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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments in Lusaka District schools in Lusaka Province.

A survey approach was used in conducting this research. Data were collected through interviews and questionnaires from a sample of 10 head teachers and 55 ordinary teachers selected to accurately represent the population under study.

Quantitative data was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) from which frequencies, percentages and graphs were generated while qualitative data obtained through interviews were coded and grouped by establishing the emerging themes.

The study found out that the attitudes of head teachers and ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children varied. Some head teachers and ordinary teachers showed some positive attitudes towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. They perceived these teachers as hardworking, tolerant, creative and caring. On the other hand, some head teachers and ordinary teachers perceived the teachers of intellectually impaired children to be emotional and that they tended to think and behave like the children they taught. These negative attitudes exhibited by head teachers and ordinary teachers towards the teachers of intellectually impaired children could partly be attributed to the anti-social behaviour of the teachers of the intellectually impaired children because in most cases they tended to isolate themselves.

The study also revealed that the teachers who taught the intellectually disabled children were stigmatised by some head teachers and ordinary teachers who called them all sorts of names such as “teachers of fools, teachers of imbeciles, teachers of idiots, teachers of mad children, teachers of lunatics” – associating them with the behaviour of the children
they taught which in due course had a negative bearing on teachers of the intellectually disabled children.

Suggested measures by respondents to change the negative attitudes of some head teachers and ordinary teachers towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children included: organising regular seminars and workshops on Special Education Needs (SEN) for both head teachers and ordinary teachers in schools; conducting in-service short courses in special education for both head teachers and ordinary teachers in schools; involving both the ordinary teachers and the teachers of the intellectually impaired children in all school activities and sensitizing both the ordinary teachers and the teachers of the intellectually impaired children to understand that they possessed the same qualifications and no one was inferior to the other. The study recommended that:

- More programmes should be introduced in schools to specifically sensitise head teachers and ordinary teachers to develop positive attitudes towards the teachers of intellectually impaired children.
- The Ministry of Education should introduce a department of education for children with intellectual disabilities in all colleges of education so that graduates from these colleges would have knowledge of teaching the children with intellectual impairments.
- The Ministry of Education should sensitize ordinary teachers on the importance of teaching children with intellectual impairments through holding regular seminars and workshops so as to enhance the relationship between ordinary teachers and the teachers of the intellectually impaired children.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background information

Traditional beliefs are built on the interplay of culture and religion in most societies and relate disability to supernatural powers as punishment. Such traditional beliefs are very common in Zambia, particularly among the rural and less educated people. In the 18th century, disabled persons were not regarded as people. Those with severe learning difficulties were referred to as *ifipuba* (fools), dead things and God’s people (Simwaka, 1985; Tembo, 1988; Kisanji, 1998).

The attitudes ordinary teachers have towards those who teach children with intellectual impairment and the actions they take for or against them (for example, association and disassociation) may positively or negatively affect the teaching process of teachers of the intellectually disabled children.

Burns (1982) and Martins (1986) state that ordinary teachers are among the people who are potentially most influential in determining the confidence and the morale of those teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children. Generally, those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children are stigmatised by the ordinary teachers who call them all sorts of names such as teachers of fools; teachers of imbeciles, teachers of idiots, teachers of mad children, teachers of lunatics, and associating them with the behaviour of the children they teach. Goffman (1963) confirms that such stigma or negative comments can affect the social role that one expects from such stigmatised teachers. However, Wishart and Johnson (1990) postulate that it is not the ordinary teachers alone that can determine the social role and minimise the ability of those teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children, but that the teachers of children with intellectual impairment themselves may also have a role to play.
Maroza and May (1985) revealed that specialist teachers teaching intellectually disabled children were considered to deteriorate with time in terms of mental or intellectual abilities. They believed that with time, their mental ability went down because they kept on teaching the same things day after day. As such, the ordinary teachers also believed that teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments would be like the children they taught.

However, Ashman and Elkins (1994) reported that it was clear that ignorance of intellectual impairment was partly responsible for the widespread negative attitudes ordinary teachers held towards those teachers who taught the children with intellectual impairment.

But Shurtleff (1983) in Ashman and Elkins (1994) had taken a different approach to attitude change by adopting a curriculum approach which prepared the ground for successful incorporation of ordinary teachers and “normal” children into sharing the same educational materials and equipment with teachers who taught the intellectually disabled children.

Although special education has been in Zambia for a long time, the teaching of children with intellectual impairments is quite a recent development in the Zambian education system. Predominantly special education was more concerned about the visually and hearing impaired, and not the intellectually impaired. Kalabula (1989) stated that during this era special needs education was marginalised. It was a situation of doing without except for the little that was provided by exclusively voluntary missionary agencies, which mainly focused on the visually and hearing impaired.

Katwishialso revealed that special education focused its attention on teaching children with visual and hearing impairments, which was solely the concern of the missionaries as they considered it to be useful and cheaper to manage.
Although Bowman’s (1986) study which included Zambia did not discuss the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired, it reported a wide variation in teacher opinions regarding integration of children with intellectual impairments in the ordinary classes. This study further indicated that severe intellectual impairments and multiple impairments were all considered least favoured, while teaching children with sensory and physical impairments were seen as the easiest to handle. It further revealed that ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers of intellectually impaired children had several interacting factors, the most important one being the level and nature of support given to teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments.

The study also revealed that teachers with substantial training had a significantly higher positive attitude towards teachers of intellectually impaired children than those with little or no training at all. The above developments could have given rise to the negative attitudes which ordinary teachers have towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

**Statement of the problem**

Although many sensitisation seminars and workshops have been conducted on the importance of teaching the intellectually impaired children in Zambia, ordinary teachers still seem to hold negative attitudes towards those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairment. However, because there is not much research done in this area, this study was designed to investigate the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

**Purpose of the study**

The study sought to investigate the attitudes head teachers and ordinary teachers held towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children in Lusaka District of Lusaka Province.
Objectives of the study

The study had the following objectives:

(a) To find out the attitudes ordinary teachers hold towards teachers of children with intellectual impairment.

(b) To establish measures of changing attitudes of ordinary teachers towards those teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children.

Research questions

The research attempted to answer the following questions:

(a) What attitudes do ordinary teachers hold towards teachers of children with intellectual impairment?

