexia and inclusive practices, while 53.3% were strong-minded about joining professional development courses in this area. The above findings clearly confirm great demand for professional development opportunities in this area and are consistent with previous research on EFL teachers' training needs (Author1, 2014). Previous research indicates that irrespective of the country where teachers taught or studied to teach and prior training in the area of EFL, dyslexia and inclusion, the vast majority of the study participants expressed a clear need for further training. This seems to confirm a rather unfavorable assumption that professional training needs of EFL teachers in the European context are not particularly well-recognized and met and that the content of the training schemes might need considerable changes.

Table 3. EFL teachers' prior training and professional training needs on dyslexia and inclusive instructional practices (in %).

Questions	definitely not true of me	mostly not true of me	somewhat not true of me	somewhat true of me	mostly true of me	definitely true of me
I learnt about how to teach English to learners with dyslexia in my courses at college/university/teacher training institutions.	33	16.1	7.0	21.1	12.5	10.4
I learned about how to teach English to learners with dyslexia on my own from available resources.	12.8	7.3	9.3	26.4	26.4	17.8
I feel the need for more information on the language teaching methods effective with dyslexic learners.	1.3	2.2	2.2	10.3	21.6	62.5
I am interested in further training in the area of teaching English to learners with dyslexia.	1.6	4.0	3.7	13.2	24.2	53.3

The second question addresses the ideal format of training on EFL and dyslexia. 19% of the participants selected printed self-study materials, 20.5% online learning course, 25% online resources that can be used for self-study, 33.9% face-to-face training workshop and 1.6%

indicated other preferred training formats. The third question addressed the participants' preferred content of a training course and listed nine possible topics, that is, nature of dyslexia (8.8%), learning difficulties associated with dyslexia (12.6%), problems dyslexia causes in language learning (14.1%), assessment of learners with dyslexia in the language classroom (13.3%), how dyslexia is diagnosed (9.1%), accommodations that learners with dyslexia are entitled to in high-stakes exams (8.9%), language teaching techniques that assist language learners with dyslexia (17.2%), general teaching and classroom management tips for teaching language learners with dyslexia (15.7%) and other topics (0.4%). The results showed that teachers were mostly interested in applied, hands-on and practical content which could help them tackle everyday teaching challenges. To this end, they wanted to learn about specific problems dyslexic learners experience while studying a foreign language, as well as how to respond to special learning needs and successfully assist these learners with particular teaching, assessment and classroom management techniques. Still, even though learning about theoretical aspects of inclusion is not particularly favored by the teachers, it is recommended these topics are included in the training as improved knowledge of legislation and policy was shown to predict increase in in-service teachers' teaching efficacy (Forlin, Sharma & Loreman, 2014).

The fourth question pertaining to possibly useful components (tasks and activities) of a training course lists twelve choices, namely, brief lectures (7.9%), reading articles (6.2%), reading book chapters (3.1%), reading online resource materials (7.6%), watching videos of classrooms (13.5%), listening to/reading interviews with learners with dyslexia (9.9%), listening to/reading interviews with teachers of dyslexic learners (10.7%), learning how to design language teaching materials for learners with dyslexia (13.4%), evaluating language teaching materials designed for learners with dyslexia (9%), designing lesson plans so that the needs of learners with dyslexia are catered for (12.2%), evaluating lesson plans (6.3%), and other tasks and activities (0.3). The results show that, again, practically-oriented activities, such as examples of good practice, including watching videos of classrooms and hands-on tasks such as designing teaching materials seemed most appealing to teachers. Previous studies showed that the content of training and course pedagogy proved to be a powerful predictor of the trainees' attitudes, sentiments and concerns about inclusion (Sharma et al., 2008). Awareness of teachers' preferences and needs with regard to course design may allow for more refined choices and decisions about course content and format, which in turn, may increase their perceived preparedness for inclusion of dyslexic learners. Studies relating to both the initial teacher training (e.g. Sharma & Sokal, 2015) and continuing professional development

context (e.g. Symeonidou & Phtiaka, 2009, 2014) stress that in order to boost positive attitudes, self-efficacy beliefs and self-confidence, teacher training courses should address possible concerns that trainees may have about the practical aspects of implementing inclusive practices.

