



## Junior High School Educators' Strategies for Making Inclusive Education Policy a Working Tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana

By Anthony Edward Boakye & Rita Tekpertey

*University of Cape Coast*

**Abstract- Background:** Like all children, persons with disability need quality of education to develop their skills and realize their full potential. Yet, they are often overlooked in policymaking limiting their access to education and their ability to participate in social, economic, and political life.

**Objective:** The study aims at investigating JHS educators' strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana.

**Methods:** A cross-sectional descriptive design was employed with 191 JHS educators. Data were analysed using frequency distribution and percentages, Kappa statistics and multiple linear regressions.

**Results:** Educators that build a welcoming school environment was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=1.000, 95%CI [1.000 — 1.000]). Educators confident to teach children with special needs was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff = -0.250, 95% CI [-0.250 — -0.250]). Being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in classroom was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=0.600, 95%CI [0.600—6.00]). Educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=-1.000,95%CI [-1.000— -1.000]).

**Keywords:** disability, education, educators, inclusion, inclusive, policy, special education, strategy.

**GJHSS-G Classification:** LCC: LC1200-1203



JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATORS' STRATEGIES FOR MAKING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION POLICY A WORKING TOOL IN THE KADJEBI DISTRICT GHANA

*Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:*



RESEARCH | DIVERSITY | ETHICS

# Junior High School Educators' Strategies for Making Inclusive Education Policy a Working Tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana

Anthony Edward Boakye <sup>α</sup> & Rita Tekperterey <sup>ο</sup>

**Abstract- Background:** Like all children, persons with disability need quality of education to develop their skills and realize their full potential. Yet, they are often overlooked in policymaking limiting their access to education and their ability to participate in social, economic, and political life.

**Objective:** The study aims at investigating JHS educators' strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana.

**Methods:** A cross-sectional descriptive design was employed with 191 JHS educators. Data were analysed using frequency distribution and percentages, Kappa statistics and multiple linear regressions.

**Results:** Educators that build a welcoming school environment was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=1.000, 95%CI [1.000 —1.000]). Educators confident to teach children with special needs was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff = -0.250, 95% CI [-0.250 — -0.250]). Being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in classroom was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=0.600, 95%CI [0.600—6.00]). Educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home was statistically significant at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=-1.000,95%CI [-1.000— -1.000]).

**Conclusion:** The study recommends that educators should be encouraged to adjust their perceptions and attitudes towards children with disability in their schools so that they can own out to nurture them well.

**Keywords:** disability, education, educators, inclusion, inclusive, policy, special education, strategy.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

There are an estimated 240 million children with disabilities worldwide [1]. Disability is one of the most serious barriers to education across the globe [2]. Disability robs of children's right to learn [3]. Children with disabilities are often denied the chance to take part in their communities, the workforce and the decisions that most affect them [4]. Therefore, getting all children in school and learning, inclusive education is the most effective way to give all children a fair chance to go to school, learn and develop the skills they need to

thrive [5]. Inclusive education means all children in the same classrooms and in the same schools [6]. It means real learning opportunities for groups who have traditionally been excluded – not only children with disabilities, but speakers of minority languages too [6]. Inclusive education value the unique contributions students of all backgrounds bring to the classroom and allow diverse groups to grow side by side, to the benefit of all [1].

With each passing year, schools are witnessing an increased number of students from all sectors [7]. Unfortunately, in the past, students have been victims of discrimination based on their disability, but not anymore. Schools are now embracing diversity and inclusion, ensuring every child feels valued and supported [8]. Central to these efforts is creating inclusive classrooms where every student's potential is recognised and nurtured. While teachers play a pivotal role in shaping these environments, the school's overall vision and commitment set the foundation for truly inclusive education [9].

In the case of Ghana, the story is different as basic school educators are less resourced in terms of assistive devices to support their effort in making inclusive education policy a reality [8, 9, 10]. Also, existing school structures are not modified to accommodate persons with disabilities, and educators are not motivated enough in order to give off their best [11]. In the Education Act, 2008 (Act 778) Article 5 captures "Inclusive Education [IE]" and states that "design" and "infrastructure" of schools need to be disability friendly [6]. In response to this, educational frameworks mandate schools to adopt, design, and implement strategies that support inclusive education. Despite inclusive education policy, disability remains a major course of exclusion in learning instructions [12]. An all-embracing education remains a multi-layered and challenging issue as the development of inclusive practices in schools is not well understood [13]. While inclusive education is part of everyday classroom life, educators' strategies for making it a working tool is important.

Our literature search on educators' strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool identifies numerous studies. For instance: [14] looked at inclusive cultures on schools that support inclusive

**Author α:** University of Cape Coast, Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Cape Coast, Ghana.

e-mail: anthonyedward58@yahoo.com

ORCID\* 0000-0002-4017-8351

**Author ο:** Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ho, Ghana.

e-mail: ritatekperterey@gmail.com

education; [15], [16], [17] also studied teachers' physical environment on schools that support inclusive education; [18] investigated belief systems on schools that support inclusive education while [19], [20] and [21] explored inclusive practices on schools that support inclusive education. From the studies above, it can be realised that none of them has its aim towards educators' strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool. Hence, the study.

The purpose of the study is to investigate JHS educators' strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana by specifically answering the following research questions:

1. What are the JHS educators' strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana?
2. What perceptions and attitudes do basic school educators have towards making inclusive education policy a working tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana?
3. What challenges do JHS educators encounter for making inclusive education policy a working tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana?
4. What is the socio-economic status of the basic school educators who try to make inclusive education policy a working tool in the Kadjebi District, Ghana?

## II. METHODS

### a) Study Area and Participants

Kadjebi district was selected for the study because it has 51 children registered with disabilities and they need to be fully integrated into main stream school. The study enrolled 200 JHS educators.

### b) Philosophy of the Study

The study employed positivist philosophical orientation because they purport reality can be observed and viewed in an objective manner [22]. This body of knowledge feels that the data collection can be carried out in the society and is related to people and their ideas [23].

### c) Study Design and Data Source

The study employed descriptive cross-sectional survey design. The design was use because it comprises asking participants the same set of questions which are normally organised in the form of a written questionnaire or ability test to a group of people or a large number of individuals either by telephone, by mail, or in person [24]. Further, with this design, a large number of variables can be considered. Based on this, the study found the design to be prudent which was why it was adopted. Furthermore, the design allows researchers to visit the study area once and then go ahead to do the analysis [23].

Data were collected from 200 JHS educators from the field at Kadjebi district. The primary data were

preferred because it is data the researcher collects himself from the field and becomes the first person to use it.

