Analysis of Teachers' Comportments towards Practices in Classrooms of Model Schools

[1]Mushtaq Hussain, [2]Muhammad Uzair-ul-Hassan, [3]Iram Uzair & [4]Joiciane de Souza
mushtaq_hussain102@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study was conducted to analyze comportments of teachers towards practices in inclusive environments of model schools in Pakistan. Under Federal Directorate of Education, 16 model schools have been functioning as inclusive schools since 2007 in Islamabad. These public model schools were transformed into inclusive schools with collaboration of International Development Partners, Norway. Population of the study was teachers teaching in the inclusive schools. Purposive and convenience sampling was used to collect data from the teachers. To identify significant differences among teachers' comportments based on demographics, quantitative techniques were used. The questionnaire was rated on five point Likert scale. The instrument reliability was 0.83. Quantitative data were collected from 196 teachers. One-way ANOVA was used for comparison on the basis of teachers' demographics. It was found that age, academic qualification and inclusive schools' experience of teachers have no impact on teachers' comportments towards involvements of students, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children, teacher training, students' assessment and available classroom facilities. On the other hand, professional qualification and total experience of teachers have impact on students' involvement and inclusive outcomes respectively.

Keywords: Teachers' comportments, practices, classrooms

Background of the study

Inclusion is a term that refers to "the practice of educating students with moderate to severe disabilities alongside their chronological age peers without disabilities in general classrooms within their home neighbourhood schools" (Alper, 2003, p. 15). According to Foreman (2006), inclusive school fulfils need of all children irrespective of their level of ability or disability. Inclusion means every child has a right to belong and to share normal experiences with family, neighbors and peers. All children can learn and develop, working side-by-side with peers with various skills and abilities (Booth & Ainscow, 2002).

UNESCO (1994) states that inclusion or participation is necessary to human dignity, satisfaction and exercise of human rights. The philosophical basis for inclusive education then, becomes a belief that all students should be included within the traditional classrooms and provided with the support and assistance needed to succeed at a level that is appropriate for the individual (Booth & Ainscow, 2002). The hypothetical concepts are "associated with the practice of full inclusion or why others might favors a range of alternative placement options from segregated to integrated special settings for students with special needs" (Zaretsky, 2005). These theoretical concepts are: the psycho-medical model, the sociological response,

cultural approaches, school enhancement strategies, and evaluation of disability studies (Clough & Corbett, 2000). From 1950 to 1960, the psycho-medical model was accepted. It basically saw disabilities as "deficit" and in turn promoter special (or separate) education for individuals with disabilities. In this model, disabilities are viewed as individual diseases which require medical dealing. By 1960 and early 1970 and through this period educational psychology was sustaining function in developing the field of special, integrative and inclusive education (Fulcher, 1989). New approaches emerged, and it was finally argued that special needs children need to be taught in schools rather than in different institutions (Long, Wood, Littleton, Passenger, & Sheehy (2011). The Sociological viewpoint emerged from the analysis of the psycho-medical model. The key movement of this viewpoint was "social structure" rather than "individual shortfall" (Clough & Corbett, 2000). Psycho-medical perspectives saw special educational needs as an individual's own characteristics; in compare, the sociological perspective saw special needs as the outcome of social structure processes.

Global and Indigenous perspectives and practices in inclusive environment

The Government of Pakistan developed an "Education for All" (EFA) policy in (2000) with achievement of the target by 2015. This complies with The United Nations eight development targets widely known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which are to be met by 2015 by all nations, and special focus on poor nations. Out of the eight MDGs, two are particularly concerned with education; one is about universal primary education (all children, boys or girls should complete primary education), and the other is concerned with 'equality' between boys and girls and the empowerment of women. It is agreed that all organizations, including the United Nations, will give priority to education. The philosophy of inclusive education exists in various international and national declarations : The United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Declaration on Education for All (UNESCO, 1990), the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action (UNESCO, 1994), the Dakar Framework for Education For All (2000), and the Compulsory Primary Education Act (1990), and UNESCO International Conference on Education, held in Geneva in November 2008 .

The Government of Pakistan is trying to establish inclusive education at primary level through educational projects from the Ministry of Education and with the support of non-government organizations (NGOs). There are many NGOs running formal and informal education program, for occurrence targeting community schools. Since inclusive education is an emerging phenomenon in Pakistan, and inclusion is now being trialed in various projects administered by the Government of Pakistan with the help of others non-government organizations as well as foreign agencies like IDP Norway, sight savers Pakistan, and USAID (Rieser, 2012). McLeskey & Henry (1999) concluded that students with disabilities have been increasingly receiving special education services in general education classrooms all over the world. Therefore, "special and general education teachers are facing the challenge of providing services in general education classrooms that were historically provided in two different educational settings.