(b) What measures can be put in place to change the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of children with intellectual impairment?

Significance of the study

Many studies have been conducted on inclusive education by a number of scholars, however there is no study conducted focusing on the attitudes held by ordinary teachers towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. The attitudes of ordinary teachers towards the teachers of intellectually impaired children are of prime importance, because they can influence the success or failure of teaching children with intellectual impairments. Tibebu (1995) and Moberg (2000) have indicated that ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers of intellectually impaired children can facilitate or hinder the learning of children with intellectual impairments in ordinary schools. Hence, the findings derived from this study may not only be an eye opener but may lead to interested stakeholders formulating appropriate interventions in order to enhance positive attitudes in ordinary teachers towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. The stakeholders may comprise Ministry of Education as policy makers, parents and teachers,
and organisations that have taken interest in the education of the intellectually impaired children.

Limitations

This study was limited to selected Lusaka District schools. The sample was rather small due to limited time and resources in relation to the entire population of schools in Lusaka. Therefore, the findings of this study ought not to be generalized.

Operational definitions of terms

Ordinary teacher: regular teachers who are not specialised in teaching intellectually impaired children.

Attitudes: negative or positive feelings ordinary teachers hold for teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children.

Negative attitudes: bad statements made about teachers who teach the children with intellectual impairment.

Labels: names attached to a teacher who teaches the intellectually impaired children.

Impairment: this refers to absence or malfunction of a part of the body.

Disability: refers to a restriction or inability of the part of the body or organ to perform its intended function as a result of impairment.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature on “ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children”.

Definition of attitude

Olson and Zanna (1993) argued that despite the long history of research on attitudes, there is no universally agreed definition. He looks at attitude as an interdisciplinary term frequently found in sociological and psychological literature. Cognitive theories assert that attitudes are found in consciously held beliefs – information that a person has about other people, objects and issues. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) and Tibebu (1995) defined attitude as a general, enduring positive or negative feeling about some person, object, or issue. In other words, beliefs as people’s subjective knowledge about themselves and their world are primary determinants of attitudes. Thus, if beliefs are regarded as “information”, attitudes can be viewed as having an informational basis. Each belief links the attitude object to a positively or negatively valued attribute (Desta, 2000).

Attitudes represent an individual’s general feeling of liking or disliking for the stimulus object. A person’s attitude towards the object are determined by beliefs that the selected object has pertaining to attributes that make it more or less favourable to the individual (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Engelbrecht, 1996; Nyewe and Green, 1999). The person’s attitudes toward the object are a function of his/her evaluations of an experience with these attributes (Dyson and Forlin, 1999). Teachers and pupils form attributes about each other through daily interactions, which reinforce a pupil’s opinion about him/herself and
the attributes of others, involved (Goodspeed and Celotta, 1982; Hogg and Vaughan, 1995; Davies and Green, 1998).

Bem (1970) indicates that attitudes are formed by behaviour. This means that one of the most identified effective ways to change the hearts and minds of people is to change their behaviour. Festinger (1957), in Bem (1970) suggests that to see how behaviour might serve as a foundation for beliefs and attitudes of ordinary teachers towards those teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children, there is need to examine two theories such as cognitive dissonance and functionalist theory.

Michener et al. (2007), view cognitive dissonance theory as a concept that involves our thoughts, beliefs and ideas about something. They (Michener et al.) maintain that when a human being is the object of an attitude, the cognitive component is frequently a stereotype; for instance, regarding teachers of intellectually impaired children as being dull or lazy. Kahn and Myer (1985), argue that cognitive dissonance theory involves several components of attitudes such as effective-feelings or emotions like fear, sympathy or hatred. In this type of component of attitude, a person might want to keep welfare recipients out of the neighbourhood. The emphasis is on the ordinary teacher’s tendency to view the teachers of intellectually impaired as being inferior in society (William, 2007).

Downie et al. (1991) define an attitude as a relatively stable tendency to respond consistently to particular people, objects or situations. This definition provided by Downie and his colleagues seems to raise several points. Firstly, attitudes are relatively stable and therefore they can change and can be changed. Secondly the phrase tendency to respond consistently implies that a person’s behavioural response in a situation provides an indication of their attitudes towards it. Downie et al. (1991), argued that by observing someone’s behaviour it is possible to deduce his or her attitudes. However, the qualifier that it is a tendency to respond consistently indicates that it is possible to behave inconsistently with ones situation, implying that a person’s behaviour does not
necessarily represent those attitudes in a straightforward manner. Thus judging attitudes from behaviour involves a lot of implications.

Attitudes have also been referred to as a set of ideas charged with emotions that predisposes a class of actions to a particular class of social situations (Triandis, 1971; Panda and Bartel, 1972; Tibebu, 1995). McGuire (1969); Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Gross (1996) argued that there are three components that form part of the development of attitudes:

Affect - which relates to the feelings of liking or disliking the attitude object.

Cognitive - which is the knowledge or beliefs a person has about the attitude object.

Conation - which refers to the behavioural intentions or actions of a person.

According to Katz (1989) in Michener et al. (2007), the functionalist theory takes the view that attitudes are determined by the functions they serve. This means that ordinary teachers hold negative attitudes towards the teachers of children with intellectual impairment to help them achieve their basic goals by passing remarks that discourage them. He distinguishes four types of functions that attitudes meet. These are:

(a) **Instrumental**: which means that we develop favourable attitudes towards things that aid or reward us. As such, we want to maximize rewards and minimize penalties. Katz further says that we develop attitudes that help us meet this goal. For example, ordinary teachers favour able-bodied children who they believe would advance their economic lot if they are in business. They are likely to change their attitude if doing so allows them to fulfil their goals or avoid undesirable consequences (preference for teaching the able-bodied to teaching the intellectually impaired).

(b) **Value-expressive psychology**: this involves the expression of basic values that reinforce self-image. For example, if one views oneself as a teacher of intellectually impaired, one can re-enforce that image by adopting the beliefs and values of teaching the children with intellectual impairments (Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia, 2003).
(c) **Ego-defensive:** this includes attitudes which serve to protect us from acknowledging the basic truths about ourselves or the harsh realities of life, serving as defensive mechanisms. For instance, the ordinary teachers’ negative attitudes towards their counterparts who teach the intellectually impaired may develop into the attitudes of superiority towards teachers of children with intellectual impairments (Katz, 2007). Katz’s functionalist theory offers an attitude change when it no longer serves its function and the individual feels blocked or frustrated. This means that attitude change is achieved not so much by changing a person’s information or perception about an object, but rather changing the person’s underlying motivational and personality needs.

