

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

Respondents' concept of inclusive education

Respondents had interpreted the concept of inclusion in almost a similar way. They all accepted that inclusion was a new concept which advocated for full integration of learners with disabilities in ordinary classrooms. During the interviews, some respondents revealed that inclusion meant that all learners with disabilities should be included in ordinary classrooms and that special education structures should gradually be phased out. This interpretation is similar to Norwich (1999: 8-10) who views inclusion as physically being in the same place and doing the same things as other students and also inclusion as social acceptance and belonging. The other respondents understood inclusion to mean including almost all learners with disabilities in ordinary classrooms, and excluding those with severe disabilities who should be educated in special schools. The second interpretation is similar to Booth (1996: 96) who states that inclusion is a process of increasing participation and reducing exclusion. The former group was more radical and seemed to ignore those with severe disabilities while the latter group realized that there were those with severe disabilities who might require specialized facility for them to benefit from the education system.

Attitudes of Ordinary Teachers towards Inclusive Education

Some teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education were positive while others were negative. Generally, the study found that ordinary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education depended mainly on the type of disability group and the support provided to such pupils. Teachers who taught pupils with moderate or mild disabilities tended to have more positive attitudes than those who had severe or profound disabilities (Fig. 4). International evidence also indicates that moderate learning disabilities make better educational progress in ordinary than in special classes (Galloway and Goodwin, 1986, as

quoted in Jones and Southgate, 1990: 70). Similarly, teachers who had appropriate teaching and learning materials for pupils with disabilities had more positive attitudes towards inclusive education than those who had none.

The research also found that teachers who had positive attitudes towards inclusive education were also confident to teach pupils with special educational needs. 64.5% of the ordinary teachers were confident to teach pupils with special educational needs. The majority of the ordinary teachers (81%) said they were able to evaluate the work of pupils with special educational needs but were unable to provide interventions to some of the work due to lack of specialized training. The study also revealed that some (49%) ordinary teachers could not manage the disruptive behaviour of some pupils with special educational needs. The study, therefore, shows that the provision of specialized teaching and learning materials as well as appropriate training to ordinary teachers are some of the factors that might support inclusive education.

These findings are consistent with Kalabula (1991:225) who found that 83% of the teachers interviewed in his study had no training to teach the blind and that there were many practical problems in schools and units where these pupils were integrated. Similarly, Gary (1997) in his study pointed out that ordinary teachers considered themselves inadequately prepared professionally for the task of inclusion and that on going professional in-service training was not adequate.

The study discovered a number of barriers to inclusion. Some (40.2%) of the teachers indicated that although they had sufficient time to plan and prepare, their timetables were not flexible enough to allow for individual attention with pupils with special educational needs. The study also revealed that ordinary classes were overenrolled with an average pupil-teacher ratio of 50: 1. In addition to this, some teachers were given extra responsibilities such as supervising sport, gardening and administrative work. As result of these, teachers were affected in the delivery of their work. In spite of all these challenges, ordinary teachers were willing to teach children with special educational needs in their classes.

In view of the challenges ordinary teachers were facing, 81% of them indicated that they needed assistant teachers in order to effectively teach all children in their classes. A similar study by Jenkinson (1997) showed that employment of teacher aides to support students with disabilities could ease the impact of integration in ordinary classes.

Teachers also felt that school environment should be made “user friendly” to all pupils in order to facilitate teaching and learning. Over 70% of the teachers observed that ordinary classes did not have appropriate teaching and learning materials and that school infrastructure was not easily accessible to most children with disabilities. This finding is similar to Nash (1985) as quoted in Jenkinson (1997: 32) who found that school principals believed that the provision of appropriate support services should be a prerequisite to integration. A similar study by Mandyata (2002) in Kasama district of Zambia revealed that some teachers were not ready for inclusion due to lack of support. A baseline study on special educational needs conducted by Kasonde-Ngandu (2001:50) in North Western and Western provinces of Zambia also showed that teachers tended to see the idea of including pupils with special needs in ordinary school classrooms as inappropriate. She indicated that 70% of them lacked knowledge and skills needed for teaching pupils with disabilities.

Ordinary teachers were also asked to indicate whether or not they received support from school administration. The study revealed that headteachers supported teachers’ innovations in areas such as providing materials for Individualised Education Plans and home based programmes. Many teachers (93%) in the study believed that headteachers could also help in developing inclusive education policies. Earlier studies by Bunch (1997) show that ordinary teachers viewed school administrators as important resource for ordinary classroom teachers and learners with special educational needs. He found that while some teachers applauded the efforts of their administrators and their success in providing them with concrete support, others were frustrated by lack of support from their administrators.

This study also looked at the benefit of the child with special educational needs in the ordinary classroom. The study found that although 75% of all respondents indicated that pupils with disabilities placed in the classroom were rejected and teased in the initial period, the majority of teachers (79.4%) observed that pupils with disabilities were later accepted and they interacted well with their non disabled peers. As a result of this positive interaction, many teachers (90%) believed that children benefited and their self-image improved. They also believed that, as children grew up together with non disabled colleagues and were part of everyday life of normal school settings, they would contribute to society when they become adults. Bunch, Lupart and Brown (1997: 86) in their study on educator attitudes, also found that interacting in an ordinary class environment improved the personal image and esteem of students with special educational needs and this was also related positively to various areas of social and academic life such as friendship, achievement, cooperative activity and happiness.