Most of research on comportments, explain that school teachers can have a variety of attitudes such as positive, negative, neutral, or both. Some research reported that mainstream school teachers'

attitudes towards inclusion are mixed. From the variety of studies, most reported that teachers possess positive attitudes or views on inclusive education (Ali, Mustapha & Jelas, 2006). Ali, Mustapha and Jelas's (2006) findings were that over all teachers had encouraging attitudes towards inclusive education and approved that inclusive education strengthens social dealings, while it decreases negative label of special educational needs children. Similarly, Dulció and Bakota (2009) examined teachers' views and found they had helpful views towards the inclusion process. Loreman, Forlin & Sharma (2007) compared teachers' attitudes from four countries, using a questionnaire and found that teachers are positive towards inclusive education for children with special needs, mainly with social, emotional and behavioral disabilities. Ross-Hill (2009) shared the same view after examining different comportments of elementary and secondary school teachers towards inclusion, and how best to develop an inclusive environment based on these attitudes. The results point out that most teachers either supported inclusion practices in regular classrooms or did not have strong views on inclusive education. Chhabra, Srivastava and Srivastava (2010) conducted a quantitative study in Botswana that showed school teachers held somewhat negative comportments. They also found that teachers felt untrained and were fearful to work with children who have learning disabilities because they insufficient knowledge about how to teach in included settings. Meng (2008) observed the attitudes of 252 school teachers in both rural and urban China towards inclusive education and found that these attitudes were a mixture of negative, neutral, and positive attitudes. Separate special education was emphasized by those participants who had shown negative attitudes. Meng also found that urban teachers had more negative attitudes towards inclusion than rural teachers, and that teachers' attitudes were not influenced by assets, teaching year, or relevant special education training.

Teachers' knowledge is the key to effectively implement any educational program. Hodkinson (2005) strongly believes that the completion of inclusive education is conditional upon the way individual teachers conceptualize an idea or concept such as inclusive education. Hodkinson (2006) reported that 40% of participants conceptualized inclusive as "education for all". These participants assumed that all mainstream schools should be inclusive. In contrast, Leung & Mak (2010) found that 60.8% of participants interpreted inclusive education as education concerning students with special educational needs in mainstream schools and program. Similarly, Gaad and Khan (2007) found that teachers insufficient knowledge and training to address the needs of students with disabilities in integrated settings.

As revealed previously, inclusive education is a new idea in Pakistan, and according to recent studies, its completion is developing promisingly. The challenges, including lack of equipment and appropriate educational materials, lack of teacher preparation, shortage of knowledge of inclusive education and large sized classrooms. According to Hassan, Parveen & Nisa (2010), the place of a wide range of students in the same classroom in Pakistan gives rise to many challenges and teachers should be prepared to muddle through. Simple teaching resources that could normally be produced locally, such as maps, charts and other descriptive devices are not available in many educational institutions in developing countries (Eleweke & Rodda, 2002). The lack of facilities and teaching materials are major barrier to the implementation of inclusive education (Charema, 2007). Kristensen (2003) suggested that the production of low cost educational materials could be a possible solution to

this problem. However, sufficient funding is required in order to purchase the suitable teaching materials. Therefore, according to Kristensen (2003) appropriate policies which include adequate funding for teaching materials are essential for the successful implementation of inclusive education. To implement inclusive education in classrooms, it is important that teachers provide an effective and stimulating educational environment for all pupils. In addition, teachers' experiences and training extensively influence attitudes (Meng, 2008). In addition, support personnel for training programs such as audiologists, psychologists, speech and language pathologists, communication support workers and interpreters are scarce in many developing countries (Eleweke & Rodda, 2002).

Rationale and Problem of the Study

Currently a variety of programs of inclusive education is being conducted and implemented in Pakistan. One of these initiatives is to ensure Education for All, including children with special educational needs, in mainstream schools (Ministry of Education, 2008). Hassan & Parveen (2012) conclude ordinary classroom teachers deny including students with severe disabilities in classrooms of ordinary schools in Pakistan. The study showed teachers also argue that there is no need to include students with disabilities in ordinary classroom because separate institutions are well equipped for the children in Pakistan. Implementation of inclusive education in selected number of schools in Islamabad started in 2007 with the collaboration of Federal Directorate of Education (Islamabad), Directorate of Special Education (Islamabad), the Sight Savers Pakistan and IDP (International development partners) Norway. The purpose of the project was to create awareness about inclusion and remove the barriers of learning, development, and participation in schools and communities

through implementation of the programs. The schools selected for inclusive purpose were already working for general education (Rieser, 2012). Based on research conducted on general schools' teachers, a need was evident to investigate demographic differences based on experiences teachers of model schools where they are practicing inclusion. These teachers were working in the nexus of practicing inclusion in classes and they directly face the situation, hence, it was of dire importance to investigate differences among them based on their experiences. Founded on the rationale of the study the problem was originated to investigate demographic differences based on experiences of teachers in inclusive classrooms of model schools in Pakistan.