### d) Sample and Sampling Procedure

A sample of 200 was sampled from a finite population of 379 public Junior High School teachers. The choice of the sample size was based on [25] table of determining sample size which stipulates that a finite population of 380 the ideal sample should be 191. However, due to incomplete answering of questionnaire, a non-response rate of 5% was added which made the actual sample to be  $(191 \times 0.05) + 191 = 200.55$ . Hence, the sample size for the study was 200. To reach the participants, a systematic sampling technique was used. This technique allows participants to be selected at regular intervals from a sampling frame or without a frame [26]. The intervals are carefully chosen to ensure an adequate sample size [27], [28]. The study enrolled 200 JHS teachers from a finite population of 379. So, to select the first participant, we calculated our sample interval as follows:  $379/200 = 1.86$ . Therefore, the 1st participant starting from the first school visited was selected follow by the 2nd participant  $1 + 1 = 2$ . The process continued until the last participant was reached. The rounding was done after the additions.

### e) Data Collection Procedures

Data collection took place on 15<sup>th</sup> of March and ended on 19<sup>th</sup> of March, 2023 with the help of two research assistants. In all, five days were used to collect the data. The data were collected with questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed based on literature, conceptual base of the study and previous survey instruments.

### f) Data Processing and Analysis

At the end of each data collection day, the data were checked for accuracy, validity, completeness and consistency. This was done to check for missing data, correct mistakes, in order to avoid deviations and errors in the data collected. When these together with editing were done, the data were then entered into the computer analysis matrix developed with the computer software Statistical Package for the Social Services (SPSS) version 20. To use a two-by-two table to interpret the results of the study, all variables that had more than two categories were recoded into two categories. Frequency distribution, Kappa statistics and multiple linear regressions were used to analyse the data. The research objective one, two, three and four were analysed and discussed with percentages and Kappa statistics. The multiple linear regression analysis was done to identify estimate of relationship between the explanatory variables and response variable.

### g) Ethical Consideration

Participation was made voluntary. Therefore, in the field, before a participant takes part in the study,

verbal informed consent was obtained from the participants before he or she takes part in the study. Aside that, participants were assured of confidentiality of their responses and their identity were kept anonymous. Again, all the possible risks and the benefits participant stand to gain from taking part in the study were explained in clear language to them.

### III. RESULTS

#### a) Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of participants. The participants comprised 32.5% females and 67.5% males. A little

above forty-one per cent (41.4%) of the participants in the sample were within 20-29 age group while 16.2% were in the 30-39 age group. Nearly thirty-two per cent (31.9%) of the participants were widowed compared to 16.2% divorce.

In terms of religion, Christianity dominated (81.7%) while the least category was traditionalist (8.9%). In terms of professional qualification, Diploma holders dominated (63.9%). Concerning working experience, about fifty-four per cent (53.9%) of the participants had worked for about 1 to 4 years while a little above three per cent (3.1%) had worked for 15-19 years.

*Table 1:* Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Characteristics	F	%
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	129	67.5
Female	62	32.5
<i>Age in groups</i>		
20-29	79	41.4
30-39	31	16.2
40-49	44	23.0
50+	37	19.4
<i>Marital Status</i>		
Never married	49	25.7
Married	50	26.2
Divorced	31	16.2
Widowed	61	31.9
<i>Religion</i>		
Christianity	156	81.7
Islam	18	9.4
Traditional	17	8.9
<i>Professional Qualification</i>		
Diploma	122	63.9
Degree	69	36.1
<i>Teaching Experience</i>		
1-4	103	53.9
5-9	31	16.2
10-14	14	7.3
15-19	6	3.1
20-24	27	14.1
25-29	10	5.2
Total	191	100.0

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

To obtain data on research question thus "JHS educators' strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool." The respondents were asked

series of questions to examine if they have specific strategies for making inclusive education policy a working tool. The results are presented in Table 2.

*Table 2: JHS Educators' Strategies for Making Inclusive Education Policy a Working Tool*

<b>Educators Strategies</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Educators Build Welcoming School Environment</i>		
Yes	69	36.1
No	122	63.9
<i>Educators Enrol Children with Disabilities from the Locality</i>		
Enrol	69	36.1
Do not enrol	122	63.9
<i>Teachers are Aware of their Duties Concerning SpED, SHEP etc</i>		
Not yet	160	83.8
Few	31	16.2
<i>Teachers and Parents of Children with Special Education needs Meet and Discuss Child Progress</i>		
Never	98	51.3
Once or twice a year	93	48.7
<i>Educators Create Supportive and Caring Environment</i>		
Yes	125	65.4
No	66	34.6
<i>Schools have Ramps or 'Flat' Access to Reach All Facilities</i>		
Not all	95	49.7
One	96	50.3
<i>Schools have Good Lighting in the Classrooms</i>		
Poor lighting	37	19.4
Reasonable	154	80.6
<i>Organised Learning for Diversity</i>		
Yes	136	71.2
No	55	28.8
<i>Educators Provide CSENs with Disability Learning Materials</i>		
Not yet	48	25.1
Few pupil	112	58.6
Almost all pupils	31	16.2
Total	191	100.0

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

On building a welcoming school environment, the results show that 63.9% of the participants reported that educators do not build welcoming school environment for pupils with disability (see Table 2). Among the 69 educators who reported that they build a welcoming school environment for pupils with disability were further asked to stipulate how they build the welcoming environment and the report revealed that about fifty-one per cent (50.7%) reported they accommodate all pupils while 49.3% indicated every staff has been sensitised to welcome and show love and affection to pupils with SEN.

On whether educators enrol children with disabilities from the locality or not, 63.9% of the participants said educators do not enrol children with disabilities (see Table 2). Regarding educators' awareness of their duties concerning SpED, SHEP, Guidance and Counselling and GirlChild Education, the results revealed that 83.8% of the participants reported that educators are not yet aware of their duties (see Table 2). Concerning whether educators and parents of children with special education needs meet and discuss the progress of these children or not, 51.3% of the participants indicated that educators and parents never

meets to discuss the progress of these children (see Table 2).

Educators were asked to indicate whether they create supportive and caring environment for pupils with disability or not and the results revealed that 65.4% of the participants stated educators create supportive and caring environment for pupil with disabilities (see Table 2). Among the 125 participants who indicated that educators create supportive and caring environment for pupil with disabilities 68.0% said just urinals while 32.0% reported that the schools do not have toilets and urinals. The analysis regarding if schools have ramps (or 'flat' access) to reach all facilities or not showed that a little above fifty per cent (50.3%) of the participants said the schools have but just one (see Table 2). When asked whether schools have good lighting in the classrooms or not, the outcome revealed that 80.6% of the participants reported that the schools have reasonable lighting (see Table 2).

Educators were asked to indicate whether they organised learning for diversity for pupils. The results revealed that 71.2% of the participants indicated that educators organised learning for diversity (See Table 2). Among the 136 participants that indicated that educators organise learning for diversity were further asked to stipulate how they organise learning for diversity and the results revealed that nearly seventy-four per cent (73.5%) said it is child-centred methods while 26.5 per cent reported co-operative learning.