To test if there is a difference between EFL in-service teachers' professional training needs on EFL and dyslexia across countries (RQ7), four Chi-square tests of independence were calculated comparing the frequency of the four questions regarding professional training needs of Cypriot, Greek and Polish in-service EFL teachers. With respect to the first and second questions, a significant interaction was found [ $\chi^2(6) = 30.14, p < .001$  and  $\chi^2(8) = 15.64, p < .05$ , respectively]. Greek teachers were more likely to respond that it is definitely not true that they learnt how to teach English to learners with dyslexia in courses at college/university/teacher training institutions and that an ideal format for training on EFL and dyslexia is printed self-study materials than Cypriot or Polish teachers. In the third and fourth questions, no significant interaction was found [ $\chi^2(16) = 8.54, p = .93$  and  $\chi^2(22) = 24.12, p = .34$ , respectively]. These findings can imply that Polish and Cypriot teachers may be offered more and perhaps more diverse and attractive training opportunities during their studies and in-service development than Greek teachers but this assumption requires further qualitative research. Also, the choice of a training format may indicate that Greek teachers, unlike their Polish and Cypriot colleagues, are more likely to further learn about EFL and dyslexia on their own from available materials rather than to join other forms of professional training. Greek teachers' response style could also be attributed to country-level characteristics (e.g. power distance, collectivism or uncertainty avoidance and extraversion) often cited in the literature based on self-reference questionnaires such as ours (see Harzing, 2006). However the issue of variability in response styles of cross-national surveys falls outside the scope of the present study and merits further research.

## CONCLUSIONS

Cautious interpretation of the findings of this study is required due to its limitations. We investigated the impact of demographic variables on EFL teacher preparedness to include dyslexic EFL learners. The levels of preparedness were assessed based on the teachers' beliefs and perceptions, which were in no way substantiated by the observation of actual classroom practices. This carries the risk of an over- or under-estimation of the levels of preparedness. Using a mixed method approach and following the initial self-report instrument with the additional data collection method, for instance, observation, interview, think-aloud protocols

or written accounts like diaries, journals, could yield more reliable findings. Also, we obtained relatively small multivariate effect sizes for variables which influenced the examined construct, that is TEPID. This suggests that there might be a number of additional variables which should be taken into account.

The results of this study provide valuable insights into the pre-service and in-service EFL teachers' perceived preparedness to include dyslexic learners and into in-service EFL teachers' preferred professional training and continuing development needs, including the training content and methods (topics, tasks, activities) and delivery modes. These findings may constitute a good starting point in searching for solutions to design the most appropriate training options for the EFL teachers with regard to dyslexia and inclusive instructional practices.

The most important finding of our study is that the type of experience relating to teaching dyslexic EFL learners seems to shape the perception of teacher preparedness to successfully include these learners. Teachers working individually with dyslexic EFL students and teaching special classes for these students believe they are better prepared for inclusion than EFL teachers whose contact and teaching experience with dyslexics is more limited. Unlike overall teaching experience (operationalised in years of teaching) and completed level of education (degree), personal involvement in inclusion activities, direct contact and teaching experience with dyslexics appears to boost teachers' acceptance, understanding and self-confidence in employing inclusive instructional practices.