Objectives of the study

The aim of the study was to identify the demographic differences existing in their experiences through teaching in inclusive classrooms. It is related with students and parents' involvement, inclusive outcomes, teachers' training, students' assessment, and classroom resources with respect to gender, age, teachers' academic and professional qualifications, and experiences in and outside inclusive classrooms. Following were the objectives to investigate demographic differences based on comportments of teachers towards:

1. the extent of students' involvement with their counterparts in inclusive classes
2. the extent of parents' involvement with children
3. the ways of teachers' assessment concerning students and students' outcomes
4. available facilities and teachers' training to teach in inclusive classes.

Research Questions

1. In what ways significant difference based on teachers' age-groups exists towards students' involvement, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement, teachers' training, students' assessment and available facilities in inclusive classes?

2. In what ways significant difference based on academic and professional qualification exists in teachers' comportments towards students' involvement, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement, students' assessment and teachers' training and facilities available in inclusive classrooms?

3. In what ways significant difference based on inclusive school experience exists in teachers' comportments towards students' involvement, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children, teachers' training and students' assessment.

4. In what ways significant difference based on total experience of teachers exists in teachers' comportments towards students' involvement, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children, teachers' training and students' assessment.

Significance

The focus of the study was on demographic differences based on teachers' practices in inclusive classrooms. Teachers may derive benefits from the study and may be able to teach all students in the same classroom if proper training is provided. Through the study both male and female teachers may increase their awareness about the significant differences that may exist about active learning environment for all students including students with disabilities. Further,

knowledge may be enhanced about demographic differences that may exist regarding teachers' attitudes towards inclusion, barriers towards inclusive education, parents' involvement in inclusive education, students' involvement, assessment in inclusive classroom and proper teaching training for inclusive classes. Further, the study poses recommendations which may provide incentives for conducting research in inclusive education by comparing ordinary and inclusive schools in Pakistan.

Population and Sampling

All male and female teachers of 16 inclusive education schools were targeted for the research study. The researchers used purposive and convenient sampling for selecting teachers. For data collection, inclusive schools were selected from Islamabad (Pakistan) as there were 16 schools working for Inclusive purpose and these also fulfill the purpose of the study. The researchers visited schools and selected sample with the help of the school-head teachers. The sample was 196 inclusive school's teachers. Among them, 188 were female and 8 participants were male. Response rate was 83.05 %.

Data Collection Instrument

The instrument for data collection was a questionnaire developed in-line with the guidelines provided in the index of inclusion (Booth & Ainscow (2002). Before collecting the final data, the researcher conducted a pilot study to ensure the reliability and quality of the questionnaire. From three schools, 30 inclusive school teachers were selected for pilot testing. These quantitative data were analyzed in SPSS (ver.17). Reliability was 0.83, where reliability of students' involvement was 0.75, inclusive outcomes 0.84, parents involvement 0.85, teachers' training 0.84, students assessment 0.87 and reliability of resources availability 0.85. After the completion of instrument's

validity and reliability process, 39 items were finalized. The researchers provided participants the instructions required to complete the questionnaire. Participants rated their responses on five-point Likert scale. Prior, researchers were granted permission from the Federal Directorate of Education, Islamabad to visit and collect data from the schools.

Data Analysis

Participant's demographics' data were analyzed through descriptive analysis and statistical differences were calculated by using t-test and one-way ANOVA.

Table 1:Gender-wise frequency distribution

Gender	Frequency	%
Male	8	4.09 %
Female	188	95.91%
Total	196	100%

Table 1 shows the frequency distribution of respondent according to gender. In this study, 95.91% (N=188) of the respondents were females and 4.08% (N=8) male. It showed that at the primary level most of the female teachers were teaching in inclusive schools.

