Teachers' Perspective on Inclusion of Students with Moderate Intellectual Disability in General Education Setting at Primary Level

Rukhsar Shabbir

M.Phil. Scholar (Special Education), Department of Special Education, Division of Education (DOE), University of Education, Township, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, Email: rukhsarshabbir1@gmail.com

Ayesha Ali Raza

M.Phil. Scholar (Special Education), Department of Special Education, Division of Education (DOE), University of Education, Township, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, Email: ayeshaalirazaofficial@gmail.com

Dr. Muhammad Javed Aftab

Assistant Professor (Special Education), Department of Special Education Division of Education (DoE), University of Education, Township, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, Email: drmjavedaftab@ue.edu.pk, drmjavedaftab@gmail.com

Abstract

General education teachers disagree on including impaired students in regular sessions. However, teachers' willingness to accommodate some pupils and trust in their capacity to run the classroom efficiently depend on the children's limitations. Teacher concerns regarding having IDD kids in general education stem from the children's lack of social skills, behavioral outbursts, curriculum changes, and lack of training and support. These demographics are difficult to teach while concurrently teaching a large class of typically developing students, according to many teachers. Teachers' attitudes towards their special needs students affect their teaching effectiveness. To construct a sample of school teachers and professors, 78 females and 23 males from primary regular schools in LAHORE and other cities were proportionally allocated and randomly selected. The quantitative data was obtained via questionnaire and analyzed in SPSS using descriptive and inferential statistics, percentages, mean scores, and the t-test. The findings showed educational policymakers, teachers, administrators, and stakeholders that inclusive education supports IDD.

Keywords: Teachers' Perspective, Students, Intellectual Disability, Education, Primary Level

Introduction

Learning and training were once thought unattainable for intellectually and developmentally disabled youngsters (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). Their birth often led to societal disdain and even family killings, with children being routinely slain or imprisoned in one room in Pakistan and elsewhere (Fazil, Faiz, Ahmed, & Asif, 2020). Such mistreatment and discrediting affected their psychosocial needs (Wilson, 1999). In the 19th century, society began to recognize the potential for educating and caring for disabled people (Winzer, 2000). Parent and community groups have fought for years to give children with modest intellectual disabilities the same educational opportunities as their peers in regular schools, supported by federal and state legislation such as the IDEA and the No Child Left Behind Act (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999). These laws mandate that moderately cognitively challenged children attend the least restrictive educational environments (Gallagher et al., 2000).

Moderately intellectually and developmentally challenged children require more education than before (Anderson, Brock, & Shawbitz, 2022). The regular education curriculum allows children to study with non-disabled peers (Qvortrup & Qvortrup, 2018). Like many countries, Pakistan passed laws to govern the education of IDD students, initially granting rights in the 1980s (Ehsan, 2018). This study investigates inclusive education in Lahore, Pakistan, highlighting gaps in knowledge, teacher attitudes, awareness, and resources (Carrington, 1999). Many conventional educational systems worldwide are struggling to accept impaired students (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). A qualitative study analyzed attitudes toward inclusive education among elementary and secondary school students and teachers (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). Including impaired pupils in regular classes demands a comfortable setting and improved infrastructure (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014).

Teacher training, student counseling, classroom amenities, and advocacy for inclusive education are essential (Coombs-Richardson & Mead, 2001). Understanding the real-world repercussions of this issue requires studying it in Pakistan (Ehsan,

2018). This study aims to reveal the state of educational inclusion in Pakistan, defining inclusive education standards to improve schools (Pelt, 2020). Further study and understanding of inclusive education will benefit mildly IDD children and help parents enroll their children in general schools. This course will also educate general teachers on the basics and value of inclusion, helping them teach IDD students and enhancing societal understanding of the benefits of including IDD students in general education (Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018). The study focused on the primary teacher's opinion on including moderate cognitively impaired kids in general education. The goal was to gather primary teachers' opinions on enrolling somewhat cognitively impaired students in general education classrooms and making learning easier. Numerous populations have moderate IDD children. Recent studies show that awareness of IDD has increased the number of children with it.

Teachers were asked about including IDD children in normal education and encouraging parents to do so. For good relationships with teachers, friends, and family, this gave parents, teachers, and the public health information to encourage IDD youngsters to attend general school (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014; Gallagher et al., 2000; Flores, 2012). Since my investigation assumed real questionnaire responses, correlation data was accurate and dependable (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020; Alquraini, 2011). The study informed respondents and laid the groundwork for the topic (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). This study examined general education teachers in Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, who teach moderate IDD primary school students (Ehsan, 2018).