Ordinary teachers were asked to indicate the type of disability groups they would be more comfortable with to teach in their classrooms. The highest percentage of teachers chose pupils with Learning Difficulties followed by those who chose pupils with physical disabilities. Smaller percentages of teachers chose pupils with mild hearing impairments, behavioural disorders and the deaf (Fig. 4). These disability groups were preferred to others perhaps because they could communicate using ordinary print rather than Braille which most of the teachers could not read. The disability groups which were least preferred were the blind, the partially sighted and the cerebral palsied pupils. This finding is similar in some ways to Tibebe (1995) who found that ordinary teachers accepted the physically disabled, the hearing impaired and other pupils who could read printed materials. However, teachers in his study accepted the blind but not the deaf.

Attitudes of Special Education Teachers towards Inclusive Education

The study revealed that the attitudes of Special Education teachers were still rather negative despite the inclusive policy in place and sensitization programmes taking place in the district. They preferred to teach children with special educational needs in secluded settings such as special units and schools rather than in ordinary classrooms. A baseline study on inclusive education conducted by Kasonde-Ngandu (2001) in the North Western and Western provinces of Zambia showed that Special education teachers had less positive attitudes towards inclusive education than ordinary teachers. According to her, it was not surprising because special education teachers were accustomed to specialisation and therefore they did not see their role in an inclusive set up. It could also be that special education teachers might have fears of losing their special allowances, power and control of special units and schools.

In this study, Special Education teachers observed that pupils with special educational needs placed in ordinary classrooms slowed down the teaching process because ordinary teachers did not know the techniques of teaching them. They observed that as result, faster learners got bored and sometimes teaching was lost and wasted. They observed that the current syllabuses were examination oriented and teachers were always in a hurry to complete the syllabuses and prepare pupils for examinations. They pointed out that as a result of this; pupils with special educational needs did not receive the attention they deserved. They also observed that government was not committed to supporting the policy of inclusion financially and materially.

About 57% of special education teachers believed that pupils with special educational needs interfered with the quality of education provided for ordinary pupils. However 63% of them supported the practice of inclusive education only for pupils with very mild disabilities. This finding is also supported by Leyser, Kapperman and Keller (1994) as quoted in Jenkinson (1997:30-31) who found that less positive attitudes towards integration were held by special education teachers who taught at primary and junior secondary levels.

Attitudes of Headteachers towards Inclusive Education

The study found that the attitudes of headteachers towards inclusive education were positive. The Majority (80%) of them believed that pupils with special educational needs would perform well in ordinary classrooms as they would share academic knowledge with pupils of different abilities and diverse needs. They pointed out that children with special needs should not be segregated and discriminated against by forcing them to learn in 'segregated' schools. This finding is consistent with Kasonde-Ngandu (2001) and Jenkinson (1997) who found that headteachers had positive attitudes towards inclusive education.

Headteachers also observed that education was a right and therefore children with disabilities were entitled to education in the normal settings. Like many advocates for inclusive education, headteachers felt that children with disabilities had the right to receive an education comparable in everyway possible to that received by the majority of ordinary children. As UNESCO (1994) put it, that schools should accommodate all children regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions (Salamanca Framework for Action, 1994, article 3). In this study headteachers also noted that the presence of pupils with disabilities in ordinary classes did not interfere with the quality of education provided to non disabled pupils. This finding does not agree with the views of special education teachers discussed earlier.

Attitudes of Parents towards Inclusive Education

This study found that parents like special education teachers had negative attitudes towards inclusive education. Many of the parents (77%) observed that ordinary schools did not have resources and qualified personnel to teach their children with special educational needs. Although they accepted the concept of inclusive education, they felt that their children were not adequately supported with appropriate teaching and learning materials compared to those in special schools. This study also revealed that parents did

not believe that the mere placing of children with ordinary classes meant providing quality of education. The findings are similar to Kalabula (1991: 239) who revealed that 75% of the parents of blind pupils interviewed in his study said their children were not happy at ordinary schools.

Other studies have found similar attitudes of parents towards inclusive education. For instance, Jenkinson (1997: 29) observed that parents were worried that their children would lose facilities, expertise and security they enjoyed in special schools if they were placed in ordinary schools. Kasonde-Ngandu (2001: 62) discovered that parents had quite negative attitudes towards inclusive education, with parents of children with disabilities having more negative attitudes than other parents. In this study, parents were more concerned with the quality of education than the social acceptance their children were receiving in ordinary classrooms. They felt that the success of inclusive education should not only be determined by social acceptance of pupils with disabilities in ordinary classes but also by the academic performance of the included pupils.

Attitudes of Traditionalists and Progressivists towards Inclusive Education

In this study traditionalists were those respondents who held the conservative views about inclusive education. They felt that inclusive education would not work due to a number of factors. First they felt that ordinary schools did not have adequate human and material resources for inclusion to work. They supported the idea that children with severe disabilities should be educated in special schools. They believed that pupils with disabilities placed in ordinary schools interfered with the quality of education as teachers could not manage to teach large classes with diverse educational needs. Traditionalists were more concerned with how inclusive education would undermine the performance and authority of the teacher rather than how the environment could be changed to suit all children. In other words traditionalists wanted to maintain the status quo. The findings of this study show that respondents with this traditionalist view displayed negative attitudes towards inclusive education. For instance the majority of special education teachers, parents and a few head teachers belonged to this category.

On the other hand, progressivists, according to the findings of this study, were those respondents who held democratic views and were concerned about the child's welfare, freedoms and rights regarding inclusive education. For instance, these respondents held views that education was a right and children with special educational needs had the right to education, association, and the freedom to choose the environment in which they wished to be educated. They also believed that inclusive education would bring about quality of education for all. Respondents with these liberal views according to the findings of this study had positive attitudes towards inclusive education. Examples of such respondents were the ordinary teachers and head teachers.