Concerning whether educators provide pupils with disability learning materials or not, the results showed that 58.6% of participants stated that educators provide few disability pupils with learning materials while 16.2 per cent respondents indicated almost all pupils (see Table 2).

In Table 3, Kappa Statistics examining the correlation between educators' strategies for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability is presented. This analysis was run to identify the correlation between educators' strategies for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability. The results show a remarkable difference in the eight (8) components studied under educators' strategies for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability. Statistically significant correlations were found among six (6) of the components namely; build a welcoming school environment [ $p=0.000$ ], educators being aware of their duty [ $p=0.000$ ], teacher and parents meet either than P.T.A meeting [ $p=0.000$ ], school have ramp to reach facilities [ $p=0.000$ ], school have good lighting [ $p=0.011$ ] as well as have organised learning for diversity [ $p=0.000$ ] and enrolment of children with disability. However, there was no statistically significant correlation found between the other components namely; create supportive and caring environment [ $p=0.064$ ] as well as provide pupils with disability learning materials [ $p=0.081$ ] and enrolment of children with disability.

**Table 3:** Correlation between Educators' Strategies for Inclusive Education and Enrolment of Children with Disability

Inclusive Education Strategies	Enrol	Not Enrol	Total n (%)	Kappa	P-Value
<i>Build a Welcoming School Environment</i>				0.297***	0.000
Yes	55.1	44.9	69(100.0)		
No	25.4	74.6	122(100.0)		
<i>Educators being aware of their duty</i>				-0.349***	0.000
Not yet	23.8	76.2	160(100.0)		
Few	100.0	0.0	31(100.0)		
<i>Teacher and Parents meet either than P.T.A Meeting</i>				0.324***	0.000
Never	52.0	48.0	98(100.0)		
Once or twice a year	19.4	80.6	93(100.0)		
<i>Create Supportive and Caring Environment</i>				0.113*	0.064
Yes	40.8	59.2	125(100.0)		
No	27.3	72.7	66(100.0)		
<i>School have Ramp to Reach Facilities</i>				-0.300***	0.000
Not at all	21.1	79.9	95(100.0)		
Just one	51.0	49.0	96(100.0)		
<i>School has good lighting</i>				0.167***	0.011
Poor lighting	54.1	45.9	37(100.0)		
Reasonable lighting	31.8	68.2	154(100.0)		

Table 3: Continued.

<i>Have Organised Learning for Diversity</i>				-0.340***	0.000
Yes	22.8	77.2	136(100.0)		
No	69.1	30.9	55(100.0)		
<i>Provide Pupils with Disability Learning Materials</i>				-0.097*	0.081
Not yet	37.5	62.5	48(100.0)		
Five pupils	45.5	54.5	112(100.0)		
Almost all pupils	0.0	100.0	31(100.0)		

Note: Row percentages in parenthesis, Kappa significant at (0.01) \*\*\*, (0.05) \*\*, (0.10) \*

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

Following the Kappa statistics analysis results on educators' strategies for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability, further analysis was run using the multiple linear regressions to estimate the relationship between the educators' strategies for inclusive education and enrolment of children with

disability. Because the independent variable is more than one and the outcome variable is only one and all variables are quantitative, it became prudent to use multiple linear regression to analyse the relationship between them. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Multiple Linear Regression Results on Educator' Strategies for Inclusive Education and Enrolment of Children with Disability

Factor	Unstandardized Coefficient	P. Value	95% CI	
Educators Build a Welcoming School Environment	1.000**	0.000	1.000	1.000
Teachers are Aware of their Duties Concerning SpED, SHEP, Guidance & Counselling and Girl-Child Education	-1.000**	0.000	-1.000	-1.000
Teachers Meet with Parents of Children with Special Education Needs and Discuss their Progress	-1.000**	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Educators Create Supportive and Caring Environment	1.000**	0.000	1.000	1.000
Schools have Ramps or 'Flat' Access to Reach All Facilities	-1.000**	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Schools have Good Lighting in the Classrooms	1.000**	0.000	1.000	1.000
Constant	1.000	0.000	1.000	1.000

Significant at (0.05) \*\*

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

In Table 4, educators "have organised learning for diversity", and "provide pupils with disability learning materials" were excluded from the model because the two independent variables were highly correlated and that, including them in the model would bring hard collinearity and that might pose a problem thereby making it difficult for the researcher to be able to correctly estimate the contribution of each single independent variable to the outcome variable.

It emerged in Table 4 that, educators that build a welcoming school environment was statistically significant variable that seems to have influenced enrolment of children with disability at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=1.000, 95%CI [1.000 — 1.000]). This coefficient (1.000) indicates that as the value of the educators that

build a welcoming school environment increases, the mean of enrolment of children with disability also tends to increase. Educators are aware of their duties concerning SpED, SHEP, Guidance & Counselling and Girl-Child Education was observed as statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=-1.000, 95%CI [-1.000 — 1.000]). This suggests that as the value (-1.000) of educators are aware of their duties concerning SpED, SHEP, Guidance and Counselling and Girl-Child Education increases, the mean of the enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease (see Table 4).

As teachers meet with parents of children with special education needs and discuss their progress value tends to increase, the mean of enrolment of

children with disability tends to decrease. This was significant at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=-1.000, 95% CI [-1.000 — -1.000]) (see Table 4). It appears in the model that educators creating supportive caring environment was statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=1.000, 95% CI [1.000 — 1.000]). This suggests that as there is an increase in the value (1.000) of the educators creating supportive caring environment while holding other variables in the model constant leads to an increase in the mean value of the dependent variable (enrolment of children with disability) (see Table 4).

Schools have ramps or 'flat' access to reach all facilities was observed to be statistically significant to inclusive education at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=-1.000, 95% CI [-1.000 — -1.000]). The coefficient (-1.000) value signifies that as the value of the independent variable (schools have ramps or 'flat' access to reach all

facilities) increases, the mean of enrolment of children with disability (inclusive education) decreases (see Table 4). It emerged that schools having good lighting in the classrooms appears to be statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=1.000, 95% CI [1.000—1.000]) suggesting that as the value (1.000) of the independent variable (schools having good lighting in the classrooms) increases, it leads to an increase in the mean value of the response variable (enrolment of children with disability) (see Table 4).

To assess educators' perceptions and attitudes towards inclusive education, several questions were asked to collect data from the participants. The questions covered perceptions, attitudes and professional efficacy and the results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: JHS Educators' Perceptions and Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education

Perceptions and Attitudes	F	%
<i>I am confident in my ability to teach children with special needs</i>		
Strongly agree	160	83.8
Disagree	31	16.2
<i>I have been adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities</i>		
Strongly agree	31	16.2
Agree	140	73.3
Disagree	20	10.5
<i>I become easily frustrated when teaching students with special needs</i>		
Strongly agree	30	15.7
Agree	31	16.2
Disagree	99	51.8
Strongly disagree	31	16.2
<i>I become anxious when I learn that a student with special needs will be in my classroom</i>		
Strongly agree	92	48.2
Disagree	79	41.4
Strongly agree	20	10.5
<i>Although children differ intellectually, physically, and psychologically, I believe that all children can learn in most environments</i>		
Strongly agree	62	32.5
Agree	48	25.1
Disagree	61	31.9
Strongly disagree	20	10.5
<i>I believe that academic progress is possible in children with special needs</i>		
Strongly agree	47	24.6
Agree	75	39.3
Disagree	38	19.9
Strongly disagree	31	16.2

Table 5: Continued.