Review of Related Literature

The factors that influence teachers' opinions on including disabled children in regular education classes have been extensively discussed in special education literature, but not in general education (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). The idea, practices, and possible benefits of inclusion on all students are still poorly understood by many educators, parents, and decision-makers (Carrington, 1999; Wilson, 1999; Westwood & Graham, 2003). In this paper, I explore critical concerns, ethical and practical issues, and student population implications of the inclusion argument (Pelt, 2020; Cameron & Cook, 2013; Anderson, Brock, & Shawbitz, 2022). Before making any substantial modifications to the technique for educating exceptional children, I propose researching integrated setting criteria and the consequences of inclusion on all pupils (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007; Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018). All stakeholders should also talk more thoroughly (Kauffman et al., 2022; Coombs-Richardson & Mead, 2001). Understanding that not all of the following diagnoses have intellectual or developmental impairments is critical. This list aids parents and others unsure of our advocacy services.

- ADHD
- Apert Syndrome
- Autism
- Cerebral Palsy
- Developmental Delay
- Down Syndrome
- Fragile X Syndrome
- Language and Speech Disorders
- Learning Disorders
- Williams Syndrome are examples

Intellectually challenged people are cognitively and adaptively impaired before 18.

Special Education

Special education serves students with impairments or special needs (Winzer, 2000). In recent years, special education has grown to provide all kids with a quality education that suits their individual learning needs (Wilson, 1999; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). This literature study will examine special education's history, current practices, and future. Since the early 20th century, special education has existed. Before this, disabled children were routinely excluded from public education and had little to no specialized instruction or care (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Flores, 2012). Several legislation and regulations in the mid-20th century advanced special education (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). The 1975 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has been revised multiple times. The legislation requires all disabled children to receive a free and adequate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) (Kauffman et al., 2022). This law also mandates schools to create IEPs for disabled kids to ensure they receive the specialized instruction and support they need to succeed (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020; Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018).

The education system relies on special education to support millions of disabled children. Still, the field confronts many hurdles (Winzer, 2000). A dearth of skilled special education teachers and related service providers is a major issue (Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018; Coombs-Richardson & Mead, 2001). The COVID-19 pandemic has made recruiting and retaining special education staff harder (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). Overrepresentation of pupils of color in special education is another issue (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). This inequality has been a problem for years, and efforts are underway to address its

root causes, including systematic racism and bias in referral and identification (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Kauffman et al., 2022).

The COVID-19 pandemic has also emphasized the need for better technology and assistive technologies for disabled pupils (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). Remote learning is difficult for disabled students without the right technology and support (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014). Despite these obstacles, special education has a bright future. Technology and assistive technology are giving disabled children more educational options (Anderson, Brock, & Shawbitz, 2022). Collaboration between general and special education teachers and inclusive methods that assist all students' learning are also rising (Carrington, 1999; Coombs-Richardson & Mead, 2001). Early intervention and prevention in special education are also becoming more important. Early learning and behavioral intervention improve results for disabled pupils, according to research (Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007; Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018).

Since its beginnings, special education has evolved to accommodate the requirements of disabled pupils (Winzer, 2000). There is optimism for the field despite a shortage of qualified staff and equity and access difficulties (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019; Kauffman et al., 2022). Advanced technology and assistive technology, more collaboration between general and special education teachers, and a focus on early intervention and prevention all bode well for special education (Flores, 2012; Alquraini, 2011).

Definition of Inclusion

To create community, inclusion recognizes and respects differences and diversity (Qvortrup & Qvortrup, 2018). Regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, or other characteristics, it is making everyone feel welcome and included (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). Inclusion is actively welcoming and celebrating variety, not just tolerating it (Wilson, 1999; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). It requires appreciating diverse perspectives, experiences, and backgrounds and ensuring equal access to resources, opportunities, and help (Carrington, 1999; Cameron & Cook, 2013). Schools, businesses, communities, and societies benefit from inclusion (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014; Kauffman et al., 2022). Removing barriers to participation and promoting fairness, equity, and respect requires intentionality (Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018; Anderson, Brock, & Shawbitz, 2022).