The findings of this study were in agreement with Kerlinger's Theoretical Frame work which this study followed. According to Kerlinger (1984: 23), people's attitudes were generally conservative (traditional) while other people's attitudes were liberal (progressive). The former held negative attitudes and later held positive attitudes. Earlier studies have also found Kerlinger's theoretical Frame Work useful and producing almost the same results. Comparing professional groups in the United States and England on attitudes to integration, Norwich (1994) concluded that professionals with more liberal social views had more positive attitudes while those who favoured social control had more negative attitudes to integration.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that attitudes of parents and teachers differed in many ways. Parents and special education teachers had negative attitudes towards inclusive education and their attitudes towards disabilities were negative. Ordinary teachers and head teachers on the other hand had positive attitudes towards inclusive education. In addition, the study revealed that there was a relationship between attitudes towards inclusive education and disabilities. Those who had negative attitudes towards inclusive education were also found to have negative attitudes towards persons with disabilities. Conversely, respondents with positive attitudes towards inclusive education tended to have somewhat positive attitudes towards persons with disabilities.

The findings of this study were interesting in that special education teachers and parents who were considered to be closer to children with special needs were expected to support inclusion and perhaps to show more positive attitudes towards persons with disabilities than ordinary teachers and head teachers but this was not the case.

Factors that were found to influence negative attitudes included lack of teaching and learning materials and management support as well as lack of appropriate training for teachers. Other factors included large classes, examination oriented syllabuses, rigid timetables and lack of commitment to inclusive policies by government. Respondents who had positive attitudes towards inclusive education were influenced by factors such as inclusive education as a right, inclusive education policies, and good management support. Other factors were those related to avoidance of exclusion and segregation, respect for human choices and values as well as cost effectiveness of inclusive education. Positive attitudes among ordinary teachers and head teachers could also have been

influenced by sensitization and training activities that have been going on in the district since 1997 when Inclusive Schooling Programme was introduced by the Ministry of Education. The main targets of this programme were ordinary teachers, school managers, health workers and social workers.

Earlier studies on attitudes towards inclusive education and integration agree with the findings of this study that headteachers and ordinary teachers had positive attitudes towards inclusion or integration (Kasonde-Ngandu, 2001, Jenkinson, 1997, Nash, 1985, Harvey, 1989, Vaughn et al, 1995). These studies indicated that special education teachers felt that ordinary teachers were intruding in their area and also that they did not know their roles in an inclusive set up. Parents on the other hand had fears that their children would lose facilities, expertise and attention they received in special schools.

The study also found that respondents with more liberal social views had more positive attitudes towards inclusive education than those with predominantly conservative views. The findings of this study were in line with Kerlinger's attitudinal generalisations which explain people's complex thinking regarding attitudes (Kerlinger, 1984).

It is hoped that negative attitudes towards persons with disabilities would gradually change positively as people involved in the education of persons with disabilities get exposed and committed to new trends in the provision of Special Education. As Kalabula (1991) put it that attitudes are not immutable but that they often change with new experiences in life.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the findings of this study, the following recommendations have been made to the Government of the Republic of Zambia, Ministry of Education policy makers, education managers, headteachers, teachers, parents and donors:

Sensitisation

- The Ministry of Education should vigorously mount sensitisation campaigns at different levels of the Education system to combat discrimination against persons with disabilities and negative attitudes towards inclusive Education.
- The Ministry of Education should conduct counseling services to parents and children with special educational needs in order to reinforce positive attitudes towards inclusive education and persons with disabilities.
- The Ministry of Education should develop an effective public information system aimed at combating prejudices and creating informed positive attitudes.
- The Ministry should ensure that inclusive schools are well informed on the need to recognize and respond to diverse needs of all learners regardless of their difficulties.

Teacher Training

- The Ministry of education should introduce special needs education on the teacher training curricula in order to prepare new cadres of teachers who should be able handle different needs in their classes. The current introduction to special education found in Education Psychology of teacher training syllabus is too shallow and it does not prepare ordinary teachers to meet the diverse needs of children in ordinary classrooms.
- The Ministry of Education should intensify school based in-service training in special needs and inclusive education to equip ordinary teachers and re-orient special education teachers to handle children with special education in an inclusive set up.

- The Zambia Institute of Special Education (ZAMISE) and the University of Zambia, currently training special education teachers should include the aspect of inclusive education on their syllabuses and train more teachers.
- The Ministry of Education should clearly define the roles of parents in inclusive education and involve them in training and sensitization programmes.

Policy

- There is need for the Ministry of Education to articulate a more clear and forceful policy on inclusion that should be backed by adequate financial and human resources.
- Government should be committed to pledges and commitments it has made to international Conventions and agreements and in all policy documents on Special Needs and inclusive education.
- The Ministry should provide all schools with guidelines on special needs and inclusive education in order to help them implement inclusive programmes effectively.
- Government should promote parental partnership through statements of policy and legislation concerning parental rights in the education of their children.
- The Ministry of Education should involve Parents in policy formulation and decision making pertaining to special needs and inclusive education.
- The Ministry of education should employ more Special Education Standard Officers and administrators in order to boost the management of special needs and inclusive education. Currently there is a critical shortage of human resource in this area.

Legislation

- Government should adopt the principle of inclusive education as a matter of law that should reinforce enrolling of all children in ordinary schools except where there are compelling reasons.
- The Ministry of Education should ensure that the current Education Bill (2003) under discussion should clearly outline the education provisions and **strategies**

for children with special education needs. It should also seriously and carefully address the unique characteristics, the interest, abilities and learning needs of all children.