(d) However, Tesser (1993), has pointed out that there are numerous theories of attitude formation and attitude change, including consistency theories which imply that we must be consistent in our beliefs and values. The most famous example of such a theory is dissonance reduction theory- associated with Leon Festinger. However, there are others like the balance theory of Fritz Heider, self-perception theory, associated with Darly Bem; meta-programmes theory associated with Neuro-Linguistic Programming; persuasion; Elaboration likelihood model, associated with Richard E. Petty and the Heuristic Systematic Model of Shelly Chaikens; Social judgment theory; balance theory, abundance theory and intellect (Tesser, 1993).

**Ordinary teachers’ attitude towards teachers of children with intellectual impairments**

Antonack (1980) in Alghazo (2000) indicated that one of the most important predictors of successful integrating of children with intellectual impairments in the regular classroom is the attitudes of general education teachers towards teachers of intellectually disabled children.
Research findings by some scholars such have shown that ordinary teachers have unfavourable attitudes towards children with intellectual impairment and that they are not even willing to teach them. Abosi (2003) in Chishimba’s (2005) dissertation, also explains that teachers are not willing to have children with impairments (intellectually impaired included) in their classes based on their superstitious beliefs about the cause of intellectual impairments, which in turn, have affected inclusive education in Africa.

Kalabula (1991) in Chishimba’s (2005) dissertation has also recorded that ordinary teachers all over the world and Zambia, in particular, hold negative and misguided attitudes towards children with disabilities. Although the observation made in his dissertation does not indicate the ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers of intellectually disabled children, he supports the fact that people’s attitudes including those of teachers who teach children without intellectual impairments, and have a long lasting negative effect on teachers of children with intellectual impairment. Kelly (1955) was also of the view that beliefs are created from an internal organization of experience into a coherent system. This system is used to predict others’ behaviours and guide one’s own behaviours, perceptions and judgement.

However, Hergety et al. (1981) in Chishimba’s (2005) dissertation, pointed out that teachers’ attitudes towards children with intellectual impairment differ from person to person. This observation may also be extended to ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments in Zambia. This therefore, shows that ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers of intellectually disabled are not uniform. They differ from one ordinary teacher to the other.

Although the above authors did not discuss the ordinary teachers’ attitudes in relation to those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairment, they made a significant observation that ordinary teachers’ negative attitudes towards children with intellectual impairments are a cause for unwillingness to accept those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled in their schools, hence, the negative attitude.
Research findings by Kasonde-Ng’andu and Moberg (2001) on inclusive schooling in North-Western and Western Provinces of Zambia also revealed that the attitudes of various respondents, teachers, head teachers and parents were predominantly negative although their data showed that a substantial number of people seemed to believe in the idea of inclusion especially among those with formal education and the young ones.

Larrivee (1982) in Chilufya (2005:17) on the other hand outlined the factors that lead to ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers of intellectually disabled as classroom behaviour of intellectually disabled children themselves. This makes the ordinary teachers associate the bad behaviour which intellectually disabled children exhibit in a classroom with those teachers who teach them. Other factors are the perceptions of teachers of intellectually disabled – their own abilities to teach children with intellectual disabilities; and the impact integration has on academic performance and social growth of children with intellectual disabilities.

Measures to change ordinary teachers’ attitudes

Attitudes can be changed through persuasion (Hovland, in Wikipedia free encyclopaedia, 2003). In Hovland’s view, attitude change is a response to communication. Hovland et al. (1960) maintain that the factors that can affect the reception of a message are dependent upon the following:

(a) **Target characteristics:** These are characteristics that refer to the person who receives and processes the message (the ordinary teacher). According to Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2003), it seems that more intelligent people are less easily persuaded by one-sided messages. Furthermore, Rhodes and Woods (1992) in Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2003), claim that another variable that has been associated with target characteristics as one of the factors that can affect the persuasiveness of a message in determining attitude change, is self-esteem. Rhodes and Woods (1992) in Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2003) postulate that although it is sometimes thought that those ordinary teachers are in higher self-esteem, there is some evidence that the relationship
between self-esteem and persuasibility is actually curvilinear, with people of moderate self-esteem being more easily persuaded than both those of high and low self-esteem levels.

(b) **Source characteristics:** Hovland and Weiss (1951) in Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2003), suggest that the major source characteristics are expertise, trustworthiness and attractiveness. They (Hovland and Weiss) hold that the credibility of a perceived message has been found to be a key variable in influencing the attitude change in ordinary teachers towards those teachers who teach the children with intellectual impairment.

(c) **Message characteristics:** The nature of the message plays a significant role in persuasion. Sometimes presenting both sides of the story is useful to help change attitudes (Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia, 2003).

(d) **Cognitive Routes:** The cognitive route refers to instances in which a person (either individually or through interaction with others) perceives and interprets the environment in some way, which affects, felt or expressed emotions (Larissa and Colin, 2004). This implies that a message can appeal to an individual’s cognitive evaluation to help change his/her attitude towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children. The ordinary teacher can thus be presented with information on disabilities, and be motivated to evaluate the data related to the teaching of intellectually disabled children. This, according to Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2003), can enable the ordinary teachers arrive at an attitude change.

Pajares (1992) argued that teachers’ beliefs strongly affect their behaviours, and as such, knowing their beliefs helps to predict behaviour. Since beliefs that teachers hold influence their behaviours, it is also true that understanding teachers’ beliefs is important for predicting ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments.

Kauffmann and Hallahan (1981); Turn Bull and Schutz (1979) in Alghazo (2003), state that because attitudes are essential in the success of educating children with intellectual
impairments in regular education classrooms, pre-service programmes should emphasize and concentrate on changing ordinary teachers' attitudes towards teachers of intellectually disabled children. Some researchers such as Murphy (1996); Conte (1994) and Wiczemski (1992) in Alghazo (2003), believe that the preparation programmes for ordinary classroom teachers for inclusion are ineffective at both the pre-service and in-service levels. Bender, Vail and Scott (1995) in Alghazo (2003) also reveal that in order to achieve successful change of ordinary teachers' attitude towards teachers of the intellectually impaired, ordinary teachers must be adequately sensitized about the importance of teaching children with intellectual disabilities.