NCERI defined it as "providing to all students, including those with severe disabilities, equitable opportunities to receive effective educational services, with supplementary aids and support services as needed, in age-appropriate general education classes in their neighborhood schools, towards the outcome of preparing all students for productive lives" in its study on inclusive education (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). The 1994 Salamanca Statement introduced "inclusion" to special education worldwide by allowing inclusive schools to integrate disabled children (Qvortrup & Qvortrup, 2018). Lipsky and Gartner say inclusion goes beyond special education. This is a response to the need to teach different students and give them high-quality education like mainstream peers (Carrington, 1999; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002).

Mithaug stated in 1998 that adoption is an example of inclusion, not simply special education, and that a complex network of discourses about education's adequacy, demography, ideologies, and attitudes of marginalized groups, and associated social issues drives the push for inclusive education. Barnes and Lehr (1993) showed that in the 1960s, educational institutions at all levels responded to the civil rights movement differently. To protect kids' rights, inclusion became a social justice idea. Traits don't limit people. A flexible, inclusive school meets each student's needs. Every student is accepted, nurtured, and educated in an inclusive school. (Winzer, 2000)

According to Nilholm and Göransson (2017), literature definitions of inclusion lack conceptual clarity. Inclusivity attitudes and behaviour efficiency research are affected. If teachers, students, parents, and the community embrace inclusive education, it will prosper. In actuality, inclusive classrooms and good attitudes towards SEN children are necessary (Antonak and Livneh, 2000). Inclusive social attitudes improve peer, family, and teacher acceptance of SEN students (Morin et al. 2013). Because inclusion has multiple definitions, we focus on inclusive education attitudes. We achieve this in one of Europe's most varied cities, with high immigration and mobility and a bilingual, tiered education system.

Importance of Inclusion

Inclusion makes society more varied, equal, and just (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019; Qvortrup & Qvortrup, 2018). Inclusion fosters acceptance and respect by recognizing and valuing diversity (Wilson, 1999; Carrington, 1999). Inclusion is crucial because it generates a sense of belonging and positive relationships between different groups (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014; Kauffman et al., 2022). It boosts self-esteem and confidence by making people feel valued for their unique talents (Flores, 2012; Anderson, Brock, & Shawbitz, 2022). Inclusion promotes workplace diversity, allowing companies to access more talent and ideas (Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018). By supporting inclusivity, organizations may encourage innovation, creativity, and collaboration, improving productivity and results (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). Building a society without discrimination and prejudice requires inclusiveness. It removes barriers to social, economic, and political participation and produces a more equitable and just society (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Kauffman et al., 2022).

According to Test et al. (2009), students with disabilities lag behind their typically developing peers in postsecondary education, employment, and independent living. Access to the general education curriculum is a moderate predictor of postsecondary success. Research shows that children with disabilities who attend general education classrooms perform better on reading and writing tests than those who attend pull-out or special education. Inclusion can happen in PE, electives, lunch, and libraries. These environments may help children with disabilities acquire social skills by connecting them with typically developing peers. Still, instructors' inclusion views are vital to student social development. Teacher values and attitudes are crucial to inclusion programming. To succeed, teachers must endorse inclusion and its rules. Teachers' inclusion attitudes are vital to students' success if general education can improve postsecondary opportunities for disabled youngsters. Fuchs (2010); Coombs-Richardson & Mead (2001).

Level of Inclusion

Our understanding of education inclusiveness must encompass special needs pupils, ensuring all kids are considered (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). This essay employs systems theory to illustrate that inclusion affects all children and necessitates a three-part operational definition. The first dimension includes various levels of inclusion. A youngster might be accepted or excluded from numerous social communities, both inside and outside schools (Qvortrup & Qvortrup, 2018). Class is one example of this social group, but bilateral relationships with other students and teachers are equally important. The third component involves community inclusion and exclusion. Instead of being fully integrated or removed, a youngster can be partially included or excluded from various communities, creating a full matrix definition of inclusion in education (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). Special needs pupils are increasingly being educated in regular education settings. One trend in special education is including these students in regular classes (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). Preschoolers' psychomotor, linguistic, and personal requirements are unique at any age, but special education children's demands are especially different (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014). The literary research aims to document kindergarten teachers' views on inclusive education for children with special educational needs (SEN), characterize the dangers of inclusive education, and describe the current state of inclusive education methods and activities in primary schools (Carrington, 1999).