Collaboration and Coordination

- Ministry of Education should work in close liaison with Ministries of Health, community and Social Welfare and Youth and Sports as well as Disability and Philanthropic Organizations in the development of welcoming schools.
- The Ministry of Education should create synergies by developing collaborative relationships across its departments from national, provincial, district, and school levels and communities in the development of inclusive education.
- School managers and teachers should avail full information to the parents on the progress of inclusive education so that parents can make informed decisions on the placement of their children.
- Ministry of Education, Donors, and international agencies should respect local cultural traditions and practices that promote positive attitudes towards inclusive living such as extended family and empathy for persons with disabilities which might have positive bearing on inclusive education.
- Donors need to be realistic in terms of results of innovative projects on inclusive education, particularly those related to changing of attitudes. This is because attitude change takes time.

Resources

- The Ministry of Education should invest its greater efforts and resources in early identification, assessment and intervention.
- To decongest the current large classes, government should construct more schools. The existing school infrastructure should also be modified to suit all children.
- The Ministry of Education should adequately fund schools and provide appropriate teaching and learning materials for teachers and children with special education needs.

- Ministry of Education should realign trained special education teachers so that every basic and high school has a trained teacher to provide technical advice on special needs and inclusive education.

FUTURE RESEARCH

This study concentrated its efforts on finding out the attitudes of teachers and parents towards inclusive education. The teachers included ordinary and special education teachers as well as school headteachers. Parents included both parents of children with disabilities and those without disabilities. The study has raised a number of issues which may attract future researches.

The following broad research areas could be conducted in future:

- Attitudes of pupils with and without disabilities towards inclusive education.
- The effect of Zambian traditions and culture on the education of children with disabilities.
- A comparative study between the provision of Special Needs Education in rural and urban schools.
- Policies of the Ministry of Education on Special Needs and Inclusive Education: Are they adequate and supportive to Special Needs Education?
- College curriculum and training: Are they adequately meeting the current needs of Zambian children with special needs?

REFERENCES

- Abang, T. A. (1986)** Handbook of Special Education: *Teaching the Visually Handicapped*. Ibadan: University Press Limited.
- Booth, T. and Potts, P. eds (1983).** *Integrating Special Education*. New York: Basil son.
- Booth, T (2000).** *Progress in Inclusive Education*. In H. Savolainen, H. Kokkala & H., Alasuutari (eds). Helsinki: Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland & Niilo Mäki Institute. pp. 17-30
- Bradfield, H.R., Brown, J. Kaplan, P., Rickett, E., & Stannard, R. (1973).** The Special Child in the Regular Classroom. *Exceptional Children*, 39, 384-390.
- Bunch, G. et al (1992).** *The Need for Refining*. In J. Pearpoint, M., Forest, & J. Suw, (Eds). *The Inclusion Papers: Strategies to Make Inclusive Work* (pp 111-113). Toronto: Inclusion Press.
- Bunch, G., Lupart, J. & Brown, M. (1997).** *Resistance and Acceptance: Educator Attitudes to Inclusion of Students with Disabilities*. A research conducted in Canada. Ontario: York University.
- Charles, C.M. & Malian, I.M. (1980).** *The Special Student*. St. Louis MO: C.V. Mosby.
- Chote, J.S. (2000)** *Successful Inclusive teaching – proven ways to detect and correct special needs*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cohen L. and Manion L. (1997)** *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge
- Department of Education, (2001)** *Education White Paper 6 – Special Needs*

Education – Building an Inclusive Education and training System, Pretoria: Department of Education.

Desta, D.D. (2000). *Attitudes Towards Disability and the Role of Community Based Rehabilitation Programs in Ethiopia*. University of Joensuu. Faculty of Education. Publication N0. 56

Fischbein, M. and Ajzen, L. (1975). *Beliefs, Attitude, Intention and Behaviour: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading MA: Addison Wesley.

Gearheart B. R. (1980). *Special Education for the 80s*. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Company.

Government of the Republic of Zambia (1977) *Educational Reform: Proposals and Recommendations*. Lusaka: Government Printers.

Hanko, G., (1995). *Special Needs in Ordinary Classrooms. From Staff Support to Staff Development*. London: David Fulton Publishers

Hegarty, S. (1980) 'Integration - Some Questions to Ask' *Special Education: Forwards Trends*, 7,1pp.8-10.

Hegarty, S. Pocklington, K. & Luc, D. (1981) *Educating Pupils with Special Needs in the ordinary school*. Windsor: NFER – Nelson.

Hegarty, S. (1987). *Special Needs in Ordinary Schools. Meeting Special Needs in Ordinary Schools*. London: Cassel Educational

Hendrickson, J. M.; Shokoohi-Yeta, M.; Hamre-Nietupski, S. & Gable, R.A. (1996). *Middle and High School students' Perceptions on being Friends with Peers with Severe Disabilities*. *Exceptional Children*, Vol. 63, N0. 1,pp. 19-28.

