



PRIMARY AND UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS ATTITUDE TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

A.V.S.Prasanna

Faculty, Department Of Education, V. S.University, Nellore.

ABSTRACT :

Inclusive Education differs from the 'integration' or 'mainstreaming' model of Education which tended to be concerned principally with disability and special educational needs, and learns changing or becoming ready for or deserving of accommodation by the main stream. By contrast, inclusion is about the child's right to participate and the schools duty to accept the child.

Inclusive education is about looking at the ways our schools, classrooms, programs and lessons are designed so that all children can participate and learn. Inclusion is also about finding different ways of teaching so that classrooms actively involve all children. It also means finding ways to develop friendships, relationships and mutual respect between all children, and between children and teachers in the school. Inclusive education is not just for some children. Being included is not something that a child must be ready for. All children are at all times ready to attend regular schools and classrooms. Their participation is not something that must be earned.

Inclusive education is a way of thinking about how to be creative to make our schools a place where all children can participate. Creativity may mean teachers learning to teach in different ways or designing their lessons so that all children can be involved. As a value, inclusive education reflects the expectation that we want all of our children to be appreciated and accepted throughout life.

The present paper is explaining the attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education.

KEYWORDS : *Inclusiv Education, Main Streeming Education, Regular Education.*

1.1INTRODUCTION

Inclusive Education means that all students attend we are welcomed by the neighbourhood schools in age appropriate regular classes and are supported to learn contribute and participate in all aspects of the life of the school.

Inclusive education is about how we develop and design our schools class rooms, programmes and activities so that all students learn and participate together. Neighbourhood schools are the heart of our communities and inclusion BC believes they are essential for a quality inclusive education system. Therefore who believe it is important to support a public education system in BC.



Inclusive education is a phrase used to describe the joint education of special needs and typically developing children. It's an often misunderstood and misused concept; many schools claim to be inclusive, but with the best will in the world, few are. So, what is it all about?

Inclusive education means students and special needs students learn while sharing the same physical space and interacting socially and academically. It's not either-or, simply sharing the same physical space, but engaging in completely different activities, is not inclusive. Because of this, it's important for a school's whole community to understand inclusion and make it a goal, School administrators, teachers, parents and kids all have to buy into its value. When this happens, everyone benefits.

Inclusion has two sub types: They are (1) Regular inclusion or partial inclusion (2) full inclusion.

Inclusive practice is not always inclusive but it is a form of integration. For example students with special needs are educated in regular classes for nearly all of the day, or atleast for more than half of the Day whenever possible, the students receive any additional help in the general class room, and the student is treated like a full member of the class. In this case the student occasionally leaves the regular class room to attend smaller, more intensive instructional sessions in a source room or to receive other related services.

1.2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Lea Suc (2015). Primary & Upper primary school Teacher's attitudes towards inclusive Education. The purpose of the study was to encourage teachers to share and reflect on their personal experiences with inclusive Education in solvenia five categories emerged from the data. This article focuses on three of the categories and explores the robust division of teachers into two groups depending on their overall attitudes towards the inclusion and children with special needs.

Alghazo and Naggar Gaad (2014). showed that teacher with one to five years of Teaching Experience held significant more positive attitudes towards the inclusion of pupils with special needs compared with teachers with 6-11 years experience and those with 12 or more years of experience, $F(2,149) = 10.3$ $P = 0.05$, Glaubman and lifshitz, also found that teachers with less years of teaching experience (1-10 years) were significantly more positive than their counter parts with more experience (greater than 11 years) $F(1,108) = 4.73$, $P > 0.05$.

Pearson etal. (2013). used interviews to examine teacher's attitude towards inclusive education ($n = 224$) many teachers agreed with the two positive values of indusion, namely realization of equal opportunity' (75.9%) and 'a good chance for students to interact (75.9%) where as 61.8% responded positively to the item that 'inclusion' is an educational value to other students. But almost half of the teachers (48.1%) responded that integrated education was 'a painful struggle for special needs students and 60% indicated that integrated education was 'a burden of the school and teacher's, According to the rule to thumb we interpreted the results as neutral out comes.