Shoho et al. (1997) in Alghazo (2003), advised that if ordinary teachers gained more knowledge about including children with intellectual impairment in regular classrooms and how their learning needs could be addressed, they may have less negative attitudes towards teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments.

Teachers' specialisations can, to some extent, influence their attitudes and perceptions. For example those teachers who teach ordinary children and have no knowledge of education of intellectually disabled, will not see the need to provide education to children with intellectual impairments. This may result in these teachers having a negative attitude towards the teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments. It is however, worthy to note here that not all ordinary teachers have negative attitudes towards teachers of intellectually impaired children.

Education Department (2001:4) argues that change of attitude of ordinary teachers towards those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments is not easy at all. He however suggests that to achieve this it requires constant persistence, commitment, coordination, monitoring, evaluation, follow up and good leadership of school managers in schools with children with intellectual impairments.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology used in the study starting with the research design, population, sample size, sampling procedures, and research instruments as well as data collection procedures.

Research design

A survey approach was used in conducting this research. A survey usually involves collecting data by interviewing a sample of people selected to accurately represent the population under study (Sidhu, 2006). Survey questions concern people’s behaviour, their attitudes, how and where they live, and information about their backgrounds. This design was used because it is flexible, in that many questions may be asked on a given topic. It provides ideas, theories, explanations of hypotheses, valuable information in formulating research problems and it reveals detailed information on a given topic or issue such as ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards their fellow teachers of intellectually disabled children in selected Lusaka District Schools.

This study used mainly qualitative methods of data collection. The study was highly descriptive in nature. Quantitative methods of data collection were, however, also employed to yield empirical data to substantiate the qualitative data.

Population

The target population comprised all the Head teachers and ordinary teachers in all the ten schools under study in Lusaka District.
Sample size

The total sample was 65 participants selected from 10 schools comprising 10 school head teachers and 55 ordinary teachers in the following schools in Lusaka District: Kamanga Basic, Kamwala Basic, Kizito Basic, Mulongoti Basic, George Central Basic, Desai Basic, Lotus Basic, St Patrick’s Basic, Matero Basic and Chitanda Basic.

Characteristics of the respondents

Respondent’s position in school by gender
Table 1 below shows the position and gender of the respondents in the study. The table shows that an equal number of male and female head teachers were interviewed. As for the teachers, there were more female than male teachers interviewed because the staffing in the schools visited by the researcher had fewer males compared to females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sex of respondent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifications of Respondents
The qualifications of the respondents are as shown in table 2 below. The table shows that the majority of respondents (36) had Primary Teachers’ Certificate, followed by those with Primary Teachers’ Diploma (13); then those with Secondary teachers’ Diploma (11). The least were those with University degrees (3) and Special Education Diploma (2).
Table 2: Qualifications of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher’s Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Teacher’s Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Teacher’s Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of respondents

The majority of the respondents fell in the age range of between 29 and 34 years old, these being mostly teachers. This was followed by those who fell in the age range of between 41 and 46 years old with the teachers being in majority again. Another group of teachers and head teachers fell in the age range of between 47 and 55 years old. These were equal in number (see table 3 below).

Table 3: Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range (years)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – 34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 – 55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampling procedures

Schools were selected by computer generated tables of systematic random numbers. Systematic sampling is an adaptation of simple random sampling. Johnson and Christensen (2000), define systematic sampling as, a sample that is obtained by determining the sampling interval (i.e. the population size divided by desired size, \( N/n \), which is symbolized by \( k \), selected at random from a starting point (a number between 1 and \( k \), including 1 and \( k \)), and then selected every \( k^{th} \) element in the sampling frame.

The benefits of systematic sampling are that:

- It is a random sampling with a system. From the sampling frame, a starting point is chosen at random, and thereafter at regular intervals. It is easier to administer when you are selecting elements from the lists such as lists of names and list of schools (John & Christensen, 2000).
- It is more convenient than simple random sampling (Charles, 1995)
- It is more efficient and preferred over sampling with replacement; and
- You cannot select one element more than once (Kalton, 1983) in Johnson and Christensen (2000). Systematic sampling is often done when all members of population are named on a master list. From that list a name of the school was chosen at random. After the first selected name, every 10\(^{th}\), 20\(^{th}\), 30\(^{th}\) up to 130\(^{th}\) elements were included in the sample.

Research instruments

A questionnaire and a semi-interview guide were used to collect the data for the study. The questionnaire consisted of closed ended questions, while the semi-structured interview guide, consisted of lists of questions to guide the interview.

A questionnaire is a form used in a survey design that participants in a study complete and return to the researcher. The participant chooses answers to the questions and supplies basic personal or demographic information (Creswell, 1998). An interview, on
the other hand, is a form on which the researcher records answers supplied by the participants in the study. The researcher asks a question from an interview guide, listens for answers or observes behaviour and records responses on the survey (Creswell, 1998).

**Questionnaire for ordinary teachers**

The questionnaire was used to gather information from the ordinary teachers in relation to their individual biography; the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of intellectually impaired children; the effects of teaching children with intellectual impairments on teachers of intellectually impaired children; and finding ways of improving relationships between ordinary teachers and teachers of intellectually impaired children.

**Interview schedules for head teachers**

Interview schedules were used to obtain information in relation to the following: when school was opened; the proprietors of the school; number of female and male teachers in the school; number of male and female teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments; the general performance of teachers who taught intellectually impaired children; their strengths and weaknesses; the effects of teaching children with intellectual impairments on these teachers; the general attitude of ordinary teachers towards these teachers; and suggested ways of improving the relationship between these teachers and their fellow ordinary teachers.

**Data collection procedures**

Prior to the collection of data, permission to visit basic schools in Lusaka District was obtained from the District Education Board Secretary. Thereafter, the researcher sought permission from the head teacher of the school to collect information from the school.