Current State of Inclusion

Inclusion in special education is giving disabled students equal educational opportunities (Qvortrup & Qvortrup, 2018; Anderson, Brock, & Shawbitz, 2022). Inclusion is a major topic for equity and high-quality education for all students (Carrington, 1999; Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). Country, region, and school/district affect special education inclusion (Alquraini, 2011; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). Some communities have made great strides towards inclusion, but others still face many barriers to impaired students' education (Ehsan, 2018; Flores, 2012). Special education is supported by laws in several nations (Winzer, 2000). All impaired students in the US must receive a free adequate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (Kauffman et al., 2022; Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). Schools must endeavor to incorporate impaired students in regular classes (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014; Weiss, Markowetz, & Kiel, 2018.

Despite legislative protections, schools and instructors have major challenges in promoting special education inclusion. Example: lack of resources and training, negative attitudes and prejudices about disability, and physical barriers to school facilities and materials. Many schools and teachers are strengthening their inclusion approaches as it becomes more vital. This includes training teachers and staff to create more inclusive classrooms and schools and providing disabled students with extra resources. While increasing special education inclusion is tough, there is a growing commitment to high-quality education for all. According to the USDOE's 40th Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (USDOE, 2018), students spend a percentage of their school day in general education by dividing their general education classroom time by the total number of hours.

Bring it up 100. 18.3% of public-school students with disabilities aged 6–21 attended general education classes 40%–79% of the day in autumn 2016, and 63.1% attended 80% or more. 13.4% of impaired pupils attend general education classes less than 40%, while 5.1% attend private placements, bedridden students, or hospitals. Intellectually impaired and multi disabled students spend the least time in general education. Over 25% of these students have an MD, and over 50% spend less than 40% of the school day in general education. Taught in the strictest non-school contexts. IDEA mandates disabled students to participate more and do better in college. High school graduates must be college- and workforce-ready under ESSA. Teachers must assess ESSA and IDEA requirements for inclusivity. Teachers must also assess if pupils are receiving FAPE and learning as much as possible alongside non-disabled classmates in the optimal environment. It appears that USDOE rules are violated because only 63% of disabled children attend general education for at least 80% of the day. The USDOE requires states to submit a State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report on special education program development to track IDEA implementation (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). In 20 instances, states must report IDEA part B application (Winzer, 2000). The fifth indicator measures LRE and general education (Kauffman et al., 2022).

Importance of Teachers' Attitudes

Teacher attitudes are crucial to special education inclusion (Coombs-Richardson & Mead, 2001). Positive attitudes towards students with disabilities and inclusive classrooms can provide a welcoming and supportive learning environment for all

students (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999). Reasons why instructors' attitudes matter for special education inclusion: Behaviour is influenced by attitudes: Attitudes affect how teachers handle impaired kids (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). Teachers who dislike or undervalue disabled pupils may hinder assistance and involvement (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). Research demonstrates that disabled students taught by inclusive teachers perform better academically and socially (Dapudong, 2013; Cameron & Cook, 2013). Because positive attitudes can foster a welcoming, inclusive learning environment that fosters progress (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014).

Teacher attitudes shape classroom dynamics. Diverse and inclusive teachers can create a more tolerant and courteous classroom where all children feel respected and supported. Positive inclusion can strengthen teacher-student relations. An inclusive classroom helps teachers build trust and connection with disabled students, improving learning and participation. Despite controversy, many academics define attitude as one's positive or negative judgement of a psychological item. Eagly and Chaiken (2007) say attitudes start in the mind and cannot exist until the item is encountered. When seen again, unfavourable responses are likely.

Many academics consider attitudes cognitive, emotional, and behavioural. Cognitive aspects influence instructors' views of disabled pupils, while emotional factors influence inclusion. Instructors' thoughts and feelings are described in behavioural component 11 (Hutzler et al., 2019). Positive attitudes improve disability inclusion in mainstream classes, according to this review. Negative views lead to low achievement expectations and limited acceptance of disadvantaged children in mainstream education (Beattie et al., 1997; Subban & Sharma, 2005). Next, we consider how such responsibilities affect student achievement. Teachers' attitudes impact impaired students' progress (Ernest & Rogers, 2009; Goyena, 2008; Rizzo & Vispoel, 1992). Teaching kids with different learning needs takes effort and skill. Teachers' attitudes affect disabled students' success in inclusive environments since student-teacher contact is critical to learning (Ernest & Rogers, 2009).