Table 2: Age-wise frequency distribution

Age group	Frequency	%
Less than 25 year	7	3.6
(26-35)	99	50.5
(36-45)	64	32.7
(46-55)	20	10.2
Above 55	6	3.1
Total	196	100

Table 2 shows the frequency distribution of respondent according to their age. In this study, 50.5% (N=99) of the respondents were between the age group of 26-35 years; 32.7% (N=64) were between the age group of 36-45 years; 10.2% (N=20) were between age group of 46-55 years; 3.6% (N=7) were under the age of 25. Only 3.1% (N=6) of the respondents were above 55 years of age.

Table 3: Academic qualification-wise frequency distribution

Educational level	Frequency	%
F.A/F.Sc	21	10.7
B.A/B.Sc	76	38.8
M.A/M.Sc	96	49.0
M. Phil/PhD	3	1.5
Total	196	100.0

Table 3 shows the frequency distribution of respondents according to academic qualification. In this study 49% (N=96) respondents were M.A / M.Sc; 38.8% (N=76) B.A /B.Sc; 10.7% (N=21) F.A /F.Sc and 1.5% (N=3) respondents were M.Phil /PhD.

Table 4: Professional qualification-wise frequency distribution

Educational level	Frequency	%
C.T	38	19.4
T.T.C	6	3.1
B.Ed/BSEd	112	57.1
M.Ed	38	19.4
MA Edu	2	1.0
Total	196	100.0

Table 4 shows the frequency distribution of respondents according to professional qualification. In this study 57.1% (N=112) respondents were B.Ed/B.S.Ed; 19.4% (N=38); M.Ed; 3.1% (N=6) T.T.C (Teaching Training certificates). Only 1% (N=2) respondents were M.A Education.

Table 5: Inclusive schools' experience-wise frequency distribution

Total number of years of teaching experience	Frequency	%
1	13	6.6
2	30	15.3
3	42	21.4
4	31	15.8
5	32	16.3
6	17	8.7
7	31	15.8
Total	196	100

Table 5 shows the frequency distribution of respondents according to years of teaching experiences in inclusive school. In this study 21.4% (N=42) respondents had three years of teaching experience in inclusive school; 16.3% (N=32) five years; 15.8% (N=31) four and seven years; 15.3% (N=30) two years; 8.7% (17) six years. Only 6.6% (N=13) respondents had one year of teaching experience in inclusive schools..

Table 6: Non-inclusive schools' experience-wise (non-inclusive schools) frequency distribution

Total number of years of teaching experience	Frequency	%
less than one	5	2.6
(1 to 5)	65	33.1
(6 to 10)	46	23.5
(11 to 15)	28	14.2
(16 to 20)	22	11.2
(21 to 25)	22	11.2
(26 to 30)	8	4.1
Total	196	100.0

Table 6 shows the frequency distribution of total teaching experience of respondents. In this study 33.1% (N=46) had 1-5 years teaching experience; 23.5% (N=46) 6-10; 14.8% (N=28) 11-15; 11.2% (N=22) 16-20; 21-25; 4.1% (N=8) 26-30 years. Only 2.6% (N=5) respondents had less than one year teaching experience.

Table 7:ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (age-wise) about students' involvement in inclusive

Age of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
less than 25	7			
(26-35)	99			
(36-45)	64	4	3.154	.015
(46-55)	20			
above 55	6			
Total	196			

Table 7 shows that F value (3.154) is significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there significant difference exists in the mean scores of students' involvements with respect to respondents' age.

Table 8: ANOVA comparison of teachers (age-wise) about inclusive outcomes

Age of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
less than25	7			
(26-35)	99			
(36-45)	64	4	.296	.880
(46-55)	20			
above 55	6			
Total	196			

Table 8 shows that F value (.296) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of inclusive outcomes with respect to respondents' age.

Table 9: ANOVA comparison of teachers' involvement with children comportments (age-wise) about parents

Age of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
less than25	7			
(26-35)	99			
(36-45)	64	4	.717	.581
(46-55)	20			
above 55	6			
Total	196			

Table 9 shows that F value (.717) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of parents' involvement with respect to respondents' age.

Table 10: ANOVA comparison of teachers (age-wise) about teachers' training

Age of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
less than25	7			
(26-35)	99			
(36-45)	64	4	1.159	.330
(46-55)	20			
above 55	6			
Total	196			

Table 10 shows that F value (.1.159) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that exists no significant difference in the mean scores of

teacher   training   with   respect   to   respondents' age.

Table 11: ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (age-wise) about students' assessments in inclusive classroom

Age of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
less than25	7			
(26-35)	99			
(36-45)	64	4	.433	.785
(46-55)	20			
above 55	6			
Total	196			

Table 11 shows that F value (.433) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance.

Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of students' assessment with respect to respondents' age.

Table 12: ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (age-wise) about facilities available in classroom

Respondents age	N	df	F	Sig.
less than25	7			
(26-35)	99			
(36-45)	64	4	1.333	.259
(46-55)	20			
above 55	6			
Total	196			

Table 12 shows that F value (1.333) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of classroom facilities with respect to respondents' age.

Table 13: ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (academic qualification-wise) about students' involvement in inclusive classroom

Academic qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
F.A/F.Sc	21			
B.A/B.Sc	76			
M.A/M.Sc	96	4	.080	.971
M. Phil/PhD	3			
Total	196			

Table 13 shows that F value (.080) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was anticipated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of students' involvement with respect to respondents' academic qualification.

Table 14: ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (academic qualification-wise) about inclusive outcomes

Academic qualification of respondents	N	Df	F	Sig.
F.A/F.Sc	21			
B.A/B.Sc	76			
M.A/M.Sc	96	4	.059	.981
M. Phil/PhD	3			
Total	196			

Table 14 shows that F value (.059) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was anticipated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of inclusive outcomes with respect to respondents' academic qualification.

Table 15:ANOVA comparison of teachers (academic qualification-wise) about parents' involvement with children

Academic qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
F.A/F.Sc	21			
B.A/B.Sc	76			
M.A/M.Sc	96	4	1.172	.322
M. Phil/PhD	3			
Total	196			

Table 15 shows that F value (1.172) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of parents' involvement with respect to respondents' academic qualification.

Table 16:ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (academic qualification-wise) about teachers' training

Academic qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
F.A/F.Sc	21			
B.A/B.Sc	76			
M.A/M.Sc	96	3	1.041	.376
M. Phil/PhD	3			
Total	196			

Table 16shows that F value (1.041) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher training with respect to respondents' academic qualification.

Table 17:ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments(academic qualification-wise) about students' assessment

Academic qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
F.A/F.Sc	21			
B.A/B.Sc	76			
M.A/M.Sc	96	3	.130	.942
M. Phil/PhD	3			
Total	196			

Table 17 shows that F value (.130) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of students' assessment with respect to respondents' academic qualification.

Table 18:ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (academic qualification-wise)about facilities available in inclusive classroom

Academic qualification of respondents	N	Df	F	Sig.
F.A/F.Sc	21			
B.A/B.Sc	76			
M.A/M.Sc	96	3	.035	.991
M. Phil/PhD	3			
Total	196			

Table 18 shows that F value (.035) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of classroom facilities with respect to respondents' academic qualification.

Table 19: ANOVA comparison of teachers (professional qualification-wise) about students' involvement

Professional qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
C.T	38			
T.T.C	6			
B.Ed/BSEd	112			
M.Ed	38	4	1.569	.184
MA Edu	2			
Total	196			

Table 19 shows that F value (1.569) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance.

Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference among the mean scores of students' involvement with respect to respondents' professional qualification.

Table 20: ANOVA comparison of teachers (professional qualification-wise)about inclusive outcomes on the basis of their professional qualifications

Professional qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
C.T	38			
T.T.C	6			
B.Ed/BSEd	112	4	1.153	.333
M.Ed	38			
MA Edu	2			
Total	196			

Table 20 shows that F value (1.153) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance.

Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of inclusive outcomes with respect to respondents' professional qualification.

Table 21: ANOVA comparison of teachers' comportments (professional qualification-wise) about parents' involvement with children

Professional qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
C.T	38			
T.T.C	6			
B.Ed/BSEd	112	4	2.478	.046
M.Ed	38			
MA Edu	2			
Total	196			

Table 21 shows that F value (2.478) is significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists significant difference in the mean scores of parents' involvements with respect to respondents' professional qualification.

Table 22: ANOVA comparison of teachers (professional qualification-wise) about teaching training

Professional qualification of respondents	N	df	F	Sig.
C.T	38			
T.T.C	6			
B.Ed/BSEd	112	4	1.629	.169
M.Ed	38			
MA Edu	2			
Total	196			

Table 22 shows that F value (1.629) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher training with respect to respondents' professional qualification.

Table 23: ANOVA comparison of teachers (professional qualification-wise) about students' assessment

Professional qualification of respondent	N	df	F	Sig.
C.T	38			
T.T.C	6			
B.Ed/BSEd	112			
M.Ed	38	3	1.120	.348
MA Edu	2			
Total	196			

Table 23 shows that F value (1.120) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of students' assessment with respect to respondents' professional qualification.