Our study demonstrated significant effects of the country (where teachers teach or study to teach) and the level of training (pre-service vs. in-service) on EFL teachers' beliefs on preparedness to include dyslexic EFL learners with regard to knowledge and skills, as well as stance for inclusion. Greek teachers believe they are better prepared for inclusion than their Polish and Cypriot colleagues and in-service teachers believe they are better prepared than pre-service teachers. More research is needed to specify the causes for these differences. We may only speculate that they may be in some way connected to the availability, amount and/or quality of the training opportunities on dyslexia, SpLD and inclusion offered to teachers in-training and practicing teachers in these three countries. Varying EFL teachers' perceived preparedness to include dyslexic learners may be linked to the differences in the aims, scope, content, methods and modes of the professional training available in these countries. The differences may also relate to specific requirements posed on teachers with regard to SEN (especially SpLD) education and inclusion by the national educational systems. Finally, teachers' motivation and stamina to self-educate, along with prevailing social attitudes and

expectations towards respecting individual learning differences in these countries may play a role.

The study findings also show that the type of school where teachers work had an effect on their perceived preparedness only with regard to the first factor (knowledge and skills) – teachers working individually with students at all levels of education believe they are better prepared for inclusion than other teachers, in particular kindergarten and primary school teachers. Our findings indicate that professional training opportunities offered to in-service teachers by teacher training institutions tend to be insufficient and that EFL teachers seek training materials and resources on their own to enhance their skills and knowledge on EFL and dyslexia. Also, a great majority of our study participants admitted that they need more knowledge in this area and are ready to undertake relevant training.

Our findings illustrate how EFL teacher professional training can be improved in terms of the content, methods and delivery modes to better meet teachers' needs and to allow them to better respond to the challenges set by the global inclusive education trends. Enhancing EFL teachers' preparedness to include dyslexic learners requires boosting their knowledge of dyslexia, SpLD, SEN, and inclusion as well as increasing their self-efficacy in implementing inclusive teaching practices. Promoting positive beliefs and attitudes to dyslexia and inclusion in teacher training is also crucial. To this end, a number of updates and changes in the European EFL teacher training schemes should be introduced so that appropriate and sufficient initial and in-service teacher training opportunities on the nature of dyslexia and inclusive practices are available (e.g. Author1 & colleague, 2016). The effects of training relating to gaining the critical skills, knowledge and social skills that EFL teachers need to possess to effectively include dyslexic students in the EFL classrooms need to be updated and incorporated in the training programmes. Importantly, contact and teaching practice – direct, personal, hands-on experience in teaching dyslexic EFL students should be incorporated into the EFL teacher training programmes.

In terms of future studies, there is a need for systematic examination of the EFL teacher preparedness to respond to the demands posed on by an inclusive approach to EFL education with regard to the implementation of differentiated instruction and the accommodation of special learning needs of EFL learners. Also, the effectiveness of diverse types of professional training in boosting teacher preparedness (knowledge and self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices), as well as the influence of the EFL teacher educators' educational background and self-efficacy beliefs on EFL trainee teachers' preparedness for inclusion need to be examined. Furthermore, comparing EFL teacher perceived preparedness for inclusion and

their actual classroom behaviour involving inclusive instructional practices, as well as exploring the relations between self-efficacy beliefs EFL teachers hold and their dyslexic learners' self-efficacy beliefs, the motivation to learn and the learners' achievements could make important contributions to our understanding of the teaching and learning processes in inclusive EFL context. Last but not least, more research is needed on the EFL teachers' preparedness to include learners who experience SpLD other than dyslexia, for instance students with ADHD or Asperger Syndrome.

## REFERENCES

- Author1 (2010) [details removed for peer review]
- Author1 (2014) [details removed for peer review]
- Author1 (2015) [details removed for peer review]
- Author1 & colleague (2016) [details removed for peer review]
- Author1 et al. (2016) [details removed for peer review]
- Author2 & Author3 (2013) [details removed for peer review]
- Author2 & colleague (2017) [details removed for peer review]
- Colleague & Author1 (2017) [details removed for peer review]
- Author1, Author2 & Author3 (submitted for publication) [details removed for peer review]
- Ahmed, M., Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. (2012). Variables affecting teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education in Bangladesh. *Journal of Research in Special Educational*, 12(3), 132–140. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01226.x
- Ahsan, M.T., Deppeler, J.M., & Sharma, U. (2013). Predicting pre-service teachers' preparedness for inclusive education: Bangladeshi pre-service teachers' attitudes and perceived teaching-efficacy for inclusive education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43(4), 517–535. doi: 10.1080/0305764X.2013.834036
- Aladwani, A.M., & Al Shaye, S.S. (2012). Primary school teachers' knowledge and awareness of dyslexia in Kuwaiti students. *Education*, 132(3), 499–516.
- Angelides, P., Stylianou, T., & Gibbs, P. (2006). Preparing teachers for inclusive education in Cyprus. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 513–522. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.11.013
- Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17(2), 129–147. doi: 10.1080/08856250210129056



- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, 40, 282–295. doi:10.1016/j.system.2012.05.001
- Borg, S. (2009). Language teacher cognition. In A. Burns, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 163–171). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39, 370–380. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009
- Borg, S. (2015). Researching teachers' beliefs. In B. Paltridge, & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Research methods in applied linguistics: A practical resource* (pp. 487–504). London: Bloomsbury.
- Bos, C., Mather, N., Dickson, S., Podhajski, B., & Chard, D. (2001). Perceptions and knowledge of preservice and inservice educators about early reading instruction. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 51, 97–120. doi:10.1007/s11881-001-0007-0
- Brady, S., Gillis, M., Smith, T., Lavalette, M., Liss-Bronstein, L., Lowe, E., North, W., Russo, E., & Wilder, T.D. (2009). First grade teachers' knowledge of phonological awareness and code concepts: Examining gains from an intensive form of professional development and corresponding teacher attitudes. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4, 425–455. doi:10.1007/s11145-009-9166-x
- Campbell, J., Gilmore, L., & Cuskelly, M. (2003). Changing student teachers' attitudes towards disability and inclusion. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 28, 369–379. doi:10.1080/13668250310001616407
- Chao, C.N.G., Forlin, C., & Ho, F.C. (2016). Improving teaching self-efficacy for teachers in inclusive classrooms in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(11), 1142–1154. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2016.1155663
- Coady, M.R., Harper, C., & de Jong, E.J. (2016). Aiming for equity: Preparing mainstream teachers for inclusion or inclusive classrooms? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 340–368. doi: 10.1002/tesq.223
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Das, A.K., Gichuru, M., & Singh, A. (2013). Implementing inclusive education in Delhi, India: regular school teachers' preferences for professional development delivery modes. *Professional Development in Education*, 39(5), 698–711. doi:10.1080/19415257.2012.747979

- Das, A.K., Kuyini, A.B., & Desai, I.P. (2013). Inclusive education in India: are the teachers prepared? *International Journal of Special Education*, 28(1), 27–36.
- De Neve, D., Devos, G., & Tuytens, M. (2015). The importance of job resources and self-efficacy for beginning teachers' professional learning in differentiated instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 47, 30–41. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2014.12.003
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2012). *Teacher education for inclusion. Profile of inclusive teachers*. Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. Retrieved November 2, 2016 from <https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/Profile-of-Inclusive-Teachers.pdf>
- Florian, L. (2012). Preparing teachers to work in inclusive classrooms: Key lessons for the professional development of teacher educators from Scotland's Inclusive Practice Project. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(4), 275–285. doi:10.1177/0022487112447112
- Florian, L., & Rouse, M. (2009). The inclusive practice project in Scotland: Teacher education for inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 594–601. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.02.003
- Forlin, C. (2013). Changing paradigms and future directions for implementing inclusive education in developing countries. *Asian Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(2), 19–31.
- Forlin, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Teacher education for inclusion. Changing paradigms and innovative approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Forlin, C. (Ed.). (2012). *Future directions for inclusive teacher education: An international perspective*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Forlin, C., & Cooper, P. (2013). Student behaviour and emotional challenges for teachers and parents in Hong Kong. *British Journal of Special Education*, 40, 58–64. doi:10.1111/1467-8578.12022
- Forlin, C., Cedillo, I. G., Romero-Contreras, S., Fletcher, T., & Hernández, J. R. (2010). Inclusion in Mexico: Ensuring supportive attitudes by newly graduate teachers. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14, 723–739. doi:10.1080/13603111003778569
- Forlin, C., Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Earle, C. (2009). Demographic differences in changing pre-service teachers' attitudes, sentiments and concerns about inclusive education.