The data were collected between the months of February and March 2007. Structured questionnaires were used to obtain information from the ordinary teachers while
interview schedules were used to gather in-depth data from head teachers regarding attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

Data analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyse quantitative data from the questionnaires while qualitative data which was obtained through interviews was analysed by coding and grouping the emerging themes. Computer generated tables of frequencies and percentages were used in describing distributions of the variables which were presented in the form of tables and graphs.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study which was conducted to determine the attitudes of ordinary school teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

The findings are presented according to the objectives of the study. The objectives of the study were: to find out the attitudes ordinary teachers held towards teachers of children with intellectual impairment; and to establish measures of changing the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

Attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments as perceived by head teachers

As regards head teachers’ views on the general attitude of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children, most of them (6) said that ordinary teachers had a negative attitude towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children while 3 of them indicated that ordinary teachers have positive attitude. One respondent was of the view that some of the ordinary teachers have positive attitude while others did not have positive attitude towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

In addition, head teachers and the ordinary teachers were asked to make some comments as to why they negatively perceived the teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments. Table 4 shows some of their comments.
Table 4: Some negative comments made by head teachers and ordinary teachers on teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They lack initiative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are easily demoralized due to lack of suitable teaching aids</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are not flexible</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They lack planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They tend to work in isolation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They easily become emotional at times and have a certain behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar to the children they teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their knowledge limited to SEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They tend to feel inferior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They handle fewer numbers of pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, head teachers and ordinary teachers were asked to comment on the positive aspect of the teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments. Their responses were as shown in Table 5.
Table 5: Some positive comments made by head teachers and ordinary teachers on teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are focused and dedicated to</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are caring and tolerant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are very cooperative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Improvise teaching aids</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are able to handle all kinds of</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that most of the head teachers and ordinary teachers said that teachers of children with intellectual impairments were “focused and dedicated to work”, as the most distinct strength that they possessed. On the other hand, 13 out of 55 teacher respondents and 3 out of 10 head teacher respondents said “tolerant” and “very cooperative”, respectively as some of the strengths found in the teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments. Other strengths identified included: “improvising teaching aids”, and “able to handle all kinds of learners” as reported by the teachers and ordinary head teachers, respectively.

The study also sought to find out the effects, if any, of teaching the intellectually impaired children on teachers who taught these children. Table 6 shows the responses from the ordinary teachers and head teachers in the study. The table shows that the majority of ordinary teacher respondents, 29 out of 55 representing 52.7% said “some teachers’ performance becomes low”, while five head teachers out of 10 said “teachers tend to be emotionally attached to the children they teach”.
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Table 6: Effects of teaching intellectually impaired children on teachers who teach them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some teachers’ performance becomes low</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers tend to be emotionally attached to the children they teach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers develop patience in dealing with different situation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers tend to behave like the children they teach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They at times get irritated easily</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes they forget that they are dealing with ordinary pupils when in an ordinary class</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinary teachers were asked to indicate how they would feel if they were called names. Their responses are shown in Table 7 below. The table shows that 60% of them said they would feel offended and discouraged while 40% said they can’t be bothered as long as they knew who they were. “Name calling” in this sense is a negative attitude which might in turn negatively affect the teaching process.

Table 7: Ordinary teachers’ responses to name calling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would feel offended and discouraged</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t be bothered as long as I know who I am</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Head teachers were also asked to indicate the general comments on the performance of the teachers who taught the intellectually impaired children. Table 8 below shows their comments.

Table 8: Head teachers’ general comments on performance of teachers of intellectually impaired children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well focused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good though they teach regular pupils since the school does not have a Special Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven out of ten respondents responded to this question. The study revealed that generally, the performance of the teachers of intellectually impaired children was “good” as evidenced by their responses as can be seen from Table 8 above.

Measures of changing the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children

Teachers and head teachers in the study were also asked to indicate ways of changing the negative attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of intellectually impaired children. The following emerged as shown in Table 9.
Table 9: Suggested ways of changing ordinary teachers’ attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested ways</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding regular seminars and workshops for both categories of teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving both categories of teachers in all school activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitizing ordinary teachers on the importance of SEN children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government should introduce Special Education course in all colleges and universities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Special Units in all ordinary schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making teachers of intellectually impaired children realize that they are equal to ordinary teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the majority of teachers (29) and and head teachers (6) indicated that the best way of changing the attitude of ordinary teachers towards those who teach children with intellectual impairments was through holding regular seminars and workshops for both categories of teachers.

Since interaction has an effect on changing the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children, ordinary teachers were asked to indicate as to whether they interacted with the teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments. Figure 1 shows their responses.
As can be seen from the figure above, most of ordinary teachers overwhelmingly indicated that they interacted with teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments, representing 50 (90.9%). Only a small number of ordinary teachers, five (9.1%) said that they did not interact with teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments.

Furthermore, ordinary teachers who indicated that they interacted with teachers of intellectually impaired children were asked to indicate how often they interacted with them. Figure 2 below shows their responses.

**Figure 2: Frequency of interaction in a week**
The figure shows that the majority of respondents, 32 (64.0%) said that they interacted "sometimes", while 17 (34.0%) of them indicated that they interacted "on a regular basis".

Ordinary teachers were asked to indicate the gender group of teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments they interacted with. Most of the respondents, 36 (72.0%) said they interacted with female teachers, while 11 (22.0%) of them said they interacted with males. Three of them said they interacted with both male and female teachers.

As for those respondents who said that they interacted with "male" teachers, a further question was asked to them to indicate the nature of the relationships. Figure 3 below shows the nature of the relationships between ordinary teachers and teachers of intellectually impaired children.

![Figure 3: Nature of relationships](image)

As shown above, the figure shows that the most of the respondents, 10 (71.4%) said that their relationship was "Good", while four (28.6 %) respondents said that it was "Very good".
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the study that was conducted to determine the attitudes of ordinary school teachers towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. This is done in line with the objectives of the study as outlined in the findings chapter (see Chapter Four).