Students with special needs have higher academic achievements when included in the regular education classroom		
Strongly agree	48	25.1
Agree	74	38.7
Disagree	31	16.2
Strongly disagree	38	19.9
<i>I believe that children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom</i>		
Agree	110	57.6
Disagree	44	23.0
Strongly disagree	37	19.4
<i>I am comfortable teaching a child that is moderately physically disabled</i>		
Strongly agree	48	25.1
Agree	74	38.7
Disagree	31	16.2
Strongly disagree	38	19.9
<i>I have problems teaching a student with cognitive deficits</i>		
Agree	123	64.4
Disagree	68	35.6
Total	191	100.0

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

Results in Table 5 depicts that majority (83.8%) of the participants were certain in their minds on the statement that they are confident in their ability to teach children with special needs with 16.2% disagreeing to the statement. Whereas 73.3% agreed that they have been adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities, 10.5% disagreed on the statement. This is supported by the extent to which the educators agreed or disagreed with the issue on easily become frustrated when teaching students with special needs. With this 51.8% disagreed while 15.7% strongly agreed on the statement. In respect to the fourth element on the table, the study finding indicates that nearly half (48.2 %) of the participants strongly agreed to the fact that they become anxious when they learn that a student with special needs will be in their classroom while 10.5% strongly disagreed with the statement (see Table 5).

With regard to the statement that although children differ intellectually, physically, and psychologically, do educators believe that all children can learn in most environments, the result shows that about thirty-three per cent (32.5%) of the participants strongly agreed while 10.5% strongly disagreed with the statement. When establishing the extent to which educators agree or disagree to the statement that academic progress is possible in children with special needs, the results showed that nearly forty per cent (39.3%) strongly agreed while 16.2% of the participants strongly disagreed to the statement (see Table 5).

Concerning the rate at which respondents agree or disagree to the statement that students with special needs have higher academic achievements when included in the regular education classroom, the results revealed that a little above thirtyeight (38.7%) at least agreed while 16.2% disagreed with the statement. Whereas 57.6% of the participants agreed to the statement that children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom, 19.4% strongly disagreed to the statement (see Table 5).

The study also tried to ascertain from educators if they agree or disagree to the statement that they feel comfortable teaching a child that is moderately physically disabled and the results showed that nearly thirty-nine per cent (38.7%) of the participant agreed with the statement while 16.2% disagreed. Participants were asked to indicate whether they agree or disagree to the statement "have problems teaching a student with cognitive deficits." The result revealed that 64.4 per cent agreed to the statement while 35.6% disagreed (see Table 5).

In Table 6, results on Kappa statistics measuring the correlation between educators' perceptions and attitudes for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability is presented. This analysis was run to ascertain how the responses on educators' perceptions and attitudes correlate to enrolment of children with disability. In all ten (10) variables were studied under the educators' perceptions

and attitudes. Statistically significant correlation was found among five (5) of the components namely; am confident to teach children with special needs [ $p=0.000$ ], am adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities [ $p=0.000$ ], believe that academic progress is possible in children with special needs [ $p=0.000$ ], believe that children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom [ $p=0.005$ ] as well as have problems teaching a student with cognitive deficits [ $p=0.005$ ], students with special needs have higher academic achievements when included in the regular education classroom [ $p=0.072$ ]

as well as am comfortable teaching a child that is moderately physically disabled [ $p=0.072$ ] and enrolment of children with disability.

However, there was no statistically significant correlation found between the other components namely; am easily frustrated when teaching students with special needs [ $p=0.923$ ], become anxious when I learn that a student with special needs will be in my classroom [ $p=0.500$ ] as well as believe that all children can learn in most environments [ $p=0.113$ ] and enrolment of children with disability.

**Table 6:** Correlation between Perceptions and Attitudes for Inclusive Education and Enrolment of Children with Disability

Perceptions and Attitudes	Enrol	Not Enrol	Total n (%)	Kappa	P Value
<i>Am confident to teach children with special needs</i>				-0.149***	0.000
Strongly agree	23.8	76.2	160(100.0)		
Disagree	100.0	0.0	31(100.0)		
<i>Am adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities</i>				0.580***	0.000
Strongly agree	100.0	0.0	31(100.0)		
Agree	12.9	87.1	140(100.0)		
Disagree	100.0	0.0	20(100.0)		
<i>Am easily frustrated when teaching students with special needs</i>				0.002	0.923
Strongly agree	0.0	100.0	30(100.0)		
Agree	0.0	100.0	31(100.0)		
Disagree	38.4	61.6	99(100.0)		
Strongly disagree	100.0	0.0	31(100.0)		
<i>Become anxious when I learn that a student with special needs will be in my classroom</i>				-0.014	0.500
Strongly agree	33.7	66.3	92(100.0)		
Disagree	22.8	77.2	79(100.0)		
Strongly disagree	100.0	0.0	20(100.0)		
<i>Believe that all children can learn in most environments</i>				0.058	0.113
Strongly agree	50.0	50.0	62(100.0)		
Agree	37.5	62.5	48(100.0)		
Disagree	0.0	100.0	61(100.0)		
Strongly disagree	100.0	0.0	20(100.0)		
<i>Believe that academic progress is possible in children with special needs</i>				-0.166***	0.000
Strongly agree	0.0	100.0	47(100.0)		
Agree	41.3	58.7	75(100.0)		
Disagree	100.0	0.0	38(100.0)		
Strongly disagree	0.0	100.0	31(100.0)		



Table 6: Continued

<i>Students with special needs have higher academic achievements when included in the regular education classroom</i>				0.074*	0.072
Strongly agree	0.0	100.0	48(100.0)		
Agree	0.0	100.0	74(100.0)		
Disagree	100.0	0.0	31(100.0)		
Strongly agree	100.0	0.0	38(100.0)		
<i>Believe that children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom</i>				-0.077***	0.005
Agree	44.5	55.5	110(100.0)		
Disagree	0.0	100.0	44(100.0)		
Strongly disagree	54.1	45.9	37(100.0)		
<i>Am comfortable teaching a child that is moderately physically disabled</i>				0.074*	0.072
Strongly agree	0.0	100.0	48(100.0)		
Agree	0.0	100.0	74(100.0)		
Disagree	100.0	0.0	31(100.0)		
Strongly disagree	100.0	0.0	38(100.0)		
<i>Have problems teaching a student with cognitive deficits</i>				-0.103***	0.005
Strongly agree	0.0	100.0	30(100.0)		
Agree	39.2	60.8	79(100.0)		
Disagree	0.0	100.0	44(100.0)		
Strongly disagree	100.0	0.0	38(100.0)		