*International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13(2), 195–209.  
doi:10.1080/13603110701365356

- Forlin, C., Sharma, U., & Loreman, T. (2014). Predictors of improved teaching efficacy following basic training for inclusion in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(7), 718–730. doi:10.1080/13603116.2013.819941
- Goldfus, C. (2012). Knowledge foundations for beginning reading teachers in EFL. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 62, 204–221. doi 10.1007/s11881-012-0073-5
- Harzing, A.W. (2006). Response Styles in Cross-national Survey Research A 26-country Study. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 6(2): 243–266. DOI: 10.1177/1470595806066332
- Hettiarachchi, S., & Das, A. (2014). Perceptions of ‘inclusion’ and perceived preparedness among schoolteachers in Sri Lanka. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 43, 143–153. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2014.07.003
- Huberty, C. J., & Petoskey, M. D. (2000). Multivariate analysis of variance and covariance. In H. Tinsley and S. Brown (Eds.), *Handbook of applied multivariate statistics and mathematical modeling* (pp. 183–208). New York: Academic Press.
- Joshi, R.M., Binks, E., Hougen, M., Dahlgren, M., Dean E., & Smith, D. (2009). Why elementary teachers might be inadequately prepared to teach reading. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 42, 392–402. doi: 10.1177/0022219409338736
- Kahn-Horwitz, J. (2015). Organizing the mess in my mind: EFL teachers’ perceptions and knowledge of English orthography. *Reading and Writing an Interdisciplinary Journal*, 28, 611–631. doi:10.1007/s11145-015-9541-8.
- Kahn-Horwitz, J. (2016). Providing English foreign language teachers with content knowledge to facilitate decoding and spelling acquisition: A longitudinal perspective. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 66, 147–170. doi: 10.1007/s11881-015-0120-0
- Kissau, S., Rodgers, M., & Haudeck, H.(2014). Foreign language teaching: An international comparison of teacher beliefs. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 9(2), 227–242. doi: 10.2304/rcie.2014.9.2.227
- Kissau, S.P., Algozzine, B., & Yon, M. (2013). Similar but different: The beliefs of foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(4), 580–598. doi: 10.1111/flan.12001
- Kormos, J. (2017a). *The second language learning processes of students with Specific Learning Difficulties*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Kormos, J. (2017b). The effects of Specific Learning Difficulties on processes of multilingual language development. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1–15. doi: 10.1017/S026719051700006X
- Kormos, J., & Smith, A.M. (2012). *Teaching languages to learners with specific learning difficulties*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kubanyiova, M., & Feryok, A. (2015). Language teacher cognition in applied linguistics research: Revisiting the territory, redrawing the boundaries, reclaiming the relevance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(3), 435–449. doi:10.1111/modl.12239
- Lai, F.T.T., Li, E.P.Y., Ji, M., Wong, W.W.K., Lo, S.K. (2016). What are the inclusive teaching tasks that require the highest self-efficacy? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 338–346. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.006
- Leyser, Y., Zeiger, T., & Romi, S. (2011). Changes in self-efficacy of prospective special and general education teachers: Implication for inclusive education. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 58(3), 241–255, doi:10.1080/1034912X.2011.598397
- Loreman, T., Deppeler, J., & Harvey, D. (2011). *Inclusive education: Supporting diversity in the classroom, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Malinen, O-P., Savolainen, H., & Xu, J. (2012). Beijing in-service teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes towards inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 526–534. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.12.004
- Malinen, O-P., Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Xu, J., Nel, M., Nel, N., & Tlale, D. (2013). Exploring teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices in three diverse countries. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 33, 34–44. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2013.02.004
- McCutchen, D., Abbott, R.D., Green, L.B., Beretvas, S.N., Cox, S., Potter, N.S., Quiroga, T., & Gray, A.L. (2002). Beginning literacy: Links among teacher knowledge, teacher practice, and student learning. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 69–86. doi:10.1177/002221940203500106
- McCutchen, D., Green, L., Abbott, R.D., & Sanders, E.A. (2009). Further evidence for teacher knowledge: Supporting struggling readers in grades three through five. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 401–423.
- Moats, L.C. (2009). Knowledge foundations for teaching reading and spelling. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 379–399. doi:10.1007/s11145-009-9162-1
- Moats, L.C., & Foorman, B.R. (2003). Measuring teachers' content knowledge of language and reading. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 53, 23–45. doi:10.1007/s11881-003-0003-7