- Heward L.W. (1996),** *Exceptional Children – An introduction to Special Education*, USA: Prentice – Hall inc
- Jenkinson, J. C. (1997).** *Mainstream or Special? Educating Students with disabilities*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, N. & South Gate, T. (1989).** *The Mnagement of Special Needs in Ordinary Schools*. London: Routledge.
- Kalabula D.M. (1989)** *Special Education in Zambia: A Historical Review and Education for the Visual Handicapped children* – Unpublished dissertation for Master of Education, University of Birmingham, UK.
- Kalabula D.M. (1991).** *Integrating Visually Handicapped Children into Zambian Ordinary Secondary Schools*. University of Birmingham, School of Education (Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis).
- Kalabula D.M. et al (1993)** *DANIDA Support to Zambia National Special Education 1995 – 1999*. Lusaka: Ministry of Education.
- Kasonde – Ng’andu S. (1987).** *Aspects of the Upbringing and Education of Children with Special Needs in a Rural Zambian Bemba Culture*. London: University of London (Unpublished M. Phil Thesis)
- Kasonde – Ng’andu, S. of Moberg, S. (2001)** *Moving Towards Inclusive Schooling – A Baseline Study of Western and North Western Province*, Lusaka: BESSIP.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1984).** *Liberalism and Conservatism: The Nature and the Structure of Social Attitudes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Larrivee, B (1982).** *Factors Underlying Regular Classroom Teachers' Attitude Toward Mainstreaming.* Psychology in schools, 19,374-379.
- Lowenfeld, B. (1974)** In: Kalabula D.M. (1989) *Special Education in Zambia: A Historical Review and Education for the Visual Handicapped children* – Unpublished dissertation for Master of Education, Birmingham: University of Birmingham: pp 43
- Mandyata J. M. (2002),** *Teachers' Views on Inclusive Practices: A case study on Basic schools in Kasama District, Zambia:* University of Zambia (Unpublished MEd Dissertation – UNZA)
- Ministry of Education (2002)** *Annual Report on Inclusive Schooling Programme* (INSPRO). Kalulushi District: unpublished report.
- Ministry of Education, (1992).** *Focus on Learning,* Lusaka: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education, (1996)** *Educating our future – National Policy on Education.* Lusaka: Zambia Education Publishing House (ZEPH)
- Moberg, S. (1997).** *Inclusive Schooling Practices as Perceived by Prospective Special Education Teachers in Estonia, Finland and the United States of America.* International Journal of Rehabilitation Research 20, 29-40.
- Moberg, S. (2000).** *Development of Educator Perceptions of Inclusive education in Finland.* 11th World Congree of the International Association for the Scientific Study of Intellectual Disabilities (IASSID). Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 44, p. 397.
- Mwanakatwe J.M. (1971).** *The Growth of Education in Zambia Since Indendence,* Nairobi: Oxford University Press

- Nyewe, K. & Green, L. (1999).** *The Attitudes of some South African Parents towards Inclusive Education of their children with mild to moderate Mental Disabilities. African Journal of Special Needs Education, Vol. 4, NO. 1.*
- Norwich, B. (1999).** *Inclusive in Education. From Concepts, Values and Critique to Practice in Special Education Re-formed. Beyond Rhetoric?* New Millennium Series. Editor: Miles, H. London: Falmer Press.
- Pocklington and Lucas (1981) In: Kalabula D.M. (1989) Special Education in Zambia: A Historical Review and Education for the Visual Handicapped children –** Unpublished dissertation for Master of Education, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Salend, L. (1984).** *Factors Contributing to the Development of Successful mainstreaming Programs.* Exceptional Children, 50, 5, pp.409 – 416.
- Savolainen H., et al (2000),** *Meeting Special and Diverse Educational Needs, making Inclusive Education a Reality,* Niilomaki Institute, Helsinki.
- Scruggs, T. and Mastropieri, M. (1996),** *Teacher Perceptions of Mainstreaming/Inclusion, 1958-1995; A research synthesis.* Exception Children 63(1), pp. 59-74.
- Siegal, J., & Jausovec, N. (1994).** *Improving Teachers' Attitudes toward Student with Disabilities.* (Report No. SP 035 470). Portales, New Mexico: Eastern New Mexico University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED 349 709).
- Siegelman et al (1984)** *“Disability and the Concept of Life Functions”.* Psychological and Social Impact of Physical Disability, (2nd ed.). New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Snelson, P. (1974). *Educational Development in Northern Rhodesia 1883 –1945.*
Lusaka: Modern Press Limited.

Solity J. and Ray Bould (1988). *A Teacher's Guide to Special Needs: A positive response to the 1981 Education Act.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Sloper, T. & Tyler, S. (1992). Integrating of Children with Severe Learning Difficulties in Mainstream Schools: Evaluation of Pilot Study. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 9(4), pp34 – 45.

Tibebu, B. D. (1995). *Meanings attached to Disability. Attitudes towards disabled people, and attitudes towards integration.* Jyvaskyla Studies in Education, Psychology, and Social Research, 118, Jyvaskyla: University of Jyvaskyla.

Tomlinson (1982) In: Kalabula D.M. (1989) *Special Education in Zambia: A Historical Review and Education for the Visual Handicapped children* – Unpublished dissertation for Master of Education, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

UNESCO, (1994) *Final Report – World Conference on Special Needs Education.* Salamanca: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2002), *Inclusive Education in Southern Africa – responding to diversity in Education Harare:* Unesco.

UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education.* Salamanca: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (1994). *Welcoming Schools. Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools.* Paris: UNESCO.

United Nations (1993). *The Standard Rules on the Equalisation of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities Adopted by United Nations General Assembly*, Forty-eight sessions, resolutions 48/96, annex, of 20 December. Rule 6 Education.

Vaac, N.A., & Kirt, N. (1977). Emotionally Disturbed Children and regular classroom Teachers. *Elementary School Journal*, 77, 309-317.

Vaughn, S. Bos. G.S, Schumm, S.J. (1999). *Teaching Exceptional, Diverse, and At-Risk Students in General Education classroom*. London: Allyn and Bacon.