According to Hernandez et al. (2016), instructors without preservice training and inclusive practise skills struggle to teach children in inclusive classrooms. To embrace inclusive practices, teacher inclusion perceptions must be evaluated and addressed. Many teachers comprehend inclusion's benefits, but it's not always done successfully (Cook et al., 2007). Research shows that some teachers fail to accommodate disabled students (Cook et al., 2007). However, inclusion-savvy teachers are more optimistic and believe they can teach disabled students (Buell et al., 1999). Negative inclusion attitudes lead to low expectations and poor performance for disadvantaged students (Cameron & Cook, 2013). Low expectations may cause students to doubt their talents and limit their learning opportunities (Cameron & Cook, 2013). Teachers with low expectations spend less time teaching, which affects student achievement (Brownell & Pajares, 1999). Teacher attitudes can affect impaired students' general education performance depending on numerous factors. Disabled students have been stigmatized and educated apart from their ordinarily developing peers (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). The general education curriculum and accountability structures omit them (Kauffman et al., 2022). Special education has been criticized for years for unfairly treating disabled pupils and providing them with unequal educational possibilities (Francisco, Hartman, & Wang, 2020). Teachers' anti-inclusion views may contribute to educational inequality (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999). For instance, forecasting student potential based on present achievement may harm pupils and perpetuate inequality (Cameron & Cook, 2013). Students with disabilities and educational issues owing to inequities may need more support than their typically developing peers (Bendová, Čecháčková, & Šádková, 2014). Teachers' preconceived notions about including disabled children affect student progress (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). Teachers' views come from the social constructivist thesis that reality is arbitrary and based on society's interactions. According to social constructivism, instructors base their inclusion perspectives on earlier experiences. These views may reflect an instructor, school culture, or social attitudes towards disabled children (Carrington, 1999). Social constructivism is used in Figure to explain how educators see inclusion. Cultural factors shape teachers' inclusion views in many ways.

General education and special education faced similarities and differences in including disabled children. When analyzing general education instructors' viewpoints, different results emerged. Most teachers supported including disabled students in the classroom, although special education teachers were more likely to do so (Pelt, 2020). Special education teachers also choose general education teachers for inclusion carefully. Many special education teachers thought general education teachers hated having disabled students (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999).

Research Methodology

Research Design:

The study used a cross-sectional or prevalence research methodology and random sampling to assess variables within a particular sample population or subgroup. This quantitative, descriptive process was sequential and methodical. To compile instructors' thoughts regarding the inclusion of primary pupils with moderate cognitive challenges in regular education settings, survey data was gathered.

Population and sampling

All mainstream and inclusive Lahore general education teachers were selected as representative sample. We sampled 101 people. The group had 78 women and 23 men.

Questionnaire

The study problem defines instrument portion. Researchers created a questionnaire from literature. The survey asked primary teachers about mainstreaming moderately cognitively impaired kids. This sample is large and representative. Selected from the population. Based on accessibility, ease, speed, and cost, purposeful sampling selected the group for analysis. Questionnaires are used in surveys and statistics. To reduce higher-level ambiguity, we collected 100 digital questions. Questionnaire has two parts: In Questionnaire Part 1, respondents provided name, gender, age, institution, and qualification. Part 2 had 35 statements about IDD children, mainstream schools, general education teachers, non-disabled peers, and society.

Validity & Reliability of Research Tool

Field experts thoroughly evaluated the research tool's content validity. Every item on the questionnaire was carefully examined to make sure it was applicable and in line with the study's goals. The procedure complied with Gay's (2005) description of the gold standard of legitimacy, which highlights the significance of determining what, when, and how to assess. A pilot test was carried out to address any potential ambiguities, misperceptions, and inaccuracies in the study instrument. General education teachers in Lahore participated in this pilot after a thorough analysis and discussion with subject-matter specialists. A good degree of reliability was indicated by the reliability coefficient of 0.891 obtained from the pilot testing. The questionnaire underwent the required adjustments to improve its accuracy and efficacy based on input from experts and pilot testing.

Data Collection and Analysis

The investigation ended with quantitative analysis. Research describes. Numerous cross-sectional data sets were evaluated. Cross-sectional development study works best. Information comes from various universities and regions, with 50% from general education teaching applicants and 50% from professors and teachers. The results were interpreted using instrument data tables and graphs. The study examined "Teacher's perspective on inclusion with moderate intellectual disability in general education at primary level". Data came from 100 employees. The data was gathered using questionnaire. A five-point scale was used to create the questionnaire. After entering data onto the coding sheet, SPSS analyzed it. Data were collected using various research equipment, analyzed using statistical methods, and presented in tables with interpretations. This is how it was presented sequentially.