Table 24: ANOVA comparison of teachers (professional qualification-wise) about facilities in classroom

Professional qualification of respondent	N	df	F	Sig.
C.T	38			
T.T.C	6			
B.Ed/BSEd	112	4	1.596	.177
M.Ed	38			
MA Edu	2			
Total	196			

Table 24 shows that F value (1.596) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of classroom facilities with respect to respondents' professional qualification.

Table 25: ANOVA comparison of teachers (experience-wise) about students' involvement in classroom

Teaching experience in inclusive school	N	df	F	Sig.
One year	13			
Two year	30			
Three year	42			
Four year	31	6	.732	.624
Five year	32			
Six year	17			
Seven year	31			
Total	196			

Table 25 shows that F value (.732) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of students' involvement with respect to respondents' years of experience in inclusive school.

Table 26: ANOVA comparison of teachers (experience-wise) about inclusive outcomes

Teaching experience in inclusive school	N	df	F	Sig.
One	13			
Two	30			
Three	42			
Four	31	6	.607	.724
Five	32			
Six	17			
Seven	31			
Total	196			

Table 26 shows that F value (.607) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of inclusive outcomes with respect to respondents' years of experience in inclusive school.

Table 27: ANOVA comparison of teachers (experience-wise) about parents' involvement with children

Teaching experience in inclusive school	N	df	F	Sig.
One	13			
Two	30			
Three	42			
Four	31	6	1.415	.211
Five	32			
Six	17			
Seven	31			
Total	196			

Table 27 shows that F value (1.415) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of parents' involvement with respect to respondents' years of experience in inclusive school.

Table 28: ANOVA comparison of teachers (experience-wise) about teachers' training

Teaching experience in inclusive school	N	df	F	Sig.
One	13			
Two	30			
Three	42			
Four	31	6	.655	.686
Five	32			
Six	17			
Seven	31			
Total	196			

Table 28 shows that F value (1.415) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher trainingwith respect to respondents' years of experience in inclusive school.

Table 29: ANOVA comparison of teachers(experience-wise) about students' assessment

Teaching experience in inclusive school	N	df	F	Sig.
One	13			
Two	30			
Three	42			
Four	31	6	1.557	.162
Five	32			
Six	17			
Seven	31			
Total	196			

Table 29 shows that F value (1.557) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of students' assessment with respect to respondents' years of teaching experience in inclusive school.

Table 30: ANOVA comparison of teachers (experience-wise) about students' involvement

Total years teaching experience	N	Df	F	Sig.
less than one	5			
(1 to 5)	65			
(6 to 10)	46			
(11 to 15)	28	6	1.161	.329
(16 to 20)	22			
(21 to 25)	22			
(26 to 30)	8			
Total	196			

Table 30 shows that F value (1.161) is not significant at 0.05level of significance, therefore, it was calculated that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of students' involvement with respect to respondents' total years of teaching experience.

Table 31: ANOVA comparison of teachers (experience-wise) about inclusive outcomes

Total years teaching experience	N	Df	F	Sig.
less than one	5			
(1 to 5)	65			
(6 to 10)	46			
(11 to 15)	28	6	2.269	.039
(16 to 20)	22			
(21 to 25)	22			
(26 to 30)	8			
Total	196			

Table 31 shows that F value (2.269) is significant at 0.05level of significance. Therefore, it was calculated that there exists significant difference in the mean scores of inclusive outcomes with respect to respondents' total years of teaching experience.

Table 32: ANOVA comparison of teachers (experience-wise) about teaching training

Total years teaching experience	N	df	F	Sig.
less than one	5			
(1 to 5)	65			
(6 to 10)	46			
(11 to 15)	28	6	.848	.534
(16 to 20)	22			
(21 to 25)	22			
(26 to 30)	8			
Total	196			

Table 32 shows that F value (.848) is not significant at 0.05 levels of significance. It was calculated that there was no significant difference among the mean scores of teachers training with respect to respondents' total years of teaching experience.

Findings

Analysis of data facilitates in deriving some useful findings of the study. These findings are not only based on answers of the research questions but also channelize recommendations which further suggest corners to conduct future research. Following are the findings of the study:

1. It was found that there was no age-wise significant difference in teachers' comportments about inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children, teacher training, students' assessment and available classroom facilities and resources except students' involvement in inclusive classroom.
2. It was found that there was no academic qualification-wise significance difference in teachers' comportments about students' involvement, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement, teachers' training, students' assessment, and available classroom facilities.
3. It was found that there was no professional qualification-wise significant mean difference of teachers' comportments about inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children, teachers' training, students' assessment, and available classroom facilities except students' involvement in inclusive classroom.
4. It was found that there was no inclusive school's experience-wise significant mean difference in teachers' comportments about students' involvement, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children, teachers' training, students' assessment, and students' involvement in inclusive classroom.