Warnock (1978). *Special Educational Needs. Report of the Committee of inquiry into Education of Handicapped and Young People*. London: HMSO

Yuker, H. et al (1966). *The Measurement of Attitudes Towards Disabled Persons*. New York: Human Resource Center

APPENDIX 1

**Table 5: All respondents' attitudes towards inclusive education item-wise
by percentage**

Item	1	2	3	4	5
1. Pupils with severe disabilities receive the best education in special classrooms.	49	33	04	07	07
2. Pupils with severe bahaviour problems need special education in special schools	65	26	01	03	05
3. Pupils with disabilities are sometimes rejected or teased by non – disabled pupils.	38	37	06	11	08
4. When pupils with disabilities are placed full time in ordinary classes teaching is lost or wasted.	12	25	09	32	22
5. It is wrong to ask ordinary teachers to admit pupils with severe disabilities to their classrooms.	40	15	09	15	21
6. Pupils with disabilities stop feeling unease if they were placed full – time in ordinary classrooms.	40	25	05	20	10
7. It is the responsibility of ordinary teachers to teach pupils with disabilities in their ordinary classrooms.	27	35	11	15	12
8. Pupils with severe behaviour problems need special classes in ordinary schools.	33	36	06	14	11
9. Placing pupils with disabilities full time in ordinary classes means providing quality education for all.	37	20	07	19	17
10. Ordinary teachers are able to meet the academic needs of pupils with disabilities in their classrooms.	25	21	02	27	25
11. Pupils with severe disabilities should only be taught by trained special education teachers.	57	14	02	15	12
12. Pupils with disabilities feel most comfortable when there are with others of similar needs.	36	25	08	12	19
13. Pupils with severe disabilities and non – disabled pupils should not learn in the same classrooms.	14	22	03	23	38
14. Ordinary schools have the resources and qualified personnel to meet the academic needs of all pupils.	08	19	07	28	38
15. Pupils with disabilities who are integrated in ordinary classrooms will interfere with the quality of education provided to non-disabled pupils.	11	17	06	31	35
16. Integrating pupils with disabilities full time in ordinary classes means equity for all pupils.	44	28	05	14	09
17. If pupils with disabilities were placed full time in ordinary classes, their self – esteem would improve.	40	37	02	15	06
18. Pupils with disabilities will academically perform better if they were placed full time in ordinary schools.	27	18	07	28	20
19. If pupils with mild disabilities where placed in ordinary classrooms, they would experience more difficulties in academic work.	10	14	09	40	27
20. All pupils with disabilities should follow programmes which are found in ordinary classrooms.	33	24	05	32	06

N=193, scale 1-5 (1 = I strongly agree, 2 = I agree generally, 3 = undecided, 4 = I disagree generally, 5 = I strongly disagree)

**Table 6: Ordinary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education item-wise
by percentage**

Item	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher self-confidence in inclusion					
1. I am sure I could teach pupils with special needs included in my classroom	27	45	04	13	11
5. I am confident that I can adapt teaching and learning materials to suit all children with special educational needs in my class	29	33	08	19	11
9. Teaching children with disabilities will make me behave like them	15	14	07	14	50
13. With school based short training, I can be confident to teach pupils with special educational needs	35	34	11	09	11
17. I am confident that pupils with special educational needs will feel welcome and enjoy my lesson	40	32	13	05	10
21. I am confident that I can evaluate pupils with special educational needs in my class.	41	40	10	05	04
23. I am confident that I can manage the behaviour of pupils with special educational needs.	16	21	08	25	30
Effective of inclusion on the ordinary class teacher					
3. Ordinary classroom teachers have sufficient time for planning and preparing for children with special educational needs	13	30	04	20	33
7. There is sufficient time for ordinary teachers to make consultation with others when teaching pupils with special educational needs	30	26	04	20	20
11. Ordinary teachers can easily develop techniques to support pupils with special educational needs without much struggling.	17	21	04	35	23
15. In order for pupils with special educational needs to fit in ordinary classrooms, there is need to change the classroom environment.	57	20	05	11	07
19. Regular teachers have access to appropriate teaching and learning materials as well as support needed to teach pupils with special needs.	22	22	06	22	28
22. My time table is flexible enough to allow individual attention.	16	21	08	25	30
24. The way an ordinary teacher relates with a child who has a disability cannot affect the child's educational progress.	18	32	13	20	17
Effective of inclusion on the included student					
2. Pupils with special educational needs integrated into ordinary classrooms would benefit socially	38	39	05	10	08
6. Pupils with special educational needs will benefit academically in ordinary classrooms	26	38	04	18	14
10. The self-concept of pupils with special needs will be strengthened when they are integrated in ordinary classrooms.	29	39	09	10	13
14. Children with special educational needs will contribute to society when they become adults.	70	20	05	02	03
18. Ordinary pupils will relate well with special educational needs pupils.	20	39	09	22	10

Appropriateness of regular teacher work load

8. Ordinary teachers need full time assistant teachers in order to cope with teaching pupils with special educational needs in their class.	58	20	04	10	08
12. It is not possible for pupils with special needs to integrate well into the life of ordinary school.	25	13	03	30	29
16. Many Techniques used to teach ordinary pupils are not different from those required for children with special educational needs.	22	34	03	19	22
20. I believe that not all pupils with special needs require constant support from a teacher.	24	46	06	09	15

Teacher confidence in head teacher support

25. Head teachers are too busy to give morale and educational support to ordinary teachers teaching children with special educational needs.	20	15	08	28	29
26. My head teacher supports innovations that I make for children with special educational needs in my class	27	36	10	16	11
27. Ordinary teachers can rely on their head teachers for support in teaching pupils with special educational needs.	24	28	05	23	20
28. Head teachers avoid overloading ordinary teachers working with pupils with special educational needs	20	11	10	31	28
29. Headteachers are active leaders in supporting the inclusion of pupils with special educational needs in ordinary classrooms.	39	29	08	13	11
30. Head teachers can help in developing school policies for inclusive education.	72	20	03	03	02

N=112, scale 1-5 (1 = I strongly agree, 2 = I agree generally, 3 = undecided, 4 = I disagree generally, 5 = I strongly disagree)

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE NO. 1

(To be answered by all teachers, head Teachers and parents)

I am a student from the University of Zambia, School of Education, carrying out a research on Inclusive Education. You are kindly asked to answer all questions from this questionnaire.

