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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

There is a need for teachers who are qualified to teach children with disabilities and a curriculum to support such an education more than ever in Thailand. Thai law mandates that students complete 12 years of free education with 9 years of compulsory education (National Education Act, 1999), with this law, more and more children are being enrolled in mainstream educational system; some of these children have some type of learning disability or handicap ranging from mild to severe (Office of Education Council, 2004). In the past the education of children with disabilities in Thailand were carried out by different organizations, which were mostly non-profit (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Bangkok, 2004). The treatments and education of children with disabilities were limited to the health department such as hospital and clinics (Chrontawonpanit, 2002), they were not introduced into schools or any other mainstream areas. In the year 1999, the Thai government passed the National Education Act, calling it the year of educating people with disabilities (Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability, 2003). According to the Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability, the National Education Act mandated the education of all children with special needs, with a goal of allowing all children to benefit from equal opportunity of education. The concept of inclusion of children with disabilities into mainstream classroom is fairly new in Thailand; it needs a lot of hard work and commitment from all the people involved in the school to make the inclusion program a success. There are people who support the inclusion
classroom setting and there are some who don’t, the remaining populations are confused about the concept of an inclusion program (Cipkin & Rizza, 2011). When a teacher has limited knowledge of the concept of inclusion, it can affect the quality of education obtained by children (Cipkin & Rizza, 2011). The attitude of the teachers towards the inclusion program can effect of the success of educating children with disabilities (Kauffmann, Hallahan & Ford, 1998).

**Statement of the Problem**

Thailand passed the National Education Act in 1999 which was later revised in 2002. This act took into consideration equal rights and an individual’s opportunity to receive an education. This made 12 years of education mandatory and free of charge. This act also took into account the rights to an education for disabled children and mandated the start of inclusive education programs in Thailand (National Education Act, 1999). This led to more access for children with disabilities to mainstream schools. With the access of inclusive programs being made, teachers need to be ready and equipped to teach classrooms of diverse abilities. Teachers are more adapt to teach a classroom of children whose abilities are of the same level or a homogenous class, but with inclusion, teachers are introduced to a classroom with children of different learning abilities or a heterogeneous classroom (Cipkin & Rizza, 2011). Teachers’ attitudes towards such classrooms is an important factor for students’ success since teachers are the individuals who are in close contact with the children (Burke & Sutherland, 2004) and it is the teachers who create the class environment, that fosters learning in the children (Charema & Peresuh, 1996). Therefore it was necessary to research the attitude of teachers towards the inclusion programs.
according to their demographic and see if they have a positive or negative attitude towards it.

**Research Questions**

These were the questions that the researcher investigated:

1. Do teachers hold positive or negative attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

2. Is there a significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?
   
   2.1. Is there a significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

   2.2. Is there a significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to nationality at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

   2.3. Is there a significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

**Research Objectives**

1. To identify the level of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.
2. To determine if there is a significant difference of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

2.1. To determine if there is a significant difference of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

2.2. To determine if there is a significant difference of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to nationality at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

2.3. To determine if there is a significant difference of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

**Research Hypothesis**

There is a significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

**Theoretical Framework**

Attitudes are a person’s feelings and beliefs that affect their behaviour towards an issue or concepts (Triandis, 1971). Attitude differs from person to person; a person reacts to different phenomena based on their personal experiences and knowledge of the phenomenon at hand (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). For the survey of the attitudes of teachers towards inclusion of Special Educational needs children according to gender, nationality and teaching experience, the tripartite or the three components model was
used. According to this model, attitude is classified into three components (Panjawani, 2012):

- Affectively based component

  Affectively based attitudes are those that rise from emotional reactions towards an attitude object. An affectively based attitude can be formed through classical conditioning, operant conditioning or through exposure (Hogg & Cooper, 2003)

- Behavioral based component

  Behavioral based attitudes are the physical reaction that a person has towards an attitude object (Panjawani, 2012).

- Cognitive based component

  Cognitively based attitudes are those that rise from beliefs and knowledge that a person has about the attitude object (Panjawani, 2012). In this study the researcher is surveying the teachers to understand and see their attitude towards IE of SEN according to gender, nationality and teaching experience. The researcher will compare the teachers’ attitude and see if their demographics affect their attitude towards teachers’ understanding of general philosophy of IE; classroom behaviour of students with disabilities; classroom management; impact of inclusion on academic and social growth of students with disabilities and teachers’ perceived ability to teach students with disabilities. For this survey the cognitive based component of the three component model was used. The theory states that in the attitude of a person towards an attitude object is affected by believes and the knowledge the respondents have towards the 5 sub scales being measured.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study shows the relationship between the demographics of a teacher and how it affects the teachers’ attitude. The framework shows the teachers’ attitude is can be changed by the difference in gender, nationality and teaching experience.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework.

Scope of the Study

The research was conducted at Rasami British International School, Trinity International School and Prasarnmit Primary International Programme. The researcher surveyed all the current teachers to study their attitudes towards the
inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics. The attitudes of the teachers were surveyed to understand their believes and understanding of IE under 5 subscales, teachers’ understanding of general philosophy of IE; classroom behaviour of students with disabilities; classroom management; impact of inclusion on academic and social growth of students with disabilities and teachers’ perceived ability to teach students with disabilities. The teachers’ attitudes were influenced by their knowledge of the subject therefore it is cognitively based attitude according to the three component attitude model.

**Definitions of Terms**

- **ABA**: Applied behaviour analysis
- **Academic growth**: Academic development or achievement of SEN children.
- **Academic year**: School year
- **Antecedents**: A thing or event that occurs before a situation
- **APCD**: Asia-Pacific Development Centre on Disabilities
- **Attitude**: Attitude is an expression of favour or disfavour toward a person, place, thing, or event.
- **Classroom Behaviour**: Students’ behaviour in the classroom
- **Classroom Management**: Teachers’ ability to manage a classroom.
- **Curriculum**: All the learning which is planned and guided by the school, whether it is carried on in groups or individually, inside or outside the school
- **Demographic**: Gender, nationality and years of teaching experience of the teachers.

**Gender**: State of being male or female.

**Nationality**: A status of belonging to a particular nation.
Teaching Experience: Experiences obtained from while working as a teacher.

- **Disabilities**: a physical or mental condition that limits a person's movements, senses, or activities.
- **Handicap**: a condition that markedly restricts a person's ability to function physically, mentally, or socially.
- **Heterogeneous classrooms**: Heterogeneous classroom is class in which the students vary in their levels of intelligence and abilities.
- **Homogeneous classroom**: Homogeneous classroom is class in which the students are of the same levels of intelligence and abilities.
- **IE**: Inclusion Education
- **IEP**: Individual Education Plan
- **Inclusion**: inclusion is an educational approach where a child with disabilities studies in the same classroom with children with no disabilities for majority of the day. (Allen & Schwartz 2000)
- **Learning disability**: a condition giving rise to difficulties in acquiring knowledge and skills to the level expected of those of the same age.
- **Mainstream Classroom**: A general classroom in a school that teaches children without special educational needs.
- **Mainstream Teacher**: A teacher who teaches children without special educational needs.
- **Negative reinforcement**: involves removing something in order to increase a response
- **PECS**: Picture exchange communication system
• **Positive reinforcement:**
  the offering of desirable effects or consequences for a behavior with the intention of increasing the chance of that behavior being repeated in the future.