- Moodie, I. (2016). The anti-apprenticeship of observation: How negative prior language learning experience influences English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *System*, 60, 29–4. doi:10.1016/j.system.2016.05.011
- Peebles, J.L., & Mondaglio, S. (2014). The impact of direct experience on preservice teachers' self-efficacy for teaching in inclusive classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(12), 1321–1336. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2014.899635
- Peer, L., & G. Reid. (Eds.). (2016). *Multilingualism, literacy and dyslexia: Breaking down barriers for educators*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Podhajski, B., Mather, N., Nathan, J., & Sammons, J. (2009). Professional development in scientifically based reading instruction: Teacher knowledge and reading outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 42, 403–417. doi: 10.1177/0022219409338737
- Robinson, D. (2017). Effective inclusive teacher education for special educational needs and disabilities: Some more thoughts on the way forward. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61, 164–178. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2016.09.007
- Russak, S. (2016). Do inclusion practices for pupils with special educational needs in the English as a foreign language class in Israel reflect inclusion laws and language policy requirements? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(11), 1188–1203, doi: 10.1080/13603116.2016.1155666
- Schneider, E., & Crombie, M. (2003). *Dyslexia and foreign language learning*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2015). The impact of a teacher education course on pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusion: An international comparison. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 15(4), 276–284. doi:10.1111/1471-3802.12043
- Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2016). Can teachers' self-reported efficacy, concerns, and attitudes toward inclusion scores predict their actual inclusive classroom practices? *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 40(1), 21–38. doi: 10.1017/jse.2015.14
- Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2008). Impact of training on pre-service teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education and sentiments about persons with disabilities. *Disability and Society*, 23(7), 773–785. doi:10.1080/09687590802469271
- Sharma, U., Forlin, C., Deppeler, J., & Guang-xue, Y. (2013). Reforming teacher education for inclusion in developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region. *Asian Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(1), 3–16.

- Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 12*(1), 12–21. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x
- Sparks, R., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., Humbach, N., & Javorsky, J. (2006). Native language predictions of foreign language proficiency and foreign language aptitude. *Annals of Dyslexia 56*, 129–160. doi:10.1007/s11881-006-0006-2
- Symeonidou, S., & Phtiaka, H. (2009). Using teachers' prior knowledge, attitudes and beliefs to develop in-service teacher education courses for inclusion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 543–550. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.02.001
- Symeonidou, S., & Phtiaka, H. (2014). 'My colleagues wear blinkers . . . If they were trained, they would understand better'. Reflections on teacher education on inclusion in Cyprus. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 14*(2), 110–119. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-3802.2012.01234.x
- Takahashi, S. (2011). Co-constructing efficacy: A "communities of practice" perspective on teachers' efficacy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 732–741. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.002
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education 27*, 751–761. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.005
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783–805. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education 23*, 944–956. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003
- Washburn, E.K., Joshi, R.M., & Binks-Cantrell, E.S. (2011a). Teacher knowledge of basic language concepts and dyslexia. *Dyslexia, 17*, 165–183. doi: 10.1002/dys.426
- Washburn, E.K., Joshi, R.M., & Binks-Cantrell, E.S. (2011b). Are preservice teachers prepared to teach struggling readers? *Annals of Dyslexia, 61*, 21–43. doi: 10.1007/s11881-010-0040-y

## APPENDIX

### DysTEFL – Needs Analysis Questionnaire Revised (DysTEFL-NAQ-R)

#### Part A. General information

Please tick the statements that describe you best. In some questions more than one answer is possible.