Table 1

Demographics

Title	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	23	22.8%
	Female	78	77.2%
	101	100%	
Age of Respondents	21-30 Y	17	16.8%
	31-40 Y	34	33.7%
	41-50 Y	48	47.5%
	51-60 Y	2	1.98%
	101	100%	
Designation	SSET	80	79.2%
	JSET	21	20.8%
	101	100%	
Qualification	B.Ed. (Hons)	62	61.4%
	Master	22	21.8%
	M.Phil.	16	15.8%
	PHD	1	1%
	101	100%	
Place of Posting	School	71	70.3%
	Center	30	29.7%
	101	100%	
Area of Posting	Rural	60	59.4%
	Urban	41	40.6%
	101	100%	

	SA f (%)	A f(%)	N f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)	M f(%)	S.D. f(%)
Inclusion means consider all children equally.	47(46.5)	38(37.6)	12(12)	3(3)	1(1)	4.25	0.85
Students who are diagnosed as IDD should be taught in mainstream schools with other children.	20(19.8)	50(49.5)	19(18.8)	12(11.90)	0(0%)	3.77	0.89
Children with IDD (Moderate) have the right to get education in mainstream schools.	29(28.7)	50(49.5)	17(16.8)	4(4.0)	0(0%)	4.04	0.78
Students with IDD learn more in inclusive classrooms than in the segregated special classrooms.	2(2.0)	45(44.6)	17(16.8)	12(11.8)	24(23.8)	2.89	1.26
Inclusion means valuing all the children equally.	49(48.5)	37(36.6)	12(11.9)	2(2.0)	0(0%)	4.33	0.76
Students with IDD learn more in inclusive classrooms than in the segregated special classrooms.	4(4.0)	30(29.7)	33(32.7)	28(27.7)	5(5.0)	3.77	1.08
Physically aggressive students towards others can be managed in classroom	4(4.0)	30(29.7)	33(32.7)	28(27.7)	5(5.0)	3	0.96
Inclusive education is helpful in viewing the teachers' willingness to accept diversified students	8(7.9)	45(44.6)	24(23.8)	10(9.9)	13(12.9)	3.25	1.15
Inclusion helps to improve the quality of life of IDD children.	19(18.8)	47(46.5)	22(21.8)	3(3.0)	9(8.9)	3.36	1.10
Inclusive education is the best educational setting for the socialization of IDD children.	19(18.8)	47(46.5)	22(21.8)	3(3.0)	9(8.9)	3.36	1.10
Inclusive education is the best educational setting for the socialization of IDD children.	21(20.8)	44(43.6)	22(21.8)	9(8.9)	3(3.0)	3.71	0.99

I would give preference to take only moderate IDD students in my class.	32(31.7)	29(28.7)	16(15.8)	8(7.9)	14(13.9)	3.51	1.01
I respect the level of achievement according to their cognitive ability	32(31.7)	29(28.7)	16(15.8)	8(7.9)	14(13.9)	3.58	1.39
I welcome all the diversities of students in my classroom.	31(30.7)	34(33.7)	16(15.8)	9(8.9)	10(9.9)	3.67	1.27
I am comfortable to communicate with special educator.	31(30.7)	53(52.5)	8(7.9)	5(5.0)	2(2.0)	4.07	0.87
I will cooperate with special education teacher in order to understand needs of IDD children better	32(31.7)	54(53.5)	8(7.9)	3(3.0)	3(3.0)	4.09	0.88
I will concentrate on the child's strengths and abilities rather than instructing him via ratification.	38(37.6)	44(43.6)	13(12.9)	3(3.0)	1(1.0)	4.16	0.83
I will use ICT frequently in order to teach them effectively.	37(36.6)	42(41.6)	16(15.8)	3(3.0)	1(1.0)	4.12	0.85
I will get information about child's medical history first in order to teach him/her effectively.	35(34.7)	46(45.5)	13(12.9)	3(3.0)	1(1.0)	4.13	0.82

I will focus on group work rather than individual work to increase socialization between him and his non-disabled peers.	29(28.7)	37(36.6)	22(21.8)	4(4.0)	4(4.0)	3.86	1.02
I will ask for parents' collaboration frequently in order for child's fast improvement.	41(40.6)	40(39.6)	13(12.9)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)	4.21	0.82