Bussing etal. (2012). several studies focused on teachers feelings towards aspects of inclusive Education assessed teacher's confidence to educate pupils with AD/HD ($n=365$). Teachers rated their confidence on their ability to perform a task on a five point likert scale, ranging from 1 (no confidence) to 5 (strongly confident). Teachers had to indicate their degree of confidence based on 10 statements such as 'I m able to manage the stress caused by students with AD/HD in many classroom. The mean score of 3.87 ($SD=0.95$) indicates that teachers were fairly confident about their ability to educate pupils with AD/HD. However the high standard deviation needs to be considered in interpreting the outcomes of the study.

Paibman and Lifshitz (2011). to examine teachers willingness to include pupils with special needs in their class room ($n = 136$) Teacher's attitudes were assessed using a five – point Likert scale. However, the response choice was compressed in the analysis of the results (1 and 2 = 1, 3 = 2 and 4 and 5 = 3), in which a higher score indicated positive attitudes. The mean score of 1.96 ($SD=0.58$) showed that teachers are neutral about the inclusion of pupils with special needs in regular classrooms.

Cook (2010). Several studies related teachers attitudes to pupil's type of disability using a nomination procedure, compared teacher's attitudes towards pupils with mild and severe disabilities ($n = 70$). The results of the study pointed out that children with specific learning disabilities, AD / HD, or

behavioural disorders were nominated significantly more often by teachers in the attitudinal category rejection than those with easy – to notice disabilities (e.g. cognitive, orthopaedic, hearing visual or multiple disabilities and autism, $\chi^2 (1, m = 63) = 3.00, P < 0.05$. According to the findings of this study if teachers could reduce their class by one child they would be relieved if it were a pupil with learning disabilities AD/HD or behaviour problems.

1.3 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:

1. To study the attitude of school assistant teacher's towards continuous comprehensive evaluation.
2. To study the attitude of primary and upper primary school teacher's towards inclusive education with respect to Gender, locality, Management, type of school, Age of the teacher and Teaching experience.

1.4 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:

1. There is no positive attitude among primary and upper primary school teacher's towards inclusive education.
2. There is no significance difference in the attitude of primary and upper primary school teacher's towards inclusive education with respect to Gender, Management, Age of the teacher and Teaching experience,.

1.5 METHODS OF INVESTIGATIONS:

1.5.1 SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLING:

A sample is small properties of a population selected for observation and analysis. Schools are selected randomly from rural and urban areas in S.P.S.R Nellore District.

The sample selected for the study is 100 school assistant teachers. A sample is small proportion selected for desperation and analysis. It is a collection consisting of a part subset of the objects or individual of characteristics which are found in the population. A simple random sampling technique was chosen to collect the data for this study.

1.5.2 METHODS USED FOR STUDY: The Investigator selected the Normative Survey method to collect the data for the present study.

1.5.3 TOOL USED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY: This present investigator used

Teacher's attitudes sale towards Inclusive Education was prepared by Dr.Vishal Sood & Dr.Arti Anand.

1.5.4 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED:

The investigator used different statistical techniques to interpret the collected data, mainly MEAN, S.D, t- test and ANOVA.

1.6 ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA:

The collected data becomes meaningful only after being analyzed and interpreted. Analysis of data means studying the tabulated material in order to determine inherent facts or meanings for the purpose of interpretation.

Table no- 1: t- test
Mean and S.D's and t-value of Primary & Upper primary school Teacher's attitude towards Inclusive Education with respect to their gender.

Gender	N	MEAN	S.D	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Male	62	93.73	11.951	1.113	@
Female	58	95.97	10.068		

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table No 1 shows the comparison of mean scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards inclusive education regarding their **GENDER**. The mean attitude score of male teachers was 93.73, and the mean attitude score of female teachers was 95.97. The observed t-value was 1.113. Since the t-value is lower than the critical t- value 1.96 at 0.05 level. It is clear that there no significance difference in the mean attitude scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards inclusive education with respect to their gender. It can be interpreted that the mean of female teachers was higher than the male teachers.

Hence the hypothesis that there is no significance difference in the attitude of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education was accepted at 0.05 level with respect to their gender.