• **PPiP:** Prasarnmit Primary International Programme

• **Professional development:** In workplaces, professional development refers to the acquisition of skills and knowledge both for personal development and for career advancement.

• **RBIS:** Rasami British International School

• **Reinforcement:** the action or process of reinforcing or strengthening.

• **SEN teachers:** Teacher who teaches Special educational needs children.

• **SEN:** Special Educational Needs

• **Social growth:** Development of social skills in SEN children.

• **TEACCH:** Treatment and education of autistic and related communication handicapped children

• **Teachers attitude towards 5 subscales**
  • **Philosophy of Inclusion:** The idea and strategies of inclusive education
  • **Classroom Management:** Teachers' ability to manage a class
  • **Classroom behaviour:** Students' behaviour in the class
  • **Social Growth:** a person's advancement in social skills
  • **Teachers' perceived ability:** Teachers' ability to teach SEN students

• **Three Schools:** Three schools in this research it means Rasami British International School, Trinity International School and Prasarnmmit Primary International Programme.

• **Tripartite:** In this research it means the three component model.

• **TRIS:** Trinity International School
- **Typical children**: Non-disabled children

**Significance of the Study**

The concept of inclusion education is significantly new in Thailand. The study of teachers' knowledge, beliefs and attitude on this type of classroom will enable curriculum developers and administrators to create necessary changes or determine the next step in the research and development of this educational field. With the monitoring of teachers' attitude, administrators can create activities and professional development programs aimed at creating and fostering a positive attitude towards inclusion programs, which will lead to the success of such a classroom.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this review is to provide examine information about teaching children with special needs in inclusive classroom settings in Thailand.

- What is Inclusion?
- Inclusion in Thailand
- Types of Special educational needs
- Review of previous studies of teachers’ attitude and perception towards inclusion
- Effect of teachers’ demographics on their attitude towards inclusion
- Intervention tools for teaching children with Special Educational needs
- Teaching strategies
- Research Context

Inclusion

The term inclusion came about during the discussion of education for children with disabilities (Itkonen, 2007). The definition of inclusion has been very flexible; different schools define it differently to fit its school’s profile (Ryndak, Jackson, & Billingsley, 2000). With the growing number of children with disabilities attending mainstream classes it is becoming very important to have a concrete definition for the inclusion programs in education. Ryndak, Jackson and Billingsley (2000) conducted a study to understand and provide a clear definition for inclusion in the United States of America. They surveyed scholars and teachers in school settings and came to the conclusion that inclusion is an educational setting where students with disabilities are
placed in classrooms with typical children for most parts of the school day, in an academic and non-academic setting, as if the child did not have a disability. The inclusive education has been a topic of discussion for a large portion of the 20th century beginning in the 1960s (Foreman, 2005). The United Nations was a driving force in bringing importance this field of education by conducting several declarations over the decades (Khan, 2011). In 1990, the World Conference in Education for all was held in Thailand, this conference gave way to the concept of inclusive education at the Salamanca World conference on special needs education in Spain in 1994. At this conference inclusive education was described as a process of education all children without discrimination in appearance, intellectual abilities, verbal and communication skills etc. (UNESCO, 1994). In 2000, at another conference in Senegal a framework for education for all children was designed where participants from around the world embarked on a journey to make education the rights for its citizen (Khan, 2011). After these conferences many countries made efforts to promote inclusive education by creating changes within the school system. Developing countries are facing problems implementing the theory of inclusive education, due to lack of teachers’ training, attitudes and funds (Khan, 2011).

**Benefit of Inclusive Education**

There are many benefits that come with an inclusion education where children are not segregated but are place in the same environment as mainstream students. Various researches have been conducted that shows that there are both social and academic benefits which are obtained by students in an inclusion education setting (D’Alonzo, Giordano & Vanleeuwen, 1998). A study found that children with disabilities tend to study and learn more when they are in an inclusion education program in a mainstream schooling system as they are exposed a wider range of
information than what is available in a segregation school (Shapiro, 1999). Studies also show that children with disabilities, when exposed to general settings and accomplish task on their own gain more confidence in their abilities (Kochhar, West, & Taymans, 2000). There are also some social benefits that come from inclusive education. Non-disabled children have expressed that they are more accepting of others that are different due to interactions they have had with their disabled peers (D’Alonzo, Giordano, & Vanleeuwen, 1998). Social interaction is a very important during the developmental stages of children, when introduced to an inclusion education environment at a very young age benefit all children, children with disabilities gain more confidence as they are not excluded by their friends, as children at that age have not learnt how to stereotype (Bricker, 1995; Buysse & Bailey, 1993). With inclusion being introduced in the early year’s education, children are more aware of the diversity around them, which they accept, this reduced the segregation and bullying that could happen in later life (The National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1996).

**Barriers to Inclusive Education**

There are a few barriers that are in the way of a successful inclusive education program. According a research by Khan (2011), some of the barriers are:

- Unavailability of resources

In developing countries some resources that are needed for teaching an inclusive classroom are not readily available (Eleweke & Rodda, 2002). This is due to the lack of monetary support that is faced by the schools. (Kristensen, Omagor-Loican & Onen, 2004)

- Inadequate teacher training
According to Khan (2011), there is not sufficient training given to teachers who are required to teach an inclusive class. This is due to lack of support system, which include psychologist, speech therapist etc., who are need to train the teacher. (Eleweke & Rodda, 2002)

• Scarcity of knowledge on the subject

The lack of training in the field of inclusive education leaves the teachers with limited knowledge of the subject, which affects their attitude towards inclusive education (Deng, 2008).

• Size of the mainstream classroom

The large sizes of mainstream classroom also fosters a negative attitude in the teachers’ minds (Chhabra, Srivastava & Srivastava, 2009) because the teacher have a difficult time trying to maintain discipline and with the implementation of inclusion, children with disabilities will have access to the classroom, which would cause more classroom management issues which the teachers are reluctant to tackle. (Khan, 2011)

Inclusion in Southeast Asian Countries

The countries surrounding Thailand have similar policies regarding human rights and the education of children. Countries like Singapore, Malaysia and Vietnam have similar issues found in Thailand regarding special education (Vorapanya, 2008). Reviewing and researching how they tackled their issues can assist Thailand in developing its inclusion education program.

• Vietnam

Vietnam was the first country in Asia to adopt the United Nation’s convention for the Rights of the child. In the year 1975, they set up schools for children with disabilities by 1991 it had 36 separate schools (Villa et al., 2003). Even though UN’s
convention talked about the reintegration of children into society, Vietnam did not adopt the inclusion education program as they are not equipped and the SEN children would not receive adequate material support, classrooms and curriculum adaptations. (Burr, 2006)

- Singapore

Special education got its start in Singapore when a group of people volunteered to teach children with leprosy in 1947 (Quah, 1993). This gave way to different centers being set up by volunteer; there were schools that were managed by the voluntary welfare organizations which provided education for children with SEN in segregation, partial integration and full integration (Chen & Soon, 2006). Singapore does not have a law regarding the education of disabled children; therefore children can be turned away from mainstream schools (Rao, 1998). To change the status quo, in 2004, Prime Minister Lee Hsein Loong called for an inclusive society, where all people are included as a part of the society (Vorapanya, 2008). To implement this society, he provided 100 million US dollars for the training of teachers to help them be more equipped in teaching children with disabilities (Lee, 2004).