Instructions

This questionnaire is about placement of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) into ordinary classrooms.

You have been selected to take part in this questionnaire. Please note that your names are not required. There are 20 statements. Each statement has 5 answers represented by numbers from 1 to 5. For each statement, you are allowed to choose only one of the five answers by marking a circle around it. Your choice represents your personal opinion and therefore there are no correct or wrong answers. A key is provided to explain the meaning of the choices from 1 to 5. Your responses will strictly be confidential. Please fill in your school and personal details before start giving your answers.

School Details (Tick where appropriate)

Name of School: Settings: Rural Peri Urban
Urban Type of School: Government Private

Participant's Details (Tick where appropriate)

Sex: Male Female
Position: Ordinary/regular teacher Special Education teacher
Headteacher Parent of child with a Disability
Parent of a Child without a disability
Level of Formal Education: Primary Secondary Tertiary None
Age Group: under 25; 25-30; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; over 60

KEY				
1	2	3	4	5
I strongly Agree	I agree generally	Not decided	I disagree generally	I strongly disagree
Statements				Choices
1. Pupils with severe disabilities receive the best education in special classrooms.				12345

2. Pupils who have severe behaviour problems need special education in special schools.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Pupils with disabilities are sometimes rejected or teased by non – disabled pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
4. When pupils with disabilities are placed full time in ordinary classes for teaching is lost or wasted.	1	2	3	4	5
5. It is wrong to ask ordinary teachers to admit pupils with severe disabilities to their classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Pupils with disabilities stop feeling unease if they were placed full – time in ordinary classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
7. It is the responsibility of ordinary teachers to teach pupils with disabilities in their ordinary classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Pupils with severe behaviour problems need special classes in ordinary schools.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Placing pupils with disabilities full time in ordinary classes means providing quality education for all.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Ordinary teachers are able to meet the academic needs of pupils with disabilities in their classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Pupils with severe disabilities should only be taught by trained special education teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Pupils with disabilities feel most comfortable when there are with others of similar needs.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Pupils with severe disabilities and non – disabled pupils should not learn in the same classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Ordinary schools have the resources and qualified personnel to meet the academic needs of all pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Pupils with disabilities who are integrated in ordinary classrooms will interfere with the quality of education provided to non-disabled pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Integrating pupils with disabilities full time in ordinary classes means equity for all pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
17. If pupils with disabilities were placed full time in ordinary classes, their self – esteem would improve.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Pupils with disabilities will academically perform better if they were placed full time in ordinary schools.	1	2	3	4	5
19. If pupils with mild disabilities where placed in ordinary classrooms, they would experience more difficulties in academic work.	1	2	3	4	5
20. All pupils with disabilities should follow programmes which are found in ordinary classrooms.	1	2	3	4	

Write any extra information that you feel is necessary.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for successfully completing this questionnaire!

APPENDIX 3

QUESTIONNAIRE N0. 2

(To be answered by **ordinary teachers only**)

I am a student from the University of Zambia, School of Education, conducting a research on Inclusive Education. You are kindly asked to answer all questions from this questionnaire.

Instructions

This questionnaire is about placement of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) into ordinary classrooms.

You have been selected to take part in this questionnaire. Please note that your names are not required. There are 20 statements. Each statement has 5 answers represented by numbers from 1 to 5. **For each statement, you are allowed to choose only one** of the five answers by marking a **circle** around it. Your choice represents your personal opinion and therefore there are no correct or wrong answers. A key is provided to explain the meaning of the choices from 1 to 5. Your responses will strictly be confidential. Please fill in your school and personal details before you start answering the questions.

School Details (Tick where appropriate)

Name of School: _____ Settings: Rural _____ Peri Urban _____
Urban _____ Type of School: Government _____ Private _____

Participant's Details (Tick where appropriate)

Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Level of Formal Education: Primary _____ Secondary _____ Tertiary _____

Age Group: Under 25; 25-30; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; Over 60.

1	2	3	4	5	
I strongly Agree	I agree generally	Not decided	I disagree generally	I strongly disagree	
Statements			Choices		
1. I am sure I could teach pupils with special educational needs included in my classroom	1	2	3	4	5
2. Pupils with special educational needs integrated into ordinary classrooms would benefit socially	1	2	3	4	5
3. Ordinary classroom teachers have sufficient time for planning and preparing for children with special educational needs	1	2	3	4	5
4. I am confident to teach pupils with the following disabilities:	1	2	3	4	5
Deaf	1	2	3	4	5
Blind	1	2	3	4	5
Learning Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Behavioural disorders	1	2	3	4	5
Mental retardation	1	2	3	4	5
Mild Hearing impairments	1	2	3	4	5
Physical disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Communication disorders	1	2	3	4	5
Mild Visual Disorders	1	2	3	4	5
Cerebral palsy	1	2	3	4	5
5. I am confident that I can adapt teaching and learning materials to suit all children with special educational needs in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Pupils with special educational needs will benefit academically in ordinary classrooms	1	2	3	4	5
7. There is sufficient time for ordinary teachers to make consultation with others when teaching pupils with special educational needs	1	2	3	4	5
8. Ordinary teachers need full time assistant teachers in order to cope with teaching pupils with special educational needs in their class.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Teaching children with special needs (disabilities) will make me behave like them	1	2	3	4	5
10. The self-concept of pupils with special needs will be strengthened when they are integrated in ordinary classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Ordinary teachers can easily develop techniques to support pupils with special educational needs without much struggling.	1	2	3	4	5
12. It is not possible for pupils with special needs to integrate well into the life of ordinary school.	1	2	3	4	5
13. With school based short training, I can be confident to teach pupils with special educational needs in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Children with special educational needs will contribute to society when they become adults.	1	2	3	4	5
15. In order for pupils with special educational needs to fit in ordinary classrooms, there is need to change the classroom environment.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Many Techniques used to teach ordinary pupils are not different from those required for children with special educational needs.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I am confident that pupils with special educational needs will feel	1	2	3	4	5