Table no- 2: t- test
Mean and S.D's and t-value of Primary & Upper primary school Teacher's attitude towards Inclusive Education with respect to their locality.

LOCALITY	N	MEAN	S.D	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
RURAL	66	99.31	10.186	2.225	*
URBAN	54	104.06	10.417		

* significant at 0.05 level

Table No 2 shows the comparison of mean scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teacher's towards inclusive education regarding their **LOCALITY**. The mean attitude score of primary and upper primary school teachers who are working in rural area was 99.31, and the mean attitude score of primary and upper primary school teacher's who are working in urban area was 104.06. The observed t-value was 2.225, Since the t-value is higher than the critical t- value 1.96 at 0.05 level. It is clear that there is significance difference in the mean attitude scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teacher's towards Inclusive Education with respect to their locality. It can be interpreted that the mean score of primary and upper primary school teacher's who are working in urban area was higher than the score of primary and upper primary school teacher's who are working in rural area.

Hence the hypothesis that there is significance difference in the attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards inclusive education was rejected at 0.05 level with respect to their locality.

Table no- 3: t- test
Mean and S.D's and t-value of Primary & Upper primary school Teacher's attitude towards Inclusive Education with respect to their management.

MANAGEMENT	N	Mean	S.D	t-Value	Level of significance
GOVT.	56	92.95	11.139	1.728	@
PRIVATE	64	96.20	9.250		

@ Not significant at 0.05 level

Table No 3 shows the comparison of mean scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education regarding their **MANAGEMENT**. The mean attitude score of primary and upper primary school teachers who are working in govt. schools was 92.95, and the mean attitude score of primary and upper primary school teachers who are working in private school was 96.20. The observed t-value was 1.728, Since the t-value is lower than the critical t- value 1.96 at 0.05 level. It is clear that there no significance difference in the mean attitude scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their management. It can be interpreted that the mean score of primary and upper primary school teachers who are working in private schools was higher than the score of primary and upper primary school teachers who are working in govt. school.

Hence the hypothesis that there is no significance difference in the attitude of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards inclusive education was accepted at 0.05 level with respect to their management.

Table no- 4: t-test
Mean and S.D's and t-value of Primary & Upper primary school Teacher's attitude towards Inclusive Education with respect to their type of school.

TYPE OF SCHOOL	N	Mean	S.D	t-Value	Level of significance
PRIMARY	56	98.93	11.637	2.206	*
U.P	64	102.88	7.981		

* significant at 0.05 level

Table No 3 shows the comparison of mean scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education regarding their **TYPE OF SCHOOL**. The mean attitude score of primary and upper primary school teachers who are working in primary schools was 98.93, and the mean attitude score of teachers who are working in U.P school was 102.88. The observed t-value was 2.206, Since the t-value is higher than the critical t- value 1.96 at 0.05 level. It is clear that there is significance difference in the mean attitude scores of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their type of school. It can be interpreted that the mean score of primary and upper primary school teachers who are working in U.P schools was higher than the score of primary school teachers.

Hence the hypothesis that there is no significance difference in the attitude of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education was rejected at 0.05 level with respect to their type of school.

Table no- 5: ANOVA TEST
Mean and F-value of Primary & Upper primary school Teacher's attitude towards Inclusive Education with respect to their Age of the teacher.

Age of the teacher	N	Mean	SUM OF SQUARES	SOURCES OF VARIANCE	df	F- VALUE	Level of significance
below 25yrs	47	93.98	326.498	BETWEEN GROUPS	2	1.334	@
25-50yrs	40	97.10	14314.094		117		
Above 50yrs	33	93.21	326.498		WITH IN GROUPS		

@ Not significant at 0.05 level

Table No-4, shows the average score of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards inclusive education regarding their **AGE OF THE TEACHER**. the mean value obtained for the teachers who has below 25yrs was 93.98, the mean value obtained for the teachers who has 25-50yrs was 97.10, and the mean value obtained for the teachers who has Above 50yrs 93.21.it indicates that the teachers who has 25-50yrs was high than that of below 25yrs and Above 50yrs. The F- value obtained was 1.334. Since the F- value is lower than the critical F- value 3.09 at 0.05 level. It is clear that there is no significance difference in the mean scores of the attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their Age of the Teacher.