- Malaysia

Malaysia has a law that supports the education of children in visual and hearing impairments but it excludes all physical disabilities (Vorapanya, 2008). Malaysia has many NGOs that provide services such as diagnosis and early intervention programs for children under the ages of the 6 years old to kick start their therapy (Department of Social Welfare [DSWD], 1999). The services of such NGOs are limited to people in the cities. The families with children who are disabled and are living in the rural areas still need to rely on the government for their education (Adnan & Hafiz, 2001). In Malaysia, like Thailand, have the cultural barriers of parents who are afraid to register
their children as being disabled (Department of Statistics, Malaysia, 2000). In Malaysia also the class sizes are very large and teachers also have extracurricular duties but are willing to teach children with disabilities once they are provided the proper training (Jelas, 2000).

Inclusion in Thailand

The National Education Act passed in 1999, gave way to the introduction of inclusive education in Thailand, where before that had segregated schooling for children with disabilities (Klibthong, 2013). The National education act gave way for many public schools to adopt the inclusive education program which gave more and more children access to mainstream schooling (United Nations International Children's Emergency funds, 2003). Records showed increase of special education needs children in the mainstream classroom, going from 144,684 to 187,050 between the years 2000 to 2004 (Vorapanya, 2008). There was also a rise in the number of schools that support inclusive programs with 18618 “inclusive” schools in Thailand. Even with the passing of the National education act in 1999 and its revision in 2002, Thailand still sees a large gap in the implementation of the inclusion program, with very few children with disabilities being enrolled in schools (Klingthong, 2013). In 2008, a law was passed in Thailand which gave equal educational rights to children with disabilities. The schools also had to create an Individual educational plan (IEP) of teaching children with SEN; this had to be updated yearly according to the procedures and criteria of the Thai Ministry of education (Rajkijjanubaksa, 2008). The education of disabled children is overlooked by the Bureau of Special Education Administration, which recognizes nine disabilities (Vorapanya, 2008):
i. Hearing loss

ii. Mental disabilities

iii. Visual impairment

iv. Physical disabilities

v. Learning disabilities

vi. Autism

vii. Behavioural and emotional disorder

viii. Speech and language

ix. Multiple disabilities

The application of the concept of inclusion in the mainstream classroom is challenging. According to UNICEF (2003), the disabled children in mainstream schools still face exclusion because of the understanding, attitude and beliefs of teachers towards the inclusive education. Thailand has taken steps to implement inclusive education but pre-existing norms and cultural beliefs about disabilities leads to negative attitudes (Vorapanya, 2008). The government has provided extra funds for schools that implement inclusion, which have led to schools accepting disabled students but are not actually providing the appropriate education for them (Vorapanya, 2008). Past research have shown that teachers in Thailand are not ready to teach inclusive programs as it increase their work load and they have not been trained to teach children with special educational needs (Kantavong & Sivabaedya, 2010). Researchers in the past also surveyed the inclusion in Thailand and found out that a lot of people in the rural areas were not aware of the inclusion program or were apprehensive to participate due to cultural beliefs (Fulk, Swerlik, & Kosuwan, 2002).
Barriers to Inclusion in Thailand

Thailand also faced many barriers when trying to implement inclusion education, the same way the other countries did. According to a research conducted by Vorapanya (2008), it was discovered that the Thai education system is underfunded, therefore there is no monetary support to train and make qualified teachers available to teach the inclusion education program. With limited funding the resources needed for teaching and accommodating of SEN children are not readily available. Teacher are also underpaid for the amount of work that they are expected to carry out (Vorapanya, 2008). Thailand is a Buddhist country, where compassion is prevalent. They also believe in Karma, which influences the attitude of the people with disabilities. In Buddhist culture, it is believed that people get what is deserved of them, and thus disability is seen as Karma of a wrong doing committed in the previous life (Vorapanya, 2008). Parents are not usually willing to discuss their children’s disabilities in fear of society and therefore have limited knowledge of that the disabilities usually are.

Types of special educational needs

There are many types of special educational needs but it can be categorized into main groups of

Cognitive and Learning Needs

This type of SEN includes children who struggle with learning and understanding of concepts being taught. These children man have mild to very severe learning disability or difficulties in learning a specific subject. Cognitive and learning disabilities include (Ireland Department of education, 2005)

- Dyslexia
Dyslexia is described as a learning disability, where an individual has trouble learning how to read and write.

- **Dyscalculia**

  According to British Dyslexia Association (Ireland Department of education, 2005) children with dyscalculia have difficulties with mathematical understanding and cannot follow procedures well. They often have average language and cognitive abilities.

- **Dyspraxia**

  This learning disability is characterized by the late development of gross and fine motor skills. Children with dyspraxia also have late speech development and low social skills (Ireland Department of education, 2005).

- **Mild learning difficulties**

  Children with mild learning difficulties struggle academically in every area, these children have below average intellectual abilities. They have slow development and cannot retain concepts taught (Department of Education and Science, 1993). Children with mild learning difficulties can taught and assist through different teaching techniques.

- **Moderate learning difficulties**

  Children with moderate learning difficulties have very low cognitive abilities even with intervention programs. Children with mild learning difficulties (MLD) have low self-esteem and a delay in speech development (Ireland Department of education, 2005).

- **Severe learning difficulties**
Children with severe learning difficulties (SLD) have significantly low cognitive ability and are not able to grasp concepts being taught without support. They are dependent on adults and needs to be taught self-care and other basic aspects of life (Ireland Department of education, 2005).

**Social, Emotional and Behavioural Needs**

Children with social, emotional and behavioural needs (SEBD) present a behaviour that is disruptive and becomes a barrier to the learning process of the child. These children are characterized by being isolated, have disruptive behaviour and immature social skills taught.

- **ADD/ADHD**

  Children with ADHD or Attention deficit disorder are characterized by the lack of attention and hyperactive demeanour. This hyperactivity and lack of attention span causes a barrier for learning as the child is not able to be still enough to learn. Children with ADD and ADHD do not have any intellectual disability but may need support because of the learning barrier caused by the disruptive behaviour (Ireland Department of education, 2005).

**Communication and Interaction Needs**

As the name suggests children with communication and interaction needs have lower language and social development taught.

- **Speech and language difficulties**

  Children with speech and language difficulties struggle with the use of language and understanding it. According to Ireland Department of education (2005), children with SL have difficulties with spoken language and cannot articulate themselves as they have low vocabulary due to the inability to recall words and express themselves.
• Autism

Children with autism usually have low communication and social skills. They are not able to pick up on social and verbal cues. They are anxious in social settings and disruption in their routine cause them high stress. Some children with autism are very sensitive to senses as they may perceive them differently (Ireland Department of education, 2005).

• Asperger’s syndrome

Children with ASP display the same characteristics as that of children with autism. Children with ASP have a high intellectual ability but show a lack of social skills. They often need routine and are very anxious when there is a disruption to the norm (Ireland Department of education, 2005).