Attitudes of ordinary teachers and head teachers towards teachers of children with intellectual impairments

The study sought to find out the attitudes of ordinary teachers and head teachers towards teachers of children with intellectual impairments. To this effect, the study revealed that majority of teachers, 43 (78%) and most of the head teacher respondents, 6 (60.0%), said that ordinary teachers had a negative attitude towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. This finding conforms to that of Murphy et al. (1996; 1994; 1992) who reported that ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers of intellectually disabled children were negative. These negative attitudes of ordinary teachers are a concern in that they are likely to act as a barrier for children with impairments to access education fairly. This means that the policy of “Education For All”, “Educating Our Future” is far from being realised by the children in question. Further, negative attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children in schools would make teachers of the intellectually impaired children ineffective in their teaching and “dilute” the learning programmes of children with intellectual disabilities.
Although in their study, Kasonde-Ng’andu and Moberg (2001) did not discuss the ordinary teachers’ attitudes towards teachers of the intellectually impaired, they pointed out that the attitudes towards inclusive education among the various respondents - teachers, head teachers and parents were predominantly negative.

The study also revealed that a substantial number of head teachers and ordinary teachers tended to pass some belittling comments on the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. Some of these unfriendly comments included the following: that these teachers are easily demoralised, they lack initiative, and they isolate themselves from the rest of us leading to signs of inferiority complex in their behaviour”.

The study also showed that some head teachers and ordinary teachers perceived the teachers of intellectually impaired children as being dirty and that they behaved like the children they taught. They also regarded some of these teachers, especially males, as having a negative attitude towards the children they taught.

Another notable finding which the study revealed was that both ordinary teachers and head teachers regarded the teachers of intellectually impaired as having knowledge which was confined to Special Education Needs. This was perceived as a serious deficiency in the teachers who taught the intellectually impaired children. Such a perception might also have contributed to the inferiority complex manifested by the teachers of children with intellectual impairments. This is what probably led to self isolation from ordinary teachers, which in turn, had a negative effect on the children they taught. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Wishart and Johnston (1990) who postulate that it is not the society that can determine the social role and minimise the ability of those teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children, but that the teachers of children with intellectual impairment themselves may also have a role to play in stigmatising those children they teach.

Gallagher et al. (1985); Stoler (1992); Richards et al. (1997) and Sack (1998) in Alghazo (2003) recorded that the relationship between ordinary teachers’ knowledge and
experience and their acceptance or resistance of including children with intellectual impairments into general education classrooms may affect both these teachers of intellectually disabled and the intellectually disabled children negatively or positively.

Schwartz, (1997), Burns (1982) and Martins (1986) expressed similar sentiments, claiming that teachers are among the people who are potentially most influential in determining the confidence and the morale of fellow teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children. In the present study teachers of the intellectually disabled children were stigmatised by the ordinary teachers who called them all sorts of names, such as, “teachers of fools; teachers of imbeciles, teachers of idiots, teachers of mad children, teachers of lunatics” and they tended to associate them with the behaviour of the children they taught. Goffman (1963) similarly stated that such stigma or negative comments can affect the social role that one expects from such stigmatised teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

Although half of the head teachers in the study were of the view that teachers of the intellectually impaired children tended to be emotionally attached to the children they taught, the study revealed that 10 out of 55 teachers (18.2%) and 2 out of 10 head teachers (20.0%), felt that teachers of the intellectually impaired children also tended to think and behave like the children they taught. However it is worthy to note here that it is not true to say that teachers of intellectually impaired children behaved like the children they taught. The reasons for such statements could be due to lack of exposure and ignorance of the ordinary teachers’ perceptions of intellectually impaired children.

As regards assessment of the general performance of the teachers of the intellectually impaired children, about half of the ordinary teachers, who responded to this issue, were of the view that the performance of these teachers became low. This finding is in agreement with that of Marisa and May’s (1985) study, which revealed that specialist teachers teaching intellectually disabled children were considered to deteriorate with time in terms of mental or intellectual abilities. They believed that with time, their mental ability standards went down because they kept on teaching the same things day after day.
Further the ordinary teachers believed that “children with intellectual retardation should be taught by those teachers who are like them”.

Despite the above gloomy picture, the study also revealed that there were some positive views on the teachers that taught children with intellectual impairments. These were as follows: a substantial number of head teachers (40%) and 47% perceived the teachers of the intellectually impaired children as being focused and dedicated to their work. Furthermore, comments were that these teachers were said to be tolerant, cooperative (able to handle all kinds of learners) and that they were able to improvise teaching aids where they were not readily available. The latter finding is in line with that of Ripley (1997) who asserts that the primary responsibility of special education teachers is to provide instruction by adapting and developing materials to match the learners’ styles, strengths, and special needs of each of their students. She further points out that in special education situations; individual learners’ needs often dictate the curriculum. Morgan (2003) was of the view that the teachers of intellectually disabled took risks, that is, they set themselves impossible goals and then strived to achieve them; had a positive attitude towards their teaching – not complaining about the challenges students gave them; thought of teaching as a form of parenting; and gave their students confidence and motivation.

Similar sentiments were echoed by Cathy (2008) who described the teachers of the intellectually impaired children as those having confidence, patience, and true compassion for their students, understanding and dedication to their work.

Kizlik (2009) also pointed out that teachers of the intellectually impaired children were good at explaining things, had a sense of humour and liked the children they taught. He further asserted that the teachers of the intellectually impaired children had empathy, positive mental attitude (thinking more on the positive and a little less on the negative and seeking the positives in every negative situation), were open to change (acknowledging that the only real aspect in life is change, that is, accepting that there is a
place for tradition but there is also a place for new ways, ideas, systems, and approaches), and were creative.

Although the study revealed that both teachers (43.7%) and head teachers (60.0%) perceived the teachers of intellectually impaired children as hardworking and caring, they were of the view that they lacked motivation. The above finding to a great extent conforms to that of Sue (about.com/teacherchecklist/a/qualities/htm) who states that teachers of intellectually impaired children have a great deal of patience; know their students well; provide non-threatening, welcoming environment that nurtures each of the students and that they are comfortable working with exceptional learners and learners with diverse needs. The findings of this study are in line with the researcher’s views on the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. Indeed, the researcher in this study confirmed those findings by others, in the sense that as he went round the schools collecting data, the teachers of intellectually disabled children gave him a warm welcome. In some of the schools where the researcher was allowed to observe some lessons, he found that these teachers had empathy for the children they taught. When he looked round the classroom walls he saw that most of the materials the teachers were using in teaching the children were “self made”, showing a degree of creativity.