Note: Row percentages in parenthesis, Kappa significant at (0.01) \*\*\*, (0.05) \*\*, (0.10) \*  
Source: Fieldwork (2023)

Table 7 highlights a multiple linear regression analysis on educators' perceptions and attitudes towards inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability. This analysis was done in order to get an insight into the degree of difference between the respondent categories and also to tell which factors among those components studied under educators' perceptions and attitudes those that predict enrolment of children with disability positively and those that

predict it negatively in order to make a conclusion. The results are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7:** Multiple Linear Regression Analysis on Educators' Perceptions and Attitudes for Inclusive Education and Enrolment of Children with disability

Factor	Unstandardized Coefficient	P Value	95%CI	
Am confident to teach children with special needs	-0.250**	0.000	-0.250	-0.250
Am adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities	-3.500**	0.000	-3.500	-3.500
Am easily frustrated when teaching students with special needs	-1.250**	0.000	-1.250	-1.250
Believe that all children can learn in most environments	1.000**	0.000	1.000	1.000
Believe that academic progress is possible in children with special needs	0.750**	0.000	0.750	0.750
Children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom	0.750**	0.000	0.750	0.750
Constant	6.250	0.000	6.250	6.250

Significant at (0.05) \*\*

Source: fieldwork (2023)

It emerged in Table 7 that, educators confident to teach children with special needs was statistically significant variable that seems to have influenced enrolment of children with disability at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff = -0.250, 95%CI [-0.250 — -0.250]). This indicates that -0.25-unit shift in the value of the educators confident to teach children with special needs, the mean of the enrolment of children with disability also tends to decrease. Educators being adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities was observed as statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=-3.500, 95% CI [-3.500 — -3.500]). This suggests that as the value of educators being adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities increases by -3.5 units, the mean of the enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease (see Table 7).

In Table 7, educators being easily frustrated when teaching students with special needs was observed as statistically significant variable influencing enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = -1.250, 95% CI [-1.250 — -1.250]). This result suggests that -1.25-units change in the independent variable (educators being easily frustrated when teaching students with special needs) the mean of the response variable (enrolment of children with disability) tends to decrease (see Table 7). It appears in the Table that educators believe that all children can learn in most environments was statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = 1.000, 95% CI [1.000 —1.000]). This suggests that as there is one-unit increase in the value (1.000) of the educators believe that all children can learn in most environments while holding other variables in the model constant

leads to an increase in the mean value of the dependent variable (enrolment of children with disability) (see Table 7).

Educators believe that academic progress is possible in children with special needs was observed to be statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=0.750, 95% CI [0.750— 0.750]). The coefficient value signifies that as the value of the independent variable (educators believe that academic progress is possible in children with special needs) increase by 0.75 units, the mean of the dependent variable (enrolment of children with disability) also tends to increase (see Table 7). It emerged that children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom appears to be statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = 0.750, 95% CI [0.750—0.750]) suggesting that 0.75 units shift in the value of the independent variable (children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom) leads to an increase in the mean value of the response variable (enrolment of children with disability) (see Table 7).

To ascertain the kind of challenges educators' encounter for implementing inclusive education, several questions were asked to collect data from participants on the challenges they encounter for implementing inclusive education. The questions comprised ignorance, logistics, support by parents and guardians, challenges in curriculum, teacher empowerment and teacher workload. The results are presented in Table 8.

*Table 8:* Educators' Challenges for Implementing Inclusive Education

IE Implementation Challenges	F	%
<i>Educators being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in their class</i>		
Yes	66	34.6
No	125	65.4
<i>Educators have the appropriate logistics for teaching in the classroom</i>		
Yes	48	25.1
No	143	74.9
<i>Schools have deficiencies in infrastructure</i>		
Yes	191	100.0
<i>Parents/guardians do physically support their wards with their homework</i>		
I think so	17	8.9
I do not think so	143	74.9
Undecided	31	16.2
<i>Parents stay in touch with their wards' teachers</i>		
Some do	110	57.6
Some do not	81	42.4
<i>Continuous changes in the school curriculum add strain to the teachers</i>		
Yes	92	48.2
No	99	51.8
<i>Teachers face challenges of new curriculum</i>		
Yes	91	47.6
No	100	52.4
<i>Educators have been sufficiently empowered to teach CSENs</i>		
Yes	167	87.4
No	24	12.6
<i>Can lack of empowerment make teachers lose confidence in delivering lessons with CSENs</i>		
Yes	144	75.4
No	47	24.6
<i>Teachers workload</i>		
Teaching and assessment	75	39.3
Marking	68	35.6
Counselling	48	25.1
Total	191	100.0

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

Regarding ignorance about pupils with special education needs in class, respondents were asked whether they ignore pupils with special education needs in their class or not and the results indicated that 65.4% reported that they do not ignore them while 34.6% said they do ignore them (see Table 8). Out of the 125 respondents who indicated that they do not ignore pupils with special education needs in their class were further asked to stipulate how they relate to these pupils with special education needs in their class and the

results revealed that 71.2% indicated that they ask pupils to help one another while 36.8% said they make them feel welcome in their class.

Concerning appropriate logistics for teaching in the classroom, respondents were asked to indicate if they have the appropriate logistics for teaching in the classroom and the results revealed that 74.9% of the respondents reported that, they do not have appropriate logistics for teaching in the classroom (see Table 8). With respect to if schools have deficiencies in

infrastructure, the results revealed that all the respondents (100%) indicated that the schools have infrastructural deficiencies (see Table 8).

When educators were asked to indicate whether parents/guardians do physically support their wards with their homework or not, the results revealed that nearly seventy-five per cent (74.9%) of the respondents indicated they do not think so while 8.9% reported they think so (see Table 8). On whether parents stay in touch with their wards educators or not, the result showed that 57.6% of the respondents reported that some parents do stay in touch with their wards educators while 42.4% indicated that some parents do not.

Educators were asked to indicate if the continuous changes in the school curriculum add strain to teachers and the responses revealed that 51.8% of the respondents said it does not add strain to teachers while 48.2% indicated that it does add strain to teachers (see Table 8). Educators were asked to indicate whether they face challenges of the new curriculum or not and the results indicated that 52.4% of the respondents stated that they do not face any challenges of the new curriculum while 47.6% reported that they face challenges (see Table 8).