Sensory or physical needs

Children with sensory and physical needs have visual, hearing and other physical disabilities that cause a barrier in their learning abilities. These children usually have partial or full hearing or blindness. Other physical disabilities could be medical conditions or syndromes such as

• Cerebral palsy
• Spin bifida and/or hydrocephalus (SBH)
• Muscular dystrophy (MD)
• Significant accidental injury
• Down syndrome

Previous research on teacher’s attitude towards inclusive education

Teachers’ attitude towards inclusion is very important for its success. Since attitude is a result of a person’s beliefs and knowledge of a situation, several
studies were conducted; some researched the attitudes (Chhabra, Srivastava & Srivastava, 2010) and some others researched the knowledge of the teachers about the inclusive education (Hodkinson, 2006). The results of the research showed varieties of results such as positive, negative or uncertain (Burke & Sutherland, 2004). Studies were conducted all over the world; in the United States of America a research was conducted to study the knowledge that the teachers had of inclusive programs, it was concluded that teacher had limited knowledge and no training to prepare them for inclusive education but they still exhibited a positive attitude towards the program (Harding and Darling, 2003). Similar studies were done in Uganda by Kristensen, Omagor-Loican and Onen (2003) and in Hong Kong, which lead to similar conclusions. In Malaysia a questionnaire was used to survey teachers’ attitude and found that teachers believe that inclusive programs lowered discrimination among students and stimulated understanding of differences (Ali, Mustapha & Jelas, 2006). Even though many studies suggest that teachers have an overall positive attitude towards inclusive education, there are some studies that concluded otherwise. Studies conducted in Israel, Palestine, Botswana and Ghana showed that teachers had negative attitude towards inclusive education and did not support its implementation due to lack of knowledge on the subject (Chhabra, Srivastava & Srivastava, 2010; Glaubman & Lifshitz, 2001). Deng (2008) conducted research in rural areas of mainland China and came to conclusion that teachers in developing countries had different views and attitudes towards inclusive education than that of a developed country. These attitudes were based on cultural and traditional values. Most researchers concluded that the attitudes of the teachers are very important for the success of the inclusion program (Chhabra, Srivastava & Srivastava, 2010). Teachers attitude differ
according to the types of disabilities (Glaubman & Lifshitz, 2001). Teachers have admitted that they believe that children should not be physically different from their peers in the mainstream schooling system (Singal & Rouse, 2003). They did not support the inclusion on physically disabled children such as hearing or visually impaired students (Chhabra, Srivastava & Srivastava, 2010). Some teachers do not favour the inclusion of children who are academically challenged in the mainstream classroom as they believe that it would lower the overall academic outcome of the class (Singal, 2006), studies have shown different outcomes from the inclusion of children with academic needs in the mainstream class. Children perform better academically when they are in a mainstream schooling system (Canadian Council on Learning, 2009). Teachers showed the most negative attitude towards the inclusion of children with behavioural difficulties as they are disruptive (Alghazo & Gaad 2004). Teachers have shown flexibility when it comes to children with social difficulties and are willing to teach them even without any training in the inclusive education (Sharma & Deppler, 2005). Some teachers who were interviewed said that they were willing to teach and accommodate children with special needs, but that they did not support having children with disabilities in a general classroom setting (Santoli, Sachs, Romey, & McClurg 2008). The teachers also expressed that with proper training and administrative support inclusion programs are feasible.

Teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education is affected by the knowledge that have on the subject (Hodkinson, 2005). Studies have shown that attitude can be altered by the change in knowledge that one has on a subject. Therefore for the success of inclusion program it is very important that teachers are educated in the concept of inclusive education (Hodkinson & Devarakonda, 2009).
Attitude of regular teachers and special school teachers

There were prior research done to study the attitude of both regular and SEN teachers towards the IE program. The findings showed that teachers with knowledge and experience of IE were more positive and had a better view of the program than their counterparts (Sharma, 1999). Regular teachers believed that SEN students needed special attention that cannot be met in a regular classroom, according to Sharma (1999). This shows the attitude of teachers towards the philosophy of IE, teachers’ perceived ability to teach children with disability.

Attitude of teachers at different grade level

Research was done in the past to compare teachers’ attitude by students’ grade levels. The studies conducted showed that teachers were less accepting of the IE program as the kids got older (Smith, 2000). The reason given was that the teachers found it easier to differentiate their teaching at a lower grade level (Larrivee & Cook, 1979). They believe that children with SEN would require more time and effort and effect classroom management and their ability to teach.

Factors that influence teachers attitude

- Students factors

In a research conducted by Smith (2000), the study showed that teachers had more positive attitude towards IE if the disabilities were mild. They believed that students with disabilities would monopolise the teachers’ time. Research has also shown that teachers had a more positive attitude if they had prior experience of teaching children with SEN (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). This shows the teachers’ attitude towards classroom management as children with emotional and behavioral disabilities can disrupt the class, which calls in the behavior of SEN students in the classroom into question. (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002)
• Teachers factors

Research done in the past has shown that teachers who have experience teaching children with SEN had a more positive attitude towards IE. The research also showed that teachers who had continuous training displayed a more favourable outlook towards IE. (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002)

• Support factors

Research had been done to see if the availability of support influenced the teachers’ attitude. Researchers conducted studies that showed that the unavailability of resources factored into the teachers’ negative attitude towards IE (Abbott, 2006). It was argued that it was not the unavailability of resources but how the teachers used the resources played a main factor in the difference in attitude as researches were conducted in developed countries and developing countries did not show a significant difference in attitude (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). On this finding the three component model of attitude (affective based, behaviour based and cognitive based) was regarded to factor in the attitude of the teachers and model to change the teachers attitude under five variables of vision, knowledge and skills, incentives, resources and action plan (Agbenyega, Deppeler & Harvey, 2007). These are the base of the five subscales used in this study.

**Intervention tools for teaching children with Special Educational Needs**

One of the main concerns that teachers have when faced with the option of teaching an inclusive classroom, is the lack of training. There are several Intervention Tools that can be employed to teach children with SEN which the teachers can learn through professional developments provided by the schools.

**Applied Behaviour analysis**
Applied Behaviour analysis (ABA) is a tool used for teaching and behaviour modification in children (Mulick, 2006). ABA has been used as an operate conditioning and a classical conditioning tool to modify the behaviour of children with autism by observing how they interact with the environment and with the use of antecedents and consequences. ABA is a technique used to understand behaviour and how it is affected by the environment. According to autism speaks website, ABA has been used by therapists to assist children with autism in their development. The intervention technique uses the principle of positive reinforcement to get desired behaviour. The technique has been modified since the 1960’s and can be used in classroom and daily settings. The ABA technique employs the use of antecedents, which are the reasons for an action, and consequences, which are the actions that follows the actions that was triggered by the antecedents, the consequence could be in the form positive or negative reinforcement. Using this technique, therapists can teach basic life skills and complex skills to children with autism. The ABA technique can help children and also adults with autism. The technique is individual rather than universal, and the therapist or an analyst overlooks all the intervention tools. A teacher in a mainstream classroom setting should be trained in the ABA technique so they may help the children and class as a whole develop in a beneficial manner. The ABA technique is a behaviour modification tool; therefore it can also be used to intervene in the behaviour of all children who are experiencing behavioural problems.