**Measures to change attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of children with intellectual impairments**

The study also sought to find out from the respondents in the study the measures to be put in place to change the attitudes of the ordinary teachers towards the teachers who taught the intellectually impaired children.

A number of measures were suggested on how attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children could be changed. One of the measures which the majority of head teachers (60%) and ordinary teachers (54%) mentioned was holding regular seminars and workshops for both categories of teachers which were thought to be the best solution of improving the relationship between the ordinary teachers and teachers who taught the intellectually impaired children.
The other suggested measure from ordinary teachers (18.9%) was creation of Special Units in all ordinary schools with a view that this would help them understand the children with intellectual impairment while 20% of head teachers were of the view that ordinary teachers needed sensitization on how best to deal with the intellectually impaired children in schools. The last two findings are in agreement with that of Ashman and Elkins (1994) who argued that ignorance of intellectual impairment was partly responsible for the widespread negative attitudes ordinary teachers held towards those teachers who teach the children with intellectual impairment. Such a position is furthermore supported by that of Shurtleff (1983) who had taken a different approach to attitude change by adopting a curriculum approach which prepared the ground for successful incorporation of ordinary teachers and “normal” children into sharing the same educational materials and equipment with teachers who taught the intellectually disabled children as a solution to attitude change among ordinary teachers. Furthermore, Bauwens and Hourcade (1995:189) argued that “to overcome the inevitable fears and stresses associated with change, the educators involved must feel that they are responsible for the change and that its success or failure lies directly in them.”

Tibebu (1995) and Moberg (2000) also pointed out that the attitudes of teachers towards children with special educational needs should be of prime concern because they can influence the success or failure of inclusion. Because of the importance of teacher attitudes in facilitating or hindering learning, numerous studies have particularly tnd rightly so, targeted them.

Larrivee (1982) concluded that ordinary teachers’ attitudes were related to five underlying dimensions: the teachers’ general philosophy about inclusive education and its impact on the affective and emotional development of the disabled child; the classroom behaviour of the disabled child; the perceptions of teachers of their own ability to teach disabled children; the impact the disabled child has on the classroom management; and the impact integration has on the academic and social growth of the disabled child. Attitudes of teachers, however, may not be different from the general public, a conclusion
supported by studies on attitudes of various professionals working with the disabled (Panda and Bartel, 1972).

Other ways of changing the attitudes of the ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children as envisaged by the ordinary teachers were that the school administration should involve both categories of the teaching staff in all school activities and that teachers of the intellectually impaired children should be made to realise that they are equal to the ordinary teachers as they possessed similar teaching qualifications. The head teachers, on the other hand, were of the view that the government should introduce Special Education courses in all teachers’ training colleges. This finding is in agreement with that of Kauffman and Hallahana (1981), Turnbull and Schutz (1979), in Alghazo (2003), who state that because attitudes are essential in the success of educating children with intellectual impairments in regular education classrooms, pre-service programmes should emphasize and concentrate on enhancing ordinary teachers’ positive attitudes towards teachers of intellectually disabled children.

Whilst collecting data in the field the researcher discovered that the negative attitudes of ordinary teachers could be attributed to the fact that before and slightly after independence, Zambia had very few or no teachers trained in Special Education. The researcher also discovered that most of the respondents in this study were those who had had no training in Special Education and yet they were still teaching in schools which were now incorporating Special Education. Thus, they were unable to comprehend the new educational system which was moving towards inclusion. They still felt uncomfortable to work in an inclusive setup with teachers of intellectual impairments. Hence, they portrayed negative attitude towards children with intellectual impairments and their teachers.

Since interaction forms part of collaboration and improvement of relationships between teachers, and later as an advocacy in change of attitudes, ordinary teachers were asked to indicate as to whether they socially interacted with the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. The study revealed that a significant number of teachers (91%) in the
study responded in the affirmative, which is an indication that there was interaction between the ordinary teachers and those teachers who taught the intellectually impaired children. Smith et al. (1986) in Alghazo et al. (2003), observe that attitudes and ability to teach children with intellectual impairments in regular classrooms is a learning process and greatly influenced by the amount of contact ordinary teachers have with persons with intellectual impairments.

The above findings have also been supported by Sho ho, Katims and Wilks (1997) in Alghazo (2003), who advise that if ordinary teachers gain more knowledge about including children with intellectual impairment and how their learning needs could be addressed, they may have less negative attitudes towards teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments. Furthermore Ripley (1997) came up with the idea of team work between the ordinary teachers and teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children. She states that an effective team of teachers will work together as equal partners in interactive relationships, with both categories of teachers (ordinary teachers and teachers of children with intellectual impairments) involved in all aspects of planning, teaching, and assessment. Areas for this collaboration would include curricula and instruction, assessment and evaluation, and classroom management and behaviour.

Crutchfield (in press) also alluded to the fact that "the key to making co-teaching work is joint planning. You must both know the entire curriculum so that you can switch back and forth and support each other’s efforts. If you don't know the curriculum you are not a co-teacher, you are just an assistant"

Although the findings showed that there was interaction between the ordinary teachers and teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments, the study revealed that the level of interaction between them was not all that impressive as reported by the majority (62%) of the respondents who responded to this issue. Such a scenario is worrisome and needs immediate attention. This is because if teachers do not socially interact it becomes difficult for them to appreciate one another’s role in the education of children with disabilities. There is also a likelihood that the attitudes of the ordinary
teachers towards the teachers of intellectually impaired children would not change but continue to be negative.

Participation in school activities by teachers of the intellectually impaired children has been a continued concern over the need to restructure our education system. Many educators advocate teacher participation in school decision making as a method to change the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards the teachers who teach the intellectually impaired children. This study revealed that teachers of the intellectually impaired children participated in various school activities considering that 60% of head teachers responded positively to this issue. The This finding concurs with the finding of Paula (1992) which suggests that involvement of teachers in budget, curriculum, and decision making was instrumental in teachers’ participation in various school activities and enhancement of change of attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers of the intellectually disabled children.