Hence the hypothesis that there is no significance difference in the attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their Age of the Teacher.

Table no- 6: ANOVA TEST
Mean and F-value of Primary & Upper primary school Teacher's attitude towards Inclusive Education with respect to their Teaching Experiences

Teaching experiences	N	Mean	SUM OF SQUARES	SOURCES OF VARIANCE	df	F- VALUE	Level of significance
less than five years	34	94.32	12.329	BETWEEN Groups	2	.049	@
five years	48	95.10	14628.262		117		
Above five years	38	94.87	12.329	Within Groups			

Table No-5, shows the average score of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards inclusive education regarding their **Teaching experiences**. the mean value obtained for the teachers who has teaching experience such as less than five years was 94.32, the mean value obtained for the teachers who has teaching experience such as five years was 95.10, and the mean value obtained for the teachers who has teaching experience such as Above 50yrs 94.87.it indicates that the teachers who has 25-50yrs was high than that of below 25yrs and Above 50yrs. The f- value obtained was 0.0393. Since the F- value is lower than the critical F- value 3.09 at 0.05 level. It is clear that there is no significance difference in the mean scores of the attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their Teaching Experiences.

Hence the hypothesis that there is no significance difference in the attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their Teaching Experiences.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. There is no significant difference in the attitude of attitude of primary and upper primary school teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their gender, management, Age of the Teacher and Teaching Experiences.
2. There is significant difference in the attitude of School Assistant teachers towards Inclusive Education with respect to their locality, and type of the school.

CONCLUSION:

The following information gives the conclusions. On the basis of analysis the following conclusion has been draw. Most of the teachers are still unaware of the concept of Inclusive Education.

1.The results of this revealed that the major problems faced by the school teachers towards Inclusive Education were large number of students in class , lack of training ,lack of proper infrastructure facilities and teaching materials. Lack of seriousness among the students towards academics was also reported as a serious concern of the teachers and lack of dedication.

2. To overcome these problems teachers suggested to reduce the number of students in classes; provide appropriate teachers training towards Inclusive Education.

REFERENCE:

- **Lea Suc (2015)**. University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Health Science, Zdravstvena pot 5, 1000 Ljubljana Slovenia, Journal of Universal Excellence, March 2015, Years 5, Number 1. Pp. 30-46. Lea Suc @ zf. Uni – lj.si.
- **Alghazo and Naggar Gaad (2014)**. General Education teachers in the united Arab Emirates and their acceptance of the inclusion of students with disabilities. British Journal of special Education 31 : 94 – 9.
- **Pearson, V., L., Eva, C. Ernest (2013)**. A Heart to learn and Care? Teacher's responses toward special Needs children in Mainstream schools in Hong Kong. Disability and Society 18 : 489 – 508.
- **Bussing, R., F.A. Gary, C.E. Leon, (2012)**. General room teacher's information and perceptions of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Behavioral Disorder 27 : 327 – 38.
- **Galubman, R., and H. Lifshitz (2011)**. Ultra – orthodox Jewish teachers self – efficacy and willingness for inclusion of pupils with special needs European Journal of special Needs Education Quarterly 22 : 24-30.
- **Wilkins, T., and J.L.Nietfeld. (2004)**. The effect of a school – wide inclusion training program upon teachers attitudes about inclusion journal of Research in special Educational Needs 4 : 115 – 21.
- **Hammond, H., and I. Lawrence (2003)**. Teacher's attitudes toward inclusion; Survey results from elementary school teachers in three South western rural School district. Rural special Education quarterly 22 : 24-30
- **Opdal, L.R., S.Wormnaes, and A. Habayeb (2001)**. Teacher opinions about inclusion: A pilot study in a Palestinian context. International Journal of Disability Development and Education 48 : 143-62.
- <https://www.google.com/search?q=objectives+of+inclusive+education+pdf&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj284HEt5bjAhVRVXwKHUOK9MQ1QIoAXoECAoQAg&biw=1262&bih=672>



A.V.S. Prasanna
Faculty, Department Of Education, V. S.University, Nellore.