Discrete Trial Instruction

Discrete trial instruction is a method of teaching where lessons are broken down and taught in step (Smith, 2001). Teaching is done in steps, and in order to get the maximum result from this technique of teaching, steps must be taught with very little
pause between them. There are six parts in a discrete trial instruction technique of teaching (Smith, 2001).

a) Antecedent

An antecedent is a part of the technique which creates the prerequisite for a response or learning. It could be a question or an instruction that the teacher or the person conducting the trial asks the child. For example: a teacher teaches the names of the animals using flashcards. She then places the cards on the table and asks the child to point to cat. The instruction given by the teacher is the antecedent for the action that will be taken by the child.

b) Prompts

The prompt are gestures provided by teacher to assist or encourage the child to do the action. For example, when the teacher asks the child to point to the picture of cat, she may point or gesture to the picture of the cat to prompt the response of the child. The teacher may also let the child work independently and give positive feedback to encourage the next step.

c) Response

The response is the action taken by the child after the prompt and the antecedents. The oral answer or the pointing to the flashcard is the response given by the child.

d) Consequences for a correct response

The consequence given after a response is very important for the success of the technique. A consequence for a correct response can be in the form of positive reinforcement such as praises or gifts. This increases the child’s confidence and encourages the child to be more engaged in the lesson and therefore learn more.
e) Consequence for an incorrect response

According to Smith (2001), when an incorrect response is given the consequence should not be negative, but neutral. The consequence should be a "let's try again" or a gesture to indicate the correct answer. The teacher should not use negative reinforcement or point out that a mistake was made as it would discourage the child in the further step of learning.

f) Inter-trial interval

Inter-trial interval, as the name suggest is the break between different steps of teaching. These breaks should be as short as possible (Malott & Trojan-Suarez, 2004).

The discrete trial instruction method is used as one of the tools in the ABA training program. The discrete trial instruction is structured and must be carried out the same way by all teachers to observe success or failure. This technique is used with autistic children as they lack the incentive to learn and need the encouragement and structured method to learn.

Treatment and education of autistic and related communication handicapped children (TEACCH)

The TEACCH program was developed at the University of North Carolina stemming from research project conducted by Eric Schopler in 1972 (Division TEACCH, 2006). It is a program used to teach children with disabilities. This program is based on the perception that learning requires prerequisite knowledge, which means that a child needs prior knowledge to acquire more knowledge.

TEACCH program is a structured program that is used to teach children with autism (Mesibov, Adams & Klinger, 1997). According to Schopler (1997) children learn better through visual aids rather than verbal aids. The classroom is structured for a child's learning continuity. The aim of this teaching program is to teach new skills in
a structured environment (Nebraska Special Education Advisory Council, 2000, p. 47).

**Task Analysis**

Task analysis is a teaching strategy where skills and instructions are made simple and broken down to make the lesson simple and easier to understand (Scheuermann & Webber, 2002). The teaching is done in steps and can teach from first to last or last to first. Reinforcement methods are used to master skills. Task analysis teaching strategy allows the children to master smaller skills and become independent and more confident to perform larger skills.

**Visual Strategies**

Study has shown that children with SEN learn better through visual aids (Layton & Lock, 2003). Visual strategies are used teach communication skills and understand. These visual aids are used in teaching such as flashcards and videos, or in communication the schedules in with visual aids. The teacher in an inclusive classroom should create a visually stimulating environment, using displays, labels etc. (Special Programs Branch, 2000)

**The picture exchange communication system (PECS)**

Children with special needs can be verbal where they are able to communicate or they can be non-verbal and have low to no communication skill. The picture exchange communication system teaches children with low communication skills to communicate using visual aids (Heflin & Simpson, 1998). The PECS is similar to visual strategies where picture aids are used to assist understanding.

**Peer tutoring**

Peer tutoring, as the name suggest, is encouraging typical students to work and assist children with SEN. This helps the children with disabilities develop socially
(Hecimovic, Powell, & Christenoen, 1999). This strategy allows students with special needs to be tutored and interact with typical students (Scheuermann & Webber, 2002)

**Social Stories**

Social stories are stories told to students about probable social events and it also demonstrate the appropriate actions to be taken during the events. (Scheuermann & Webber, 2002). The social story is beneficial because children or adults who have autism lack the social skills to interact in mainstream society. This strategy of Social Stories will allow them to witness events and see the appropriate reaction to those events.

**Self-monitoring**

Self-monitoring strategy used for the development and teaching of children with autism allow the child to gain independence (Scheuermann & Webber, 2002). The strategy teaches the child to monitor his own behaviour by focusing a particular behaviour.

**Holding Therapy**

Children with mental disabilities are usually very sensitive to stimuli to the senses; they have anxiety in social setting. The holding therapy helps with this fear. The child is held and allowed to relax till he or she maintains eye contact. This in the long run allows the child to relax and create relationship for the child.

**Music Therapy**

Music therapy is used to relax the child and form relationship with them (Yapko, 2003). This helps to encourage the physical, mental, social, and emotional development (Bunt, 1994). Music development is good for children with autism as it requires no communication skills.
Inclusion Classroom Teaching Strategies

Inclusive education is a process of educating children with disabilities and normal children in the mainstream schooling system. In such a classroom, teachers are faced with the task of teaching children of different skill levels. The teachers therefore need to adopt strategies that will assist them to teach in the most effective manner, so that all children benefits from such an education setting (Friend & Cook, 2007). Six strategies were created by Friend & Cook (2007) for teaching a class of different abilities.

**One teach one support method**

In one teach one support strategy of teaching, there are two teachers present in the classroom. One teacher leads the instruction, while another teacher walks around class and offered assistance to children who need them (McCarty, 2013). This strategy is beneficial for students who need monitoring, teachers who are the support in the class, also help to keep the children on track and avoid disruption in class (Friend & Cook, 2000). The One teach one support method of teaching is suited for teaching theories.

**One teach one observe method**

One teach one observe strategy of teaching is similar to one teach one support method of teaching. This method also recommends two teachers in a class, where one teacher leads the classroom, while another teacher observes the instruction for later research and development (Friend & Cook, 2007)

**Station Teaching**

The teaching station strategy is a method of setting up a few different stations in the classrooms where children are presented with activities that they can carry out by themselves. The groups are formed with balance of children with disabilities and
normal children. Teachers rotate themselves between groups giving instructions and presenting lessons. This strategy is beneficial as it allows small group and intimate interaction with the teachers, which allows the children to learn more. This strategy is best suited for lessons that needs hands on participation, such as experiments (Friend & Cook, 2007).

**Parallel Teaching**

Parallel teaching is a teaching strategy with two teachers in a classroom teaching the same lessons to two different groups (Friend & Cook, 2007). The children in the classroom are divided into two equal groups which have both special needs students and normal students. This strategy allows teachers to teach in a smaller group setting and children can be separated from one another for the purpose of teaching.

**Alternative Teaching**

Alternative teaching is a strategy where one teacher conducts a normal class, while at the same time another teacher works with a smaller group of students. This group of students does not have to comprise of just special needs students but also normal students who need extra academic support (Friend & Cook 2007). The school group lesson may not be the same as the main lesson but a support lesson to catch children up to date if they are falling behind or have missed lessons. This small group lessons takes places in the same classroom that the main lesson is taking place. Teachers should be vigilant when calling on children to the small group and refrain from calling the same students over and over again as it would hurt the confidence of the child (Lain 2006).

**Team Teaching**
According to Friend & Cook (2007), teach teaching is the most complex strategy. The teachers in the classroom both teach at the same time and assist the same group of students. The instructions are more informal and interactive and not a lecture. Team Teaching works best with discussion.