Students with disabilities should be accepted in the general education classroom by their peers without disabilities	32(31.7)	46(45.5)	15(14.9)	5(5.0)	0(0%)	4.07	0.82
IDD students can develop better interaction with others in inclusion setup	19(18.8)	55(54.5)	19(18.8)	4(4.0)	1(1.0)	3.88	0.79
Inclusive education is equally beneficial for main stream and IDD children	27(26.7)	45(44.6)	20(19.8)	4(4.0)	2(2.0)	3.92	0.90
The talents of every student vary on an individual basis.	46(45.5)	37(36.6)	10(9.9)	4(4.0)	1(1.0)	4.25	0.87
Inclusion means changing thinking of non-disabled children towards their disabled peers.	31(30.7)	44(43.6)	18(17.8)	4(4.0)	1(1.0)	4.02	0.86
Studying with their non-disabled peers can improve their social skills.	33(32.7)	47(46.5)	15(14.9)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)	4.11	0.86
The interaction between students who have moderate IDD and their classmates without disabilities will be facilitated by their placement in general education classes.	27(26.7)	46(45.5)	22(21.8)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)	3.97	0.82
Healthy relationship with peers can increase his/her urge to attend school regularly.	27(26.7)	46(45.5)	22(21.8)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)	4.15	0.75
Knowing everything about disabilities can help non-disabled peers to understand the needs of their disabled peers.	28(27.7)	54(53.5)	13(12.9)	2(2.0)	2(2.0)	4.05	0.82
Tasks in groups create a sense of responsibility in children with no disability to help their disabled peers without hesitation	30(29.7)	49(48.5)	16(15.8)	4(4.0)		4.0	0.78

Results

Important information on respondents' demographics and beliefs is provided by the inclusive education study. Most participants are female, mostly between the ages of 21 and 22, and many have master's and master's-level degrees. Diverse perspectives exist about inclusion: some hold that it entails treating every kid fairly, while others question whether regular schooling is appropriate for those with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD). A sizable portion favour mainstream education for kids with mild IDD, and many thinks inclusive classrooms are more effective than specialised programmes. Though some answers are neutral or disagree, there is broad agreement that inclusive education fosters acceptance and socialisation of children with intellectual disabilities. Support for accommodating mildly autistic students and placing an emphasis on cognitive abilities is evident in attitudes towards individualised education techniques. Most said they are willing to talk to special educators and help them understand the requirements of kids with IDD. These results demonstrate the complexity of inclusive education by exposing respondents' differing and common perspectives

Discussion

Research has thoroughly examined teachers' views on including students with moderate intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) in general education classrooms (Ajzen, 2001; Anderson, Brock, & Shawbitz, 2022). Efforts to promote citizenship, inclusion, and identification for individuals with IDD, who are often seen as unable to participate in mainstream society, have been advocated by various groups and individuals (Carrington, 1999; Flores, 2012). A survey of 100 trained primary school teachers was conducted using random digit dialing to assess their acceptance of mildly IDD students in general education classrooms (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999). This study explores teachers' perspectives on including moderate IDD students and the broader public debate on the challenges of multiculturalism and community cohesion (Krischler, Powell, & Pit-Ten Cate, 2019). It also examines social segregation, identity, and cohesion in primary school IDD inclusion within general education classrooms (Westwood & Graham, 2003; Winzer, 2000).

Recommendations

Several suggestions for improving inclusive education can be offered in light of the study's findings. First and foremost, it's critical to raise teacher knowledge and training regarding inclusive classroom benefits, with a focus on the advantages for both IDD and non-IDD students. Programmes for professional development that centre on integrating and assisting students with intellectual disabilities in mainstream environments ought to be implemented by schools. The different requirements of every student can also be met by creating a collaborative atmosphere where ordinary and special educators can exchange knowledge and resources. Additionally, initiatives to foster acceptance and socialisation should be undertaken through inclusive extracurricular activities and peer mentoring. The broad support for inclusive education should be taken into account by policymakers when allocating funds for the creation of comprehensive support systems in schools.

Conclusion

According to the study, the majority of survey participants mostly women between the ages of 19 and 25—preferred public universities. A sizable majority of respondents favour placing special education students in ordinary classrooms alongside peers who do not have disabilities, highlighting the advantages of socialisation for IDD students and highlighting the adaptability of teachers. It is imperative that special education teachers possess thorough knowledge of IDDs. Furthermore, respondents are more in favour of fostering a child's abilities than just making sure they satisfy required standards. These results emphasise the value of inclusive education and the necessity of well qualified teachers.