welcome and enjoy my lessons.					
18. Ordinary pupils will relate well with special educational needs pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Regular teachers have access to appropriate teaching and learning materials as well as support needed to teach pupils with special needs.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I believe that not all pupils with special needs require constant support from a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I am confident that I can evaluate pupils with special educational needs in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
22. My time table is flexible enough to allow individual attention.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I am confident that I can manage the behaviour of pupils with special educational needs.	1	2	3	4	5
24. The way an ordinary teacher relates with a child who has a disability cannot affect the child's educational progress.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Head teachers are too busy to give morale and educational support to ordinary teachers teaching children with special educational needs.	1	2	3	4	5
26. My head teacher supports innovations that I make for children with special educational needs in my class	1	2	3	4	5
27. Ordinary teachers can rely on their head teachers for support in teaching pupils with special educational needs.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Head teachers avoid overloading ordinary teachers working with pupils with special educational needs	1	2	3	4	5
29. Headteachers are active leaders in supporting the inclusion of pupils with special educational needs in ordinary classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Head teachers can help in developing school policies for inclusive education.	1	2	3	4	5

Write any extra information that you feel is necessary.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for successfully completing this questionnaire!

APPENDIX 4.

SEMI – STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

An interview will be conducted with parents, teachers and school headteachers individually. The interview is meant to get qualitative information that would otherwise not be easily obtained with a questionnaire.

There are two sections. Section A has 10 questions to be answered by all parents and only and section B has 14 questions to be answered by all participants.

SECTION A

This Section comprises 14 questions to be answered by all parents.

1. Do you think children with disabilities would learn more in special classrooms or schools than in ordinary classrooms or schools? Why?
2. When pupils with special needs are moved from special schools and placed in ordinary schools what do you think they will: (i) lose from special schools? or (ii) gain in ordinary schools?
3. Do you believe that pupils with special educational needs could be educated and contribute effectively to society? Why? Can you give examples?
4. Do you agree that when children with disabilities are placed in ordinary schools they will feel unease or uncomfortable? Why?
5. Do you think that when children with disabilities are integrated in ordinary classrooms, their friends who are not disabled will tease, mock and call them bad names?
6. Which is more expensive; to send a disabled child to a special school or ordinary school? Which one would you prefer? Why?
7. Some people have said that inclusive/integration education will not work because teachers in ordinary schools are not trained and that they have 'I don't care' attitude towards the disabled? Do you agree with this statement? Why?

8. Do you think it is fair to mix children with disabilities and those who are not disabled? Why?
9. Do headteachers of ordinary schools accept children with special educational needs in their schools? What kind of problem do children face with headteachers?
10. How do you compare teaching and learning resources between special schools and inclusive classes in your district
11. If your child with disabilities was provided with all necessary resources, do you think he/she will successfully complete school and go to college?
12. Do you think the concept of inclusion and its practices are good? Can you give examples of good or bad practices?
13. Do you think government is doing enough in the provision of resources and promotion of special education for children with disabilities?
14. What would you like government do in order to improve the education of children with disabilities in (i) ordinary schools (ii) in special schools?

SECTION B

This Section comprises 14 questions to be answered by all participants

There are six different provisions/placements for different learners with special educational needs. These are:

(a.) Full time in ordinary classrooms

(b). Most of the time in ordinary classrooms

(c.) Most time in special classes

(d) Full time in special class/unit in ordinary school

(e.) Full time in special institution such as Cheshire homes or Day Care Centers.

I would like you to tell me the best provision or placement for pupils with different disabilities I am going to describe to you. You are also expected to briefly explain why your choice is the best

Where would a child with the following disability be placed?

1. Moderate speech impairments
2. Severe speech impairments
3. Moderate hearing impairments
4. Severe hearing impairments
5. Moderate specific learning difficulties (e.g in spelling, writing, reading)
6. Severe specific learning difficulties (e.g in spelling, writing, reading)
7. Moderate mental retardation
8. Severe mental retardation
9. Moderate visual impairment
10. Severe visual impairments
11. Moderate physical and health impairment
12. Severe physical and health impairments
13. Moderate behavioural problems
14. Severe behavioural problems

APPENDIX 5

NAMES OF SCHOOLS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY

- 1. Chambeshi**
- 2. Chavuma**
- 3. Chembe**
- 4. Chibuluma**
- 5. Chilonga**
- 6. Denovan**
- 7. Fibale**
- 8. Ichimpe**
- 9. Kafubu Depot**
- 10. Kalulushi**
- 11. Kameme**
- 12. Kangwena**
- 13. Kawama**
- 14. Masamba**
- 15. Michinka**
- 16. Mitobo**
- 17. Sitwe**
- 18. Twaiteka**
- 19. Twikatane**
- 20. Twalubuka**