Generally, the findings of the study revealed that there still exist some negative attitudes by ordinary teachers towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. Most of the respondents in the study, for instance, the head teachers, did acknowledge that ordinary teachers perceived teachers of the intellectually impaired children in a traditionalist way, where they perceived these teachers as dull or low performers. They further perceived these teachers to have behaved like the children they taught. Teachers of the intellectually impaired were also labelled as teachers of imbeciles; teachers of idiots; teachers of mad children, which conforms to traditional beliefs attached to teachers of the intellectually impaired children and indeed of SEN in general. From findings of this study, it appears that very few ordinary teachers have had disabled childhood friends; social contact with the disabled persons; willingness to help and share leisure interests with disabled; conversations about or with disabled people or reading about and attending lectures or workshops on disability. This has in the end resulted in ordinary teachers developing negative attitudes towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusion and recommendations of the study that aimed at investigating the attitudes of ordinary teachers towards those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments.

Conclusion

The findings of the study revealed that attitudes of ordinary teachers and head teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children varied. Those ordinary teachers who taught in schools with Special Units showed positive attitudes towards the teachers of the intellectually impaired children. This could be as a result of the good relationships and cooperation that existed between themselves and the teachers of children with intellectual impairments. Negative attitudes towards teachers of children with intellectual impairments portrayed by ordinary teachers, on the other hand, could be attributed to the anti-social behaviour the teachers of the intellectually impaired children had. The teachers of intellectually impaired children were said to isolate themselves from the ordinary teachers in most cases as they perceived themselves as having low qualifications.

The study has shown that the biggest challenge in change of attitude of ordinary teachers towards those teachers who taught children with intellectual impairments was the creation of a conducive environment in which both teachers should be seen as being equal in the provision of education to both ordinary and intellectually disabled children.

However, this scenario could only be changed through conducting in-service short courses in special education for both ordinary teachers and the head teachers in schools.
Above, all it would be more probable to send all head teachers of ordinary schools to special education colleges to do courses in special education administration.

**Recommendations**

Arising from the findings of the study the following recommendations are suggested:

- More programmes should be introduced in schools to specifically sensitise head teachers and ordinary teachers to develop positive attitudes towards the teachers of intellectually impaired children.

- The Ministry of Education should introduce a department of education for children with intellectual disabilities in all colleges of education so that graduates from these colleges would have knowledge of teaching the children with intellectual impairments.

- The Ministry of Education should sensitize ordinary teachers on the importance of teaching children with intellectual impairments through holding regular seminars and workshops so as to enhance the relationship between ordinary teachers and the teachers of the intellectually impaired children.

**Future research**

The study’s main focus was to investigate attitudes of ordinary teachers towards teachers who taught the intellectually impaired children. It involved ordinary teachers and school head teachers (mangers) in selected Lusaka District Schools.

- The relationship between ordinary teachers, head teachers and teachers of the intellectually impaired children in Zambia.

- Effects of attitudes of ordinary teachers and head teachers on teachers of intellectually impaired children in Zambia.

- The factors associated with the negative attitudes of ordinary teachers and head teachers towards teachers of the intellectually impaired children.
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APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SCHOOL MANAGERS

1. What is the name of the school? ____________________________

2. When was your school opened? ____________________________

3. Who is the Proprietor? ____________________________

4. How many members of Staff does the school have? ____________________________

5. How many? (a) Male ________ (b) Female__________

6. Do you have a special unit for children with intellectual impairments in your school? (a) Yes □ (b) No □

7. How many teachers for disabled are in your school?

8. How many? (a) Male ________ (b) Female__________

9. Comment on the general performance of those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled in your school.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. Mention some various school activities available in your school.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
11. Do those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children participate in some of these various school activities available in your school?
(a) Yes □ (b) No □

12. How do you rate those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children in terms of cooperation with the school administration in your school?


13. What do you see as strengths and weaknesses in those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children in your school?

(a) Strengths


(b) Weaknesses


14. What do you, as a school manager say about those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments in your school?
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15. What do you think can be the effects of teaching the intellectually disabled children on those teachers who teach them?


16. How would you feel if your fellow teachers called you names associated to children you teach?


17. How is the general attitude of ordinary teachers towards those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments in your school?


18. Suggest some ways in which the relationship between ordinary teachers and those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children can be improved in your school?
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REGULAR TEACHERS

The University of Zambia is conducting a research on teachers’ attitudes towards those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments in selected Lusaka District Schools/Units. The study is expected to focus on the views ordinary teachers hold for those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairment and how those very teachers feel about what the regular teachers tell them.

The purpose of this discussion is to gather data on teachers’ attitudes towards those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairment that will help the researcher to analyse the situation and make appropriate recommendations. It is hoped that the study will help regular teachers and those teachers of children with intellectual impairment as well as the parents in finding out an appropriate way of providing education to intellectually disabled children.

Kindly provide your honest answers by filling in the information appropriately and truthfully. The information will be strictly confidential and your name will not be published in the document.

INSTRUCTIONS

Tick (√) or write responses in the spaces provided on each item.

1. (a) Name of School: ____________________________
(b) Number of teaching staff: Male ________ Female ________
(c) Sex of respondent: Male [ ] Female [ ]
(d) Qualifications of respondent: ____________________________
(e) Age of respondent: ____________________________
(g) Number of years experienced in teaching ordinary children: ________
(g) Number of years experienced in teaching children with intellectual impairments: ____________________________
2. Do you interact with teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments?
   (a) Yes [ ]
   (b) No [ ]

3. If Yes, how often do you interact with them on a weekly basis?
   (a) Regularly [ ]
   (b) Sometimes [ ]
   (c) Not at all [ ]

4. Which gender group of those teachers who teach the intellectually disabled children do you interact with most?
   (a) Male [ ]
   (b) Female [ ]

5. If your response to question 4 is male, how good is the relationship?
   (a) Very good [ ]
   (b) Good [ ]
   (c) Poor [ ]

6. What do you, as a regular teacher say, about teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments?

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
7. What do you see as strengths and weaknesses in teachers who teach children with intellectual impairments?

(a) Strengths

(b) Weaknesses

8. What do you think can be the effects of teaching children with intellectual impairment on the teachers who teach them?

9. How do you feel, if you were a teacher of children with intellectual impairment, when they call you names associated with children you teach by others?

10. By what means can the relationship between the ordinary teachers and those teachers who teach children with intellectual impairment be improved?