5. It was found that there was no significant difference based on total experience of teachers about teachers' training to teach inclusive classes but significant difference exists about inclusive outcomes.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the age of teachers makes no impact on teachers' comportments about inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children, teacher training, students' assessment and available classroom facilities and resources except students' involvement in inclusive classes which needs further qualitative exploration to get insight of the phenomena. Further, academic qualifications and inclusive schools' experiences of teachers have no links with their comportments about students' involvement, inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children with and without special education needs, teachers' training to teach in inclusive classes, students' assessment, and available facilities. Similarly, professional qualification of teachers have no links with their comportments about inclusive outcomes, parents' involvement with children with and without special education needs , teachers' training to teach in inclusive classes, students' assessment, and available facilities except students' involvement. Total experiences of teachers have no impact on teachers' comportments about students' involvement, parents' involvement with children with and without special education needs, teachers' training to teach inclusive classes, students' assessment, and available facilities except inclusive outcomes which also needs further qualitative exploration to get insight of the phenomena.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M., & Cesar, M. (2006). Inclusive education ten years after Salamanca: setting the agenda. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *21*(3), 231-238. Retrieved on May 14,2012 from: http://link.springer.com/static-content/0.6248/lookinside/627/art%253A10.1007%252FBF03173412/000.png

Ainscow, M., Booth, T., Dyson, A., Farell, P., Frankham, J., Gallannaugh, F., Howes, A., Smith, R. (2006). Improving schools: developing inclusion. London: Routledge.

Alghazo, M. E., & Gaad, N.E. (2004). General education teachers in the United Arab Emirates and their acceptance of the inclusion of students with disabilities. *British Journal of Special Education*, 31(2), 94-99. Retrieved on November 01,2012from:http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ685427&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ685427

Ali, M. M., Mustapha, R., & Jelas, M. Z. (2006). An Empirical study on teachers perceptions towards Inclusive education in Malaysia. International Journal of Special Education, 21(3), 36-44. Retrieved on April 03, 2012 from: http://www.internationaljournalofspecialeducation.com/articles.cfm

Alper, S. (2003). Curriculum and instruction for students with significant disabilities in inclusive settings (pp. 13- 30). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. Retrieved on May 15, 2012 from: www.eiu.edu/~speced/syllabi/spe3700.doc

Booth , T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for Inclusion*: Center for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE).

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (Eds.) (1998). From them to us*: An international study of inclusion in education.* London: Routledge.

Charema, J. (2007). From special schools to inclusive education: The way forward for developing countries south of the Sahara. *The Journal of the International Association of Special Education, 8*(1), 88-97.

Chhabra, S., Srivastava, R., & Srivastava, I. (2010). Inclusive education in Botswana: The perceptions of school teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 20*(4), 219-228.

Clough, P., & Corbett, J. (2000). *Theories of inclusive Education: A students' guide*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ : Pearson.

Creswell, J.W., & Clark, V.L. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed-methods research. London: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

D'Alessio, S. (2008). Made in Italy: integrazione scolastica and the new vision of Inclusive education. In Barton, L. and Armstrong, F (Eds), Policy, experience and change: cross-cultural reflections on inclusive education (pp.53-72). The Netherland: Springer.

Dulcio, A., & Bakota, K. (2009). Views of elementary school teachers towards

students with cochlear implants inclusion in the Process of Education. *Collegium Antropologicum*, 33(2), 495-501.

Eleweke, C. J., & Rodda, M. (2002). The challenge of enhancing inclusive education in developing countries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 6(*2),113-126.

Foreman, P. (2005). Disability and inclusive: Concepts and principles. In P. Foreman Geneva: UNESCO. Retrived on 5 June, 2011 from http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmi n/user_upload/Policy_Dialogue/48t h_ICE/ICE_F INAL_REPORT_eng.pdf

Fulcher, G. (1989). Disabling policies? A comparative approach to education policy and disability. London: Falmer.