References:

Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operations of attitudes. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 27–58. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.27

Bendová, P., Čecháčková, M., & Šádková, L. (2014). Inclusive education of pre-school children with special educational needs in kindergartens. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 112, 1014-1021.

Carrington, S. (1999). Inclusion needs a different school culture. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 3(3), 257–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/136031199285039s

Coombs-Richardson, R., & Mead, J. (2001). Supporting general educators' inclusive practices. Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 24(4), 383–390. https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640102400412

Ehsan, M. J. A. A. S. R. J. f. E., Technology,, & Sciences. (2018). Inclusive education in primary and secondary schools of Pakistan: Role of teachers. 40(1), 40-61.

Francisco, M. P. B., Hartman, M., & Wang, Y. (2020). Inclusion and Special Education. 10(9), 238. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/10/9/238

Krischler, M., Powell, J. J. W., & Pit-Ten Cate, I. M. (2019). What is meant by inclusion? On the effects of different definitions on attitudes toward inclusive education. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 34(5), 632-648. doi:10.1080/08856257.2019.1580837

Pelt, R. M. (2020). Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in the General Education Classroom in a Rural School District.

Qvortrup, A., & Qvortrup, L. (2018). Inclusion: Dimensions of inclusion in education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 22(7), 803-817. doi:10.1080/13603116.2017.1412506

Winzer, M. A. (2000). Special education in the 21st century: Issues of inclusion and reform: Gallaudet University Press.

Dapudong, R. C. (2013). Knowledge and attitude towards inclusive education of children with learning disabilities: The case of Thai primary school teachers. *Academic Research International, 4*(4), 496.

Kauffman, J. M., Ahrbeck, B., Anastasiou, D., Badar, J., Crockett, J. B., Felder, M., ... & Smith, C. R. (2022). Parents' and educators' perspectives on inclusion of students with disabilities. In *Research for Inclusive Quality Education: Leveraging Belonging, Inclusion, and Equity* (pp. 205-217). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

Gallagher, P. A., Floyd, J. H., Stafford, A. M., Taber, T. A., Brozovic, S. A., & Alberto, P. A. (2000). Inclusion of students with moderate or severe disabilities in educational and community settings: Perspectives from parents and siblings. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 135-147.

Cameron, D. L., & Cook, B. G. (2013). General education teachers' goals and expectations for their included students with mild and severe disabilities. *Education and training in autism and developmental disabilities*, 18-30

Wilson, B. A. (1999). Inclusion: Empirical guidelines and unanswered questions. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 119-133.

Weiss, S., Markowetz, R., & Kiel, E. (2018). How to teach students with moderate and severe intellectual disabilities in inclusive and special education settings: Teachers' perspectives on skills, knowledge and attitudes. *European Educational Research Journal, 17*(6), 837- 856.

Cook, B. G., Semmel, M. I., & Gerber, M. M. (1999). Attitudes of principals and special education teachers toward the inclusion of students with mild disabilities: Critical differences of opinion. *Remedial and special education, 20*(4), 199-207.

Alquraini, T. A. (2011). *Teachers' perspectives of inclusion of the students with severe disabilities in elementary schools in Saudi Arabia* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University).

Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: a review of the literature. *European journal of special needs education, 17*(2), 129-147.

Anderson, E. J., Brock, M. E., & Shawbitz, K. N. (2022). Philosophical Perspectives and Practical Considerations for the Inclusion of Students with Developmental Disabilities. *Education Sciences, 12*(7), 478

Flores, K. V. (2012). *Inclusive general education teachers' perspectives on inclusion: a qualitative case study* (Doctoral dissertation, California State University, Sacramento).

Barned, N. E., Knapp, N. F., & Neuharth-Pritchett, S. (2011). Knowledge and attitudes of early childhood preservice teachers regarding the inclusion of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 32*(4), 302-321.

Westwood, P., & Graham, L. (2003). Inclusion of students with special needs: Benefits and obstacles perceived by teachers in New South Wales and South Australia. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties, 8*(1), 3-15.

Downing, J. E., & Peckham-Hardin, K. D. (2007). Inclusive education: What makes it a good education for students with moderate to severe disabilities?. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 32*(1), 16-30.

Fazil, H., Faiz, M. A., Ahmed, A., & Asif, S. (2020). Possibilities Of Inclusion Of Children With Mild Intellectual And Developmental Disabilities At Primary Level: A Teacher's Perspective. *Webology (ISSN: 1735-188X), 17*(2).