Regarding whether educators have been sufficiently empowered to teach CSEs or not, the results revealed that majority (87.4%) of the respondents reported that educators have been sufficiently empowered to teach while 12.6% said educators have not been sufficiently empowered to teach (See Table 8). Analysis of whether lack of empowerment makes teachers lose confidence in delivering lessons with CSEs revealed that 75.4% of the respondents indicated that lack of empowerment makes teachers lose confidence in delivering lessons with CSEs while

24.6% stated lack of empowerment do not make teachers lose confidence in delivering lessons. The study collected data on the workload of teachers and the results revealed that 39.3% of the respondents reported that it is teaching and assessment while 25.1% indicated counselling (see Table 8).

In Table 9, Kappa statistics analysing the challenges JHS educators encounter for making inclusive education policy a working tool is presented. This analysis was run to ascertain the correlation between responses on educators' challenges for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability. In all ten (10) components were studied under the challenge's educators encounter for making inclusive education a working tool. Statistically significant correlation was found among six (6) of the components namely; being ignorant about pupils' with special education needs in their class [ $p=0.000$ ], have the appropriate logistics for teaching in the classroom [ $p=0.000$ ], parents stay in touch with their wards teachers [ $p=0.000$ ], teachers face challenges of new curriculum [ $p=0.000$ ], being sufficiently empowered to teach CSEs [ $p=0.004$ ] as well as can lack of empowerment make teachers lose confidence in delivering lessons with CSEs [ $p=0.000$ ], parents/guardians support their wards with do physically their homework [ $p=0.074$ ] as well as workload of teachers and inclusive education [0.097] and enrolment of children with disability. However, there was no statistically significant correlation found between the other components namely; have deficiencies in infrastructure [ $p=1.000$ ] as well as continuous changes in the school curriculum add strain to the teachers [ $p=0.500$ ] and enrolment of children with disability.

**Table 9:** Correlation between Educators' Challenges for Implementing Inclusive Education and Enrolment of Children with Disability

Challenges of IE Implementation	Enrol	Not Enrol	Total n(%)	Kappa	P. Value
<i>Being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in their class</i>				0.576***	0.000
Yes	74.2	25.8	66(100.0)		
No	16.0	84.0	125(100.0)		
<i>Have the appropriate logistics for teaching in the classroom</i>				- 0.421***	0.000
Yes	0.0	100.0	48(100.0)		
No	48.3	51.7	143(100.0)		
<i>Have deficiencies in infrastructure</i>				0.000	1.000
Yes	36.1	63.9	191(100.0)		
<i>Parents/guardians do physically support their wards with their homework</i>				0.080*	0.074
I think so	0.0	100.0	17(100.0)		
I do not think so	26.6	73.4	143(100.0)		

Table 9: Continued

Parents stay in touch with their wards' teachers				- 0.437***	0.000
Some do	16.4	83.6	110(100.0)		
Some do not	63.0	37.0	81(100.0)		
Continuous changes in the school curriculum add strain to the teachers				-0.047	0.500
Yes	33.7	66.3	92(100.0)		
No	38.4	61.6	99(100.0)		
Teachers face challenges of new curriculum				- 0.698***	0.000
Yes	0.0	100.0	91(100.0)		
No	69.0	31.0	100(100.0)		
Being sufficiently empowered to teach CSEs				0.209***	0.004
Yes	50.8	49.2	61(100.0)		
No	29.2	70.8	130(100.0)		
Can lack of empowerment make teachers lose confidence in delivering lessons with CSEs				0.312***	0.000
Yes	47.9	52.1	144(100.0)		
No	0.0	100.0	47(100.0)		
Teachers workload				-0.079*	0.097
Teaching and assessment	41.3	58.7	75(100.0)		
Marking	55.9	44.1	68(100.0)		
Counselling	0.0	100.0	48(100.0)		

Note: Row percentages in parenthesis, Kappa significant at (0.001) \*\*\*, (0.01) \*\*, (0.05) \*

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

Following Kappa statistics result on educators' challenges for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability, further analysis was run to identify which categories of the various explanatory

factors studied under educators' challenges for implementing inclusive education those that strongly predict enrolment of children with disability. The results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Multiple Linear Regression Results on Educators' Challenges for Inclusive Education and Enrolment of Children with Disability

Factor	Unstandardized Coefficient	P. Value	95% CI	
Being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in their class	0.600**	0.000	0.600	0.600
Parents stay in touch with their ward's teachers	-0.200**	0.000	-0.200	-0.200
Going through training on the new curriculum	-0.400**	0.000	-0.400	-0.400
Teachers face challenges of new curriculum	-0.600**	0.000	-0.600	-0.600
Workload of teachers	0.400**	0.000	0.400	0.400
Educators teach concepts they do not understand	-0.600**	0.000	-0.600	-0.600
Constant	2.600	0.000	2.600	2.600

Chi Square Significant at (0.05) \*\*

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

In Table 10, it emerged that, being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in classroom was statistically significant variable that seems to have influenced enrolment of children with disability at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=0.600, 95%CI [0.600—6.00]). This indicates that a 0.60-unit shift in the value of being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in classroom, causes a positive change in the mean of the enrolment of children with disability. Parents stay in touch with their wards teachers was statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = -0.200, 95%CI [-0.2000 — -0.200]) suggesting that a -0.20 unit change in the value of parents stay in touch with their ward's teachers, the mean of the enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease (see Table 10).

As going through training on the new curriculum value tends to increase by -0.40 unit, the mean of enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease. This was significant at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = -0.400, 95% CI [-0.400 — -4.00]) (see Table 10). It appears in the model that teachers face challenges of new curriculum was statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = -0.600, 95% CI [-0.600 — -0.600]). This proposes that as there was -0.60-unit shift

in the value of the teachers face challenges of new curriculum, the mean value of enrolment of children with disability decreases (see Table 10).

Educators workload was observed to be statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=0.400, 95%CI [0.400 — 0.400]). The coefficient value signifies that as the value of educators' workload increases by 0.40 units, the mean of enrolment of children with disability also tends to increase (see Table 10). It emerged in the model that educators teach concepts they do not understand is statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = -0.600, 95% CI [-0.600 — -0.600]) suggesting that a -0.60-unit shift in the value of educators teach concepts they do not understand, it leads to a decrease in the mean value of enrolment of children with disability (see Table 10).

#### b) Socio-Economic Status of the JHS Educators

To analyse socio-economic status of Educators some questions were generated to request respondents to provide data that will enable the researcher to measure this objective. The questions asked included high economic status and health status. The results obtained are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Socio-Economic Status of the JHS Educators

Socio-Economic Status	F	%
<i>Educators are able to provide basic needs for the family</i>		
Yes	92	48.2
No	99	51.8
<i>Educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home</i>		
Yes	122	63.9
No	69	36.1
<i>Educators' life being figured as a weary-faced person</i>		
Yes	106	55.5
No	85	44.5
<i>Economic status</i>		
High	31	16.2
Low	143	74.9
Undecided	17	8.9
<i>Often absent yourself from school</i>		
Yes	92	48.2
No	99	51.8
Total	191	100.0

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

On whether educators are able to provide family's basic needs or not, the results show that 51.8 per cent of the respondents reported that they are not able to provide basic needs for their families while 48.2 per cent said they can provide for their family's basic

needs (see Table 7). Regarding if educators are able to provide adequate learning facilities at home for their wards or not, 63.9 per cent of the respondents said they are able to provide adequate learning facilities at home for their wards while 36.1 per cent indicated that they are

not able to provide adequate learning facilities at home for their wards (see Table 11).