Research context

Rasami British International school was founded in 1971, originally a private school, RBIS has developed into a school that offers education for students of ages ranging from 18 months to 18 years old. RBIS follows the British National Curriculum and is certified by CFBT. It is a forward thinking school where teachers recognize children as individuals and guide them to learn and succeed in their academic life and set a path for their future.

Trinity International School was founded in 2003 and is centred on the Seventh-day Adventist values and tenets of education. The school offers education for students up to the age of 18. TRIS follows the State of California Department of Education Curriculum and is accredited by WASC.

Srinakharinwirot Prasarnmit Demonstration School (Elementary) was established on 24th June, 1956 by Mom Luang Pin Malakul for the purpose of teacher placement by the Faculty of Education, Srinakharinwirot University, and to be the research base of the faculty. At present, the school offers Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education for children from ages 5 to 6 years old to the completion of Year 6. The international program, Prasarnmit Primary International Program (PPiP) offers placement to students from Nursery at ages 3-4 years old until end of Year 6.
Rasami British International School (RBIS), Trinity International School (TRIS) and Prasarnmit Primary International Programme accept children with special educational needs without a support of a special education needs (SEN) department. The majority of teachers at RBIS are mainly from the United Kingdom while the teachers at TIS are mostly American and Prasarnmit Primary International Programme have a mix background teachers, this difference in demographics can also show a difference in attitude of the teachers at these schools.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methods and procedures that were used by the researcher while conducting this survey. It includes research design, respondents of the study, instruments used, collection of data and statistical techniques used in the analysis of the data.

Research Design

The design for this study was casual comparative because it compares the attitude of teachers towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand. Casual comparative research design studies the effect of independent variable on the dependent variable. In this case the independent variables are the teachers’ gender, nationality and teaching experience and the dependent variable are the teachers’ attitude.

Population

The population in this study was all the teachers in RBIS, TRIS and PPiP. These three schools were the focus of this research because the teachers in these schools have interactions with SEN students in the mainstream classroom and have to teach them any help from an SEN department and without any support.
Sample

The sample for this survey is a population sample. The population sample was all teachers currently working at Rasami British International School, Trinity International School and Prasarnmit Primary International Programme. All the teachers are selected to participate in the survey because they all interact with the students and some of the children have some kind of SEN and are included in the mainstream classrooms without an SEN department to assist with the education and inclusion of SEN students. The researcher distributed surveys to all homeroom and subject teacher during the final term of the school as teachers have now almost finished teaching the school year and have experienced some kind of inclusion during the course of the year. Below is the table showing the frequency of the respondents from each school. RBIS had 25 respondents, TRIS had 14 respondents and PPiP had 11 respondents, 50 respondents in total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBIS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPiP</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Instrument

The attitude of teachers towards inclusion of SEN students in the mainstream classroom can be accurately measured using a survey (Albarracin, Johnson & Zanna, 2005). For this survey the instrument was previously used in 2008 to measure the attitude of teachers towards inclusion of SEN students in the mainstream classroom in Vietnam. The survey is a modified version of the Attitude towards Mainstreaming Scale (ATMS); it was created in 1979 by Larrivee and Cook (Pham, 2008). In the research conducted in Vietnam, this survey was chosen by the researcher, Huong Thi Mai Pham, because it was originally used to measure the attitudes of mainstream teachers. This research being conducted in Thailand, is also focusing mainstream teachers attitude towards inclusion of SEN children in the mainstream classroom, therefore the same survey is being used.

The instrument is divided into two sections,

Section A contains questions that collect the demographic information of the participants. This section contains 16 questions which are both multiple choice questions and open ended questions. This section used both open ended question and 6- point Likert scale items to give the participants freedom to express themselves and their views.

Section B consists of 29 indicators which describes teachers' attitude towards inclusion. The original ATM Scale consisted of 30 questions, but the original 26th item was removed by researcher in Vietnam as it was information about parents of SEN students (Pham, 2008). The 5 sub- scales used in the ATM survey was used in the survey, namely: (i) Teachers' understanding of general philosophy of IE; (ii)
Classroom behaviour of students with disabilities; (iii) Classroom management; (iv) Impact of inclusion on academic and social growth of students with disabilities; and (v) Teachers’ perceived ability to teach students with disabilities. The Likert Scale in the original ATM scale survey consist of the 5-points rating but for the research in Vietnam and this research neutral value was removed to avoid teachers from taking a neutral stance. The scale was modified to a 4-point range:

- 4  means strongly agree
- 3  means agree
- 2  means seldom agree
- 1  disagree

The score will be subdivided into ranges with the following interpretation:

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00-4.00</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>Moderate attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>Negative attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive attitude means that the respondent believe that the teachers had a good understanding of the philosophy of inclusion education, they also believe that SEN students behaviour will not be disruptive or distracting. With positive attitude result the respondent also believes that teachers have the ability to manage classroom with SEN students and that IE classroom promotes social and academic growth.

Teachers also believe that they have the ability to teach in an IE classroom. Moderate attitude means that the respondent does not have a negative or positive attitude, and take as neutral stance. Negative attitude means that teachers do not have an
understanding of IE and would not be able to manage the classroom with SEN student, who will be disruptive and distracting in the class. They also believe that IE programmes will not promote social and academic growth and that the teachers do not have the ability to teach in an IE setting.

The questionnaire researched and studied teachers’ attitudes under 5 subscales of Teachers’ understanding of general philosophy of inclusion education, classroom behaviour of students with disabilities, classroom management, impact of inclusion on academic and social growth of students with disabilities and teachers’ perceived ability to teach students with disabilities. The questions in the survey were designed to research the above mentioned subscale. In the table below the questions corresponding to the subscales are shown.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ understanding of general philosophy of inclusion education</td>
<td>2, 27, 21, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom behaviour of students with disabilities</td>
<td>3, 5, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>7, 13, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of inclusion on academic and social growth of students with disabilities</td>
<td>4, 6, 10, 11, 15, 18, 23, 24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ perceived ability to teach students with disabilities</td>
<td>1, 8, 16, 20, 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers’ attitude towards the above mentioned subscales will also be compared according to gender, nationality and years of teaching experience.
Validity and Reliability

A survey needs to be consistent and be able to collect the data that needs to be measured. The validity and the reliability of a survey are very important for the data collection.

Validity

Validity is the measurement of the appropriateness of the survey to get the information necessary for the study (Henerson, Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987). The validity of an instrument use to measure depends upon how the concept it is designed to measure is defined. In this study construct, content and external validity was demonstrated (Pham, 2008). Construct and content validity are related to one another, construct validity referrers to how well the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure and content validity referred how well the items in the instrument emphasized the various component what it is supposed to measure appropriately. For this survey, Pham (2008) reviewed literature to see the popular findings amongst previous related researches regarding teachers’ attitude towards IE. Previous findings showed that teachers were not confident with their understanding of IE, which is a threat to the study. As stated by Henerson, Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1987) people cannot respond accurately to questions they don’t understand and sometimes even though the questions are understood, they may not know their own attitude. The issue needed to be researched further on how teachers reflect their belief (cognitive factor) and their feelings towards inclusion (affective factor) and how react towards inclusion education (behavioral factor). After those researches were done by Pham (2008) the answer for the question “do the teachers mean what they mean” can be valid.
External validity

External validity means is the findings can be applied to other situations. External validity was met by this survey conducted by Pham in Vietnam because the sample of the study was randomly selected thus the research findings could be generalized to all population of the same criteria.