Gaad, E., & Khan, L. (2007). Primary mainstream teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of students with special educational needs in the private sector: A perspective from Dubai. *International Journal of Special Education*, 22 (2), 95-108. Retrieved on May 03, 2012 from: http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ81 4493.pdf

Hassan, M., & Parveen, I. (2012). Interconnected Manifold Barriers Exclusion of Students with special Educational Needs in Ordinary schools in Pakistan. *UOS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, summer 2012, vol. 1, No. 1 (pp. 27-47)

Hassan, M., Parveen, I., & Nisa, R. (2010). Exploring teachers' perspectives: Qualms and possibilities of inclusive classes in Pakistan. Journal of International

association of special education, spring, 2010, vol, 11. No,1.

Hodkinson, A. (2005). Conceptions and misconceptions of inclusive education: a critical examination of final year teacher trainees; knowledge and understanding of inclusion. *Research in Education*, *73*, 15-28.

Hodkinson, A. (2006). Conceptions and misconceptions of inclusive education one year on: A critical analysis of newly qualified teachers knowledge and understanding of inclusion, *Research in Education, 76*, 43-55.

Kristensen, K. (2003). The inclusion of learners with barriers to learning and development into ordinary school settings: a challenge for Uganda. *British Journal of Special Education*, 30(4), 194-201.

Leung, C., & Mak, K. (2010). Traning, understanding and the attitudes of primary school teachers regarding inclusive education in HongKong. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(8), 829-842.

Lifshitz, H., Glaubman, R., & Issawi, R. (2004). Attitudes towards inclusion: the case of Israeli and Palestinian regular and special education teachers. *European Journal of Special Needs Children, 19*(2), 171-190.

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A (1999). Inclusive education: a requirement of a democratic society. (pp.12-23).London: Kogan Page.

Long, M., Wood, C. Littleton, K., Passenger, T., & Sheehy, K. (2011). *The psychology of education* (2nd ed.). Newyork: Routledge.

Loreman, T., Forlin, C., & Sharma, U. (2007). An International Comparison of Pre- service Teacher Attitudes towards Inclusive Education. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 27*(4),p5-5. Retrived on 7 June 2011 from http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy. canterbury.ac.nz/ehost/detail?vid=3 &hid=10

McLeskey, J. & Waldron, N. L. (2007). Making differences ordinary in inclusive classrooms. Intervention in School and Clinic, 42 (3), pp. 162 – 168.

McLeskey, J., & Henry, D. (1999). Inclusion: What progress is being made across states: *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *31*(5), 56–62.

Meng, D. (2008). The attitudes of primary school teachers toward inclusive education in rural and urban China. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *3*(4), 473-

Ministry of Education, Pakistan. (2008). *National report on the development of Education,Pakistan.*RetrievedOctober12,2011,from:http://www.ibe.unesco.org/National_Reports/ICE_2008/pakistan_NR08.pdf

Mujahid, A. G., Abrar, N., & Ghafoor, A. B. (2010). Attitude of secondary schools' Principles and Teachers towards inclusive education: Evidence from Karachi, Pakistan. *European Journal of social sciences, 15 (4).* Retrieved on February, 10 2012, from; http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2030445

Mumtaz, S. (2008). Towards Inclusive Education. Dawn, November, 24 2008. Retrieved on March, 10 2012

from; http://archives.dawn.com/2008/11/24/op.htm.

Mushoriwa, T. (2001). A study of attitudes of primary school teachers in Harare towards the inclusion of blind children in regular classes. *British Journal of Special Education*, *28*, 142-147.

Plaisance, E. (2008). The integration of disabled children in ordinary school in France: A new challenge. In Barton, L. and Armstrong, F (Eds), Policy, experience and change: cross-cultural reflections on inclusive education (pp.37-52). The Netherland: Springer.

Rieser, R. (2012). Implementing Inclusive education. A commonwealth guide to implementing article 24 of UN convention on the rights of people with disabilities. London: commonwealth secretariats.

Ross-Hill, R. (2009). Teacher Attitude towards inclusion practices and special needs students. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 9*(3), 188-198.

Sharma, U., Desai, I. (2002) Measuring concerns about integrated education in India. *The Asia-Pacific Journal on Disabilities, 5*, 2-14.

Sharma, U., Deppler, J. (2005). Integrated education in India: Challenges and prospects. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 25*(1), 1-8.

Singal, N., Rouse, M. (2003). "We do inclusion": practitioner perspectives in some inclusive Schools in India, perspectives in education: Special issue, *The Inclusion /Exclusion Debate in South Africa and Developing*

Countries, *21*(3), 85-98.

UNESCO (1994). Final report-World conference on special needs education: Access and quality. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2001). The open file on inclusive education. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2009). Final report-International conference on education, 48th Session.

Zaretsky, L. (2005). From practice to theory: Inclusive models require inclusive theories. *American Secondary Education, 33*(3), 65-86.