Analysis of whether educators' life is being figured as a weary-faced person or not, revealed that about fifty-six per cent (55.5 %) of the respondents indicated that educators' life is being figured as a weary-faced person while 44.5 per cent of the respondents said their life is not figured as weary-faced person (see Table 11). Educators were asked to indicate their economic status and nearly seventy-five per cent (74.9%) reported that their economic status is low while 8.9 per cent could not decide (see Table 11). Regarding if educators often absent themselves from school or not showed that about fifty-two per cent (51.8%) of the respondents said they do not absent themselves from school regularly while 48.2% said they often (regularly) absent themselves from school (see Table 11).

Table 12 presents Kappa statistics analysing the socio-economic status of educators and enrolment of children with disability. This analysis was run to find out if there is correlation between educators' socioeconomic status and enrolment of children with disability. In all five (6) components were studied under the educators' socioeconomic status. Statistically significant correlation was found among four (4) of the components namely; educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home [ $p=0.000$ ], educators' life being figured as "a weary-faced person [ $p=0.027$ ], economic status [ $p=0.000$ ] as well as often absent from school [ $p=0.000$ ] and inclusive education. However, there was no statistically significant correlation found between educators being able to provide basic needs for the family [ $0.500$ ] and inclusive education.

**Table 12:** Correlation between Educators' Socio-Economic Status and Inclusive Education

Socio-Economic Status	Enrol	Not Enrol	Total n(%)	Kappa	P. Value
<i>Educators are able to provide basic needs for the family</i>				0.070	0.500
Yes	33.7	66.3	92(100.0)		
No	38.4	61.6	99(100.0)		
<i>Educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home</i>				-.0254***	0.000
Yes	25.4	74.6	122(100.0)		
No	55.1	44.9	69(100.0)		
<i>Educators' life being figured as a weary-faced person</i>				-0.148*	0.027
Yes	29.2	70.8	106(100.0)		
No	44.7	55.3	85(100.0)		
<i>Economic Status</i>				-0.323***	0.000
High	0.0	100.0	31(100.0)		
Low	48.3	51.7	143(100.0)		
Undecided	0.0	100.0	17(100.0)		
<i>Often absent from school</i>				-0.703***	0.000
Yes	0.0	100.0	92(100.0)		
No	69.7	30.3	99(100.0)		

Note: Row percentages in parenthesis, Kappa significant at (0.01) \*\*\*, (0.05) \*\*, (0.10) \*

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

Following the Kappa statistics results on educators' socio-Economic Status (SES) for making inclusive education (IE) a working tool, further analysis was run using the multiple linear regressions to estimate the relationship between the educators' socio-economic status and enrolment of children with disability. The analysis became necessary because the researcher wanted to determine how strong the relationship might be between the educators' socio-economic status and

enrolment of children with disability. The results are presented in Table 13.

**Table 13:** Multiple Linear Regression Results on Socio-Economic Status and Enrolment of Children with Disability

Factor	Unstandardized Coefficient	P. Value	95% CI	
Educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home	-1.000**	0.000	-1.000	-1.000
Educators' life being figured as a weary-faced person	1.000**	0.000	1.000	1.000
Economic Status	-1.000**	0.000	-1.000	-1.000
Often absent from school	-1.000**	0.000	-1.000	-1.000
Constant	5.000	0.000	5.000	5.000

Significant at (0.05) \*\*

Source: Fieldwork (2023)

It emerged in Table 13 that, educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home was statistically significant variable influencing enrolment of children with disability at  $P=0.000$ , (coeff=-1.000, 95% CI [-1.000— -1.000]). This unstandardized coefficient (-1.000) indicates that as the value of the educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home increases, the mean of the enrolment of children with disability also tends to decrease.

Educators' life being figured as a weary-faced person was emerged statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=1.000, 95%CI [1.000—1.000]). This suggests that as the value (1.000) of educators' life being figured as a weary-faced person increases; the mean of the enrolment of children with disability also tends to increase (See Table 13).

As educators' economic status value tends to increase, the mean of enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease. This was significant at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff=-1.000, 95%CI [-1.000 — -1.000]) (see Table 9). It appears in the model that educators often (regularly) absent themselves from school was statistically significant to enrolment of children with disability at  $p=0.000$ , (coeff = -1.000, 95% CI [-1.000 — -1.000]). This suggests that as there is an increase in the value (0.1000) of the educators often (regularly) absent themselves from school while holding other variables in the model constant leads to a decrease in the mean value of enrolment of children with disability (see Table 13). However, educators are able to provide basic needs for the family was excluded from the model due to the fact that its inclusion brought hard collinearity which could not make the researcher to observe the contribution of each independent variable to the response variable.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

The study focused on investigating educators' strategies for inclusive education, educators' perceptions and attitudes towards inclusive education, challenges educators' encounter and socioeconomic

status of these educators. Educators report on building a welcoming school environment, surprisingly, revealed that small proportion of the respondents responded in affirmative. The few respondents outlined that they built a welcoming school environment by accommodating all pupils irrespective of their status and also sensitised every staff to welcome and show love and affection to pupils with special education needs. This finding confirmed that inclusive education strategies can only be recognised when all relevant variables that regulate the implementation process are in control on one hand.

On the other hand, it could be that educators that refute building a welcoming school environment for inclusive education reason might be that relevant variables that regulate the implementation of inclusive education process are not in control and that they do not want to perpetuate suffering for the school as a whole. It could also be that the schools that do not build a welcoming environment reason might probably be that the educators lack the capacity to ensure reform of the cultures, practices and strategies within the schools so that they can respond to learners' diversity which might lead to enrolment of children with disability. This confirms a submission made by [29], [30] in their study that like many reforms, inclusive education involves reforming the cultures, practices and strategies within the schools so that they respond to learners' diversity.

The study revealed that overwhelmingly majority of the respondents confirmed that in terms of inclusive education, they are not yet aware of their duties. It is not surprising that the study discovered that educators and parents never met to discuss the progress of children with disability in the school. This finding has revealed that because most educators are not aware of their duties in terms of inclusive education, they do not see why they should build a welcoming school community to accommodate children with disability which would pose problem on them. Parents and teachers never met to discuss progress of children with disability in school could mean they do not welcome or enrol children with disability in their school and that they are not held responsible to meet with parents to discuss learners'

progress. This finding confirmed a study by [31] that creating and sustaining inclusive learning environments is difficult, particularly in a system dominated by curriculum coverage, compliance, performativity and measurable outcomes.