##### A1. I am:

(A1.1) - training to be an EFL teacher

(A1.2) - an EFL teacher

A2. I teach/I am training to be a teacher in ..... (please give the name of the country).

##### A3. I am:

(A3.1) - male

(A3.2) - female

##### A4. My age is:

(A4.1) - 25 years or below

(A4.2) - 26-35 years

(A4.3) - 35-45 years

(A4.4) - 46 years or above

##### A5. I have:

(A5.1) - no teaching experience

(A5.2) - 1-5 years of teaching experience

(A5.3) - 6–10 years of teaching experience

(A5.4) - more than 10 years of teaching experience

##### A6. I teach at ..... (more than one answer is possible):

(A6.1) - kindergarten

(A6.2) - primary school

(A6.3) - lower-secondary school

(A6.4) - upper-secondary school

(A6.5) - college, university

(A6.6) - language school

(A6.7) - one-to-one tuition

(A6.8) - not applicable

##### A7. Most of my students are aged ..... (more than one answer is possible):

(A7.1) - under 5 years

(A7.2) - 6–12 years

(A7.3) - 13–15 years

(A7.4) - 16–18 years

(A7.5) - older than 18

(A7.6) - not applicable

##### A8. I have taught ..... (more than one answer is possible):

(A8.1) - classes where there are no students with dyslexia

(A8.2) - classes where there are some students with dyslexia

(A8.3) - special classes for students with dyslexia

(A8.4) - classes with students who are exempted from assessment because they have dyslexia

(A8.5) - one-to-one sessions for students with dyslexia

(A8.6) - not applicable

##### A9. My highest level of education completed is:

(A9.1) - Secondary School

(A9.2) - Bachelor's Degree

(A9.3) - Master's Degree

(A9.4) - PhD

(A9.5) - Other, please specify

**Part B. Accommodating the learning needs of EFL learners with dyslexia – TEPID – Teacher of English Preparedness to Include Dyslexics Scale**

**B1. Please consider the statements below referring to teaching foreign language learners with dyslexia and indicate to what extent the following statements are true for you.**

	<b>Statements</b>	<b>definitely not true of me</b>	<b>mostly not true of me</b>	<b>somewhat not true of</b>	<b>somewhat true of me</b>	<b>mostly true of me</b>	<b>definitely true of me</b>
<b>B1.1</b>	I believe foreign language learners with dyslexia benefit from attending regular classes in mainstream education.						
<b>B1.2</b>	I am familiar with the difficulties learners with dyslexia experience in foreign language learning.						
<b>B1.3</b>	I can give feedback to learners with dyslexia in such a way that it boosts their self-esteem.						
<b>B1.4</b>	I believe foreign language learners with dyslexia need adjustments in the mainstream language classroom.						
<b>B1.5</b>	I believe teacher behavior in a language classroom influences dyslexic learner's self-esteem.						
<b>B1.6</b>	I am familiar with the signs of dyslexia.						
<b>B1.7</b>	I can provide differentiated instruction to cater for the individual needs of learners with dyslexia.						
<b>B1.8</b>	I can modify the way teaching materials are presented to accommodate individual learning needs of learners with dyslexia.						
<b>B1.9</b>	I am familiar with the principles of multisensory teaching and learning.						
<b>B1.10</b>	I can personalize assessment techniques to evaluate my dyslexic language learners' progress.						
<b>B1.11</b>	I believe foreign language teachers should have high expectations for their learners with dyslexia.						
<b>B1.12</b>	I am familiar with the nature of dyslexia.						
<b>B1.13</b>	I believe developing self-determination in foreign language learners with dyslexia is important.						
<b>B1.14</b>	I can help foreign language learners with dyslexia to develop effective learning strategies.						
<b>B1.15</b>	I believe foreign language teachers should differentiate their approach to learners.						
<b>B1.16</b>	I can foster autonomy in foreign language learners with dyslexia.						
<b>B1.17</b>	I believe it is important for foreign language teachers to collaborate with parents and families of their dyslexic learners.						
<b>B1.18</b>	I know what to do if I think that one of my students is dyslexic.						
<b>B1.19</b>	I am familiar with other learning difficulties often associated with dyslexia.						