Reliability

The survey used for this research is an adaptation of the ATM survey used in 1979 by Larrivee and Cook, this survey was used to research the attitude of teachers towards mainstreaming of children. The initial reliability of the survey when used in 1979 was 0.92, when used to measure the attitude of teacher’s towards inclusion education in Vietnam in 2008; the reliability of the survey was 0.79 by estimating Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of internal consistency (Pham, 2008). The reliability of the questionnaire for the survey used in this study was 0.774 by estimating Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of internal consistency.

Collection of Data

The researcher asked permission from the head teacher and the principal at the Trinity International School, RBIS and Prasarnmit Primary International Programme. The permission was request in academic year 2015-2016. The researcher distributed the surveys during the final term of AY 2015-2016. The researcher asked for assistance from the school staff in the distribution and retrieval of the surveys. Surveys were distributed at all three schools. 30 surveys were distributed at each school, a total of 90 surveys distributed. 25 teachers from RBIS responded, 14 from TRIS and 11 from PPiP, coming to a total of 50 respondents which is a return rate of 55.5%. The sample was selected purposely as
the teachers at the school have interacted with children with special needs in mainstream classrooms with an SEN department.

Data Analysis

The analysis of data for the research objectives of this survey was done using mean, standard deviation and dependant samples t-test. The data analysis showed the mean of teachers’ attitude towards inclusion of special needs according to gender nationality and teaching experience and if they believe that all students will benefit from the inclusive education program. The data also showed a comparison in the data obtained according to gender, nationality and teaching experience. All data was analysed using statistical analysis software.
**Summary of the Research Process**

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Source of Data or Sample</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO 1: To identify the level of teachers’ attitude towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>Teachers at RBIS, TIS and PPiP</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Mean and Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO 2: Is there a significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?</td>
<td>Teachers at RBIS, TIS and PPiP</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Dependent samples t-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the study and data analysis findings regarding the following research objectives concerning teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational at the three international school in Bangkok, Thailand:

Research Objective 1: To identify the level of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

This study was conducted to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand. The researcher used a validated survey on the respondents’ background profile and their attitude towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the mainstream classroom.

Demographic Information of Respondents

The research intended to collect the data 90 teachers of the three schools. The researcher, however, was able to collect the data from 50 out of 90 teachers, which accounted for the response rate of 55.5% of the respondents, most of them were female 64% or 32 people, and another 36% or 18 people were male. The nationalities were divided into Asian and Non-Asian teachers. 26 people or 52% were non-Asian and another 24 people or 48% were Asian teachers. There were 33 people or 66% work from 0-10 years and 17 people or 34% worked more than 10 years.

From the above information, the summaries of respondents’ demographic factors are shown in the table 5.
Table 5

Respondents' Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Years and above</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Data Analysis of Research Objectives

Results related to Research Objective 1

Research Objective 1 is to identify the level of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand. The results showed that overall teachers’ attitude towards inclusion of children with special educational needs was at a moderate level (2.69). 23 items out of 29 are at a high level, three items in were at the “moderate” level but under the 5 subscales the attitudes are indicated as high. The highest attitude is towards the understanding of the philosophy of IE while the lowest was the teachers’ ability to teach an IE setting.
Table 6 below shows the results of teachers’ attitudes towards SEN according to gender, nationality and teaching experience.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ understanding of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general philosophy of IE</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom behaviour of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with disabilities</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of inclusion on academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and social growth of students</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ perceived ability to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach students with disabilities</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results related to Research Objective 2

Research Objectives 2 seek to compare the significant difference of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand. Since the researcher wanted to find out if there is any significant difference of teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion of
children according to demographics, thus the three demographic profiles of teachers that were compared were gender, nationality, and teaching experience.

**Teachers’ attitudes and Gender**

Table 6 is to compare the significant difference of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

**Table 7**

*Dependent Samples t-test of Teachers’ Attitudes According to Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of special educational needs children according to gender in the
mainstream classroom at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand. From the table above the p value is more than 0.05. Therefore there is no difference at the level of 0.05.

**Teachers’ attitudes and Nationality**

For this, research is to compare if there is any significant difference of teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to nationality at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Growth</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that there is no significant difference on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of special educational needs children according to nationality in the mainstream classroom at three schools in Bangkok under the subscale of classroom management, impact on social and academic growth and teachers ability as the p
value is more than 0.05. For subscales of understanding of the philosophy go IE and classroom behaviour, the p value is less than 0.05 with the p value of 0.002 and 0.0002.

**Teachers' attitudes and Teaching Experience**

To compare the significant difference of teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand, the finding is shown on table 9

**Table 9**

*Dependent Samples t-test of Teachers' Attitudes According to Years of Teaching Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows that there is no significant difference on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of special educational needs children according to teaching experience in the mainstream classroom at three schools in Bangkok. There is no difference at the level of 0.05.

Summary of hypothesis testing

The study surveyed the attitudes of teachers' towards inclusion of children with special education needs according to demographics at three schools in Bangkok; the table below shows the summary of the hypothesis and its result.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Hypothesis Testing</th>
<th>Research Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a significant difference in teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>children with special educational needs according to demographic at three schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the survey conducted the results of the dependent samples t-test of the means and standard deviation of the attitude according to demographic, the p values derived were more than 0.05, which means that the research hypothesis is rejected so there is no significant difference in teachers' attitude towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographic at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand at the significant level of 0.05.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter covers the summary of the findings that answers the objective of this study, discussion of the conclusion reached and recommendation for further study.

Summary of Findings

This research was done to study the teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, namely Rasami British International School, Trinity International School and Prasarnmit Primary International Programme. The study conducted surveyed if teachers had a positive or a negative attitude towards inclusion education. Based on the research conducted, the findings are as follows:

1. Teachers mainly had a positive attitude towards inclusion of children with special needs according to demographic at three schools in Bangkok.

2. There were no significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok.

Conclusion

The research was conducted at three schools in Bangkok during term 3 of the academic year 2015-2016. A survey was used as the instrument for data collection. According to the findings, this study concludes and reports below according to research questions.
Research Question 1: Do teachers hold positive or negative attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to gender, nationality and teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

The results of the study showed that teachers of all gender and nationality mainly had positive attitude while some had moderate attitude towards the IE program for SEN students in the mainstream classroom.

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics: gender, nationality, and teaching experiences at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

The finding showed the result that the gender, nationality, and teaching experiences do not influence the attitude of teachers toward inclusion of special educational needs and therefore it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to demographics: gender, nationality, and teaching experiences.

Discussion

The survey questions were designed to get the teachers’ attitudes with regards to the beliefs and knowledge they had towards the topic and if demographic and years of experience had an effect on the attitudes. For this research to study teachers’ attitude towards the inclusion of students with Special Educational needs in the mainstream classroom, the tripartite or the three components model was used. This model classifies attitude into three components (Panjawani, 2012), affectively based component, behavioural based component and cognitive based component. In this study the teachers’ attitude is based off the cognitive component where a persons’ attitude is based on the knowledge and believes that the person has towards an attitude
object. The researcher surveyed teachers' attitudes towards the topic at hand under five subscales, teachers' understanding of general philosophy of IE; classroom behaviour of students with disabilities; classroom management; impact of inclusion on academic and social growth of students with disabilities; and teachers' perceived ability to teach students with disabilities.