<b>B1.20</b>	I believe collaborative teamwork with a range of educational professionals is important for teachers of foreign language learners with dyslexia.						
<b>B1.21</b>	I am familiar with the accommodations that learners with dyslexia are entitled to in taking foreign language proficiency exams.						
<b>B1.22</b>	I can manage the classroom environment to cater for individual learning needs of learners with dyslexia.						
<b>B1.23</b>	I am familiar with the local educational legislation/policy concerning learners with dyslexia.						
<b>B1.24</b>	I can differentiate tasks/assignments to cater for individual learning needs of learners with dyslexia.						

**Part C. Professional training needs on EFL and dyslexia**

**C1. Please consider the statements below referring to professional training needs on EFL and dyslexia and indicate to what extent the following statements are true for you.**

	Statements	definitely not true of me	mostly not true of me	somewhat not true of me	somewhat true of me	mostly true of me	definitely true of me
<b>C1.1</b>	I learnt about how to teach English to learners with dyslexia in my courses at college/university/teacher training institutions.						
<b>C1.2</b>	I learned about how to teach English to learners with dyslexia on my own from available resources.						
<b>C1.3</b>	I feel the need for more information on the language teaching methods effective with dyslexic learners.						
<b>C1.4</b>	I am interested in further training in the area of teaching English to learners with dyslexia.						

**C2. An ideal format for the course on dyslexia and methods of teaching foreign languages to learners with dyslexia is ..... (more than one answer is possible):**

- (C2.1) - printed self-study materials
- (C2.2) - online learning course
- (C2.3) - online resources that I can use for self-study
- (C2.4) - face-to-face training workshop
- (C2.5) - other preferred training formats, please specify .....

**C3. In a training course, I would like to learn about the following .....**

**(please tick the topics you would find relevant; more than one answer is possible)**

- (C3.1) - nature of dyslexia
- (C3.2) - learning difficulties associated with dyslexia
- (C3.3) - problems dyslexia causes in language learning
- (C3.4) - assessment of learners with dyslexia in the language classroom
- (C3.5) - how dyslexia is diagnosed
- (C3.6) - accommodations that learners with dyslexia are entitled to in high-stakes exams
- (C3.7) - language teaching techniques that assist language learners with dyslexia
- (C3.8) - general teaching and classroom management tips for teaching language learners with dyslexia
- (C3.9) - other topic, please specify .....

**C4. In a training course I would find the following useful .....**

**(please tick the tasks and activities you would find relevant; more than one answer is possible)**

- (C4.1) - brief lectures
- (C4.2) - reading articles
- (C4.3) - reading book chapters
- (C4.4) - reading online resource materials
- (C4.5) - watching videos of classrooms
- (C4.6) - listening to/reading interviews with learners with dyslexia
- (C4.7) - listening to/reading interviews with teachers of dyslexic learners
- (C4.8) - learning how to design language teaching materials for learners with dyslexia
- (C4.9) - evaluating language teaching materials designed for learners with dyslexia
- (C4.10) - designing lesson plans so that the needs of learners with dyslexia are catered for
- (C4.11) - evaluating lesson plans
- (C4.12) - other tasks and activities, please specify .....

**Do you have any further comments you would like to add? If yes, please write them here:**