From the findings stated above, the teachers have good knowledge of IE and have experienced it before, teachers had mostly good attitude towards inclusion with some moderates and very few low attitudes. The results also showed that there were no significant difference in the teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of children with SEN according to gender and teaching experience but there were significance difference according to nationality for the subscales understanding of general philosophy of IE and classroom behaviour of students with disabilities. The results showed that respondents of Asian descent showed a more favourable attitude towards understanding of understanding of general philosophy of IE while respondents of non-Asian descent showed a more positive attitude towards classroom behaviour of students with disabilities. Previous research done in China in rural areas of the mainland shows that some attitudes based on cultural and traditional values and the attitudes of teachers are very important for the success of the inclusion program. (Chhabra, Srivastava & Srivastava, 2010). Teacher attitude also differ according to the types of disabilities of students (Glaubman & Lifshitz, 2001). From the survey conducted the results from of the dependent samples t-test of the mean and standard deviation of the teachers' attitude towards IE according to nationalities, Asian and non-Asian showed that out of the five subscales, the results of the teachers' attitude towards classroom management, impact on social and academic growth and teachers’ perceived ability to teach children with disabilities, the p value of was more than 0.05.
This means that there is no significant difference in the teachers’ attitude towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to nationality i.e. Asian and non-Asian, under the above mentioned three subscales. The p value results for the understanding of the philosophy of IE and classroom behaviour were less than 0.05 therefore it shows that there is a significant difference in teachers’ attitude towards the two above mentioned subscales, with respondents of Asian background showed a more positive attitude towards understanding of the IE philosophy while non-Asians had a more positive attitude towards classroom behaviour of students with special educational needs.

From the survey conducted the results from the of the dependent samples t-test of the means and standard deviation of the attitude according to teaching experience, the p values derived were more than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is rejected and the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in teachers’ attitude towards inclusion of children with special educational needs according to teaching experience at three schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

**Recommendations**

This study is one of the few done on special educational needs in Thailand. Since it is a relatively new topic, the recommendations are for implementations at school levels and for future research.

**Recommendations for Schools:**

This research can be used by administration to help assist teachers with teaching students with SEN and helping them provide the best education to all the students at the school. From the study the teachers majorly had positive attitude towards IE but there were some areas that the teachers had some low attitudes, the
teachers' perceived ability to teach students with disabilities scored a lower mean than all the other subscale, this can be used by administrator to plan training for teachers and also for future researchers to study the reason behind the low score. A section of the survey also questioned the teachers regarding the support received from school administration and parents and most teachers feel that that the school provides support but not enough resources for IE education, while parents are not a constant support. School administrations can use this finding to help support teachers with resources needed in regards to teaching students with disabilities and also create a platform to involve more parents in the education process of the children to help create the best education setting.

**Recommendations for Future research**

For future researches study of teachers' attitude towards inclusion can be conducted in Thai schools, without international influences and also at schools small cities and rural areas and compare the research with the findings done at international schools. This will allow the researchers to see the difference in the attitude of teachers and how demographic influences that. The second highest mean and SD was derived from the subscale of impact of inclusion on academic and social growth of students with disabilities. Most teachers believe that IE setting is beneficial towards the growth and independence of students with SEN, this factor can be studied as into the difference in the exclusion and inclusion method of inclusion and what factors play a role in the development of students and why do they have a better academic and social growth in a the IE program.

Thailand has a growing SEN population and this is a stepping stone into the direction of understanding the situation and educating teachers through in-service and
on-going trainings. This study can be used as a base line for further study of special educational programs in Thailand.
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APPENDIX A

Survey
Instructions
The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information relating to what you think about inclusive education of students with disabilities. All information in this questionnaire is provided anonymously and will be treated then analyzed under the framework of this research only. This is not a test. Thus, there is no right or wrong answer. All you have to do is mark a cross by each statement that is true for you.

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION
The information provided will be used only to make the results more meaningful. It will not be used to identify you in any way.
1. Gender: Male    Female    2. Nationality:..............
3. Years of experience as a teacher..................years 4.
City/District...........................................
5. (You can have more than one choice) I am school administrator
   head teacher, subject teacher of(Subject)...........
6. Have you received any training on special needs education No Yes (If YES, please continue with the items a,b,c)

   a. What kind of training you have received
      In-service training during summer
      School-based training
      Teacher training college degree
      Teacher training university degree
      Other (please specify)..........................

   b. Total time of training you have received:..........................

   c. Main contents of the training I have received:..................

7. I have had experience of working with students with disabilities for...........years
8. What kind of impairment? (You may select more than one statement)
   • Visual impairment
   • Hearing impairment
   • Intellectual disability
   • Physical disability
   • Language disability
   • Multi-disabilities
   • Other (Please specify)................................
(Make only ONE tick against the statement that best describes your opinion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9) My degree of success to date in dealing with students with disabilities in the regular classroom has been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) My expectation of students with disabilities’ performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) The level of administrative support I have received relative to including students with disabilities has been:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) The availability of additional support services for accommodating students with disabilities such as resource SEN teachers, appropriate instructional materials… has been:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) The participation of parents of students with disabilities in their education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTIONB:** Please make only ONE tick against the statement that best describes your opinion. Once again, there are no right or wrong answers!

1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most of the methods teachers use with regular students in classroom are appropriate for students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The needs of students with disabilities can best be served through special, separate classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The behavior of a student with disabilities generally requires more patience from the teacher than does the behavior of a “normal” student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The challenge of being in the regular classroom will promote the academic growth of the students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The extra attention that students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inclusion offers mixed group interaction which will foster understanding and acceptance of difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains a student with disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Regular teachers possess a great deal of expertise necessary to work with students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Isolation in a special class has a negative effect on the social and emotional development of the students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. The students with disabilities will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special class than in a regular classroom.

12. Most students with disabilities do not make adequate attempt to complete their assignments.

13. Inclusion of students with disabilities will require significant changes in the regular classroom procedures.

14. Most students with disabilities are well behaved in the classroom

15. The contact regular students have with included students with disabilities may be harmful.

16. Regular teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.

17. Students with disabilities will monopolize the teachers’ time.

18. Inclusion will promote the students with disabilities’ social independence.

19. It is likely that a student with disability will exhibit behavior problems in regular classroom setting.

20. Diagnostic/prescriptive teaching is better done by resource room or special teachers than regular-classroom teachers.

21. The inclusion of students with disabilities can be beneficial for regular students.

22. Students with disabilities need to be told exactly what to do and how to do it

23. Inclusion is likely to have a negative effect on emotional development of the students with disabilities.

24. Increased freedom in the classroom creates too much confusion.

25. The students with disabilities will be socially isolated by regular classroom students.

26. Inclusion of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive re-training of regular teachers.

27. Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in the regular classroom setting where possible.

28. Inclusion of students with disabilities creates confusion in regular classroom.

29. The presence of students with disabilities will promote acceptance of differences on the part of regular students.

Please make sure that there was no item left unchecked!

If you have any comment or information that you may want to share with us and you find it interesting for the researcher, please write it down here.
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Thank you very much for your time and contribution!