The study identified a statistically significant correlation between educators' strategies for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that when educators have in place strategies for implementing inclusive education, it goes a long way to assist educators to enrol children with disability. Ideally, the assumption is that, the more and more educators have in place credible strategies for implementing inclusive education, it is the more and more they can enrol children with disability. It emerged that six (6) components of the educators' strategies for inclusive education have their  $p$ -value not greater than the standard 0.05 cut-off which indicates that the variables were not independent of each other and that there was a statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables. However, the other two variables which have their  $p$ -value greater than the cut-off indicates that the variables were independent of each other and that there was no statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables.

The multiple linear regression analysis on educator' strategies for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability revealed correlation between build a welcoming school environment and enrolment of children with disability. This correlation had revealed that when educators have commendable strategies for inclusive education, it helps to increase the enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream schools. The coefficient (1.000) of build a welcoming school environment curtails that the more and more educators build a welcoming school environment, it is the more and more it increases the enrolment of children with disability in a mainstream school.

Moreover, the correlation found between educators are aware of their duties concerning SpED, SHEP, Guidance & Counselling and Girl-Child Education and enrolment of children with disability revealed that when the value of educators are aware of their duties concerning SpED, SHEP, Guidance & Counselling and Girl-Child Education increases, the mean of enrolment of children with disability also tends to decrease. The coefficient (-1.000) of the educators is aware of their duties concerning SpED, SHEP, Guidance & Counselling and Girl-Child Education signifies that the more and more educators are aware of their duties, it is the more and more it reduces the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

As teachers meet with parents of children with special education needs and discuss their progress value (-1.000) tends to increase, the mean of enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease. It appears

the more and more educators meet with parents of children with special education needs to discuss their progress it is the more that it decreases the intake of these disabled children into the mainstream schools. A one-unit (1.000) shift in the value of educators creating supportive caring environment causes a positive change in the mean of enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream schools. This advances that the intake of children with disability are being more in the mainstream schools. The implication of this finding could be that educators understand that in inclusive classrooms there should not be discrimination between the learners with disabilities, and those without disabilities. Hence, educators might beware that each learner contributes to the rich variety of ideas and actions in the classroom. This finding corroborates to a study by [32] that inclusive education is an opportunity to work with each pupil regardless of their disability, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and ability.

Though association was found between schools have ramps or 'flat' access to reach all facilities and enrolment of children with disability but did not demonstrate an increase in the mean of the dependent variable (DV). This finding has revealed that as the value of the independent variable (IV) increases by one-unit (-1.000), it negatively affects the mean of the enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream school by decreasing the intake of children with disability. This is because the one-unit shift in the (IV) brought a reduction in the (DV).

Per the study, it appears the more and more schools have good lighting in the classrooms positively affected the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools. The coefficient (1.000) has revealed that as schools continue to have good lighting in the classrooms then it is the more, they will increase the enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream schools.

#### a) *Educators' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Inclusive Education*

As the study tries to analyse educators' perceptions and attitudes towards inclusive education, it was revealed that overwhelming majority of the respondents were certain in their minds on the statement that they are confident in their ability to teach children with special needs. An educator can be confident in a duty when such a person has passion about such duty on one hand. On the other hand, it could be that these educators admit that such children also have different skills that they can bring to the fore when permitted in a mainstream school. Probably it might be that, teachers might willingly show a high level of commitment to their beliefs and values about these disabled students in a classroom due to the fact that these teachers might have observed that their views and attitudes relating to inclusion are just as important as

material and policy support in implementing inclusion which might have motivated them to be confident in teaching children with disability. This finding corroborates to a submission made in a study by [33] that the voices and opinions of teachers are critical on issues regarding inclusion because teachers are vital to the implementation in their classrooms. The successful implementation of inclusion depends on teachers' beliefs and attitudes.

The study brought to bear that majority of the respondents confirmed that they have been adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities. This was supported by the extent to which the educators agreed or disagreed with the issue on easily become frustrated when teaching students with special needs. With this an encouraging number of respondents disagree to the statement that they easily become frustrated. This finding is in line with a submission made in a study by [34] that, teachers who have had multiple special education trainings have been shown to demonstrate mainly positive attitudes towards inclusion. Educators being able to believe that all children can learn in most environments irrespective of their intellectual, physical and psychological differences could probably mean that these educators have developed positive perceptions and attitudes towards inclusive education. It could also mean that these educators are aware that each and every child has a unique skill so when put together in a classroom would encourage peer to peer learning and in the end would help all of the students benefit from one another in terms of skills and knowledge. This finding is in accordance with the framework of [35] planned behaviour theory that it is possible that teachers could exhibit positive behaviours in the classroom when they are already predisposed to positive perceptions towards children with disabilities.

The study has revealed that academic progress is possible in children with special needs. This was supported by few of the respondents who established that students with special needs have higher academic achievements when included in the regular education classroom. The reason for this finding could be that these educators have positive perceptions and attitudes about these children with special education needs and that endeavour to guide them very well during classroom delivery. This finding is in line with [33] that a teacher will show a high level of commitment to his or her beliefs and values about students in a classroom hence, in any country, educators are the driving force behind inclusive education.

The study unveiled that children with special needs should be placed in special education classroom. This was made clear when more than sixty per cent (60%) of the respondents acknowledged that they have problems teaching a student with cognitive deficits. The reason for this finding could be that educators do not

believe that students with special education needs will do well and that might not put in much effort into teaching these children hence, poor performance of these students.

Statistically significant correlation was found between educators' perceptions and attitudes for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that when educators have a positive perception and attitude towards inclusive education, it goes a long way to assimilate students with disabilities in regular classrooms. This finding corroborates to [36] study that positive teachers' attitudes foster an easier integration of students with disabilities in the mainstream education.

It emerged that five (5) components of the educators' perceptions and attitudes have their  $p$ -value not greater than the standard 0.05 cut-off which indicates that the variables were not independent of each other and that there was a statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables. However, the remaining five variables which have their  $p$ -value greater than the cut-off indicates that the variables were independent of each other and that there was no statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables.

The multiple linear regression analysis on educator' perceptions and attitudes and enrolment of children with disability revealed correlation between being confident to teach children with special education needs and enrolment of children with disability. This correlation had revealed that when educators have admirable confident to teach children with special education needs can make educators to develop positive attitudes for inclusive education, however, the coefficient (-0.250) of being confident to teach children with special education needs rather reduces the mean of enrolment of children with disability in a mainstream school. The implication is that having confident to teach children with disability does not correspond to the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream school but rather reduces the intake of these children into mainstream schools.

Also, the correlation found between being adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities and enrolment of children with disability revealed that when the value of independent variable (IV) that is "being adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities" increases the mean of enrolment of children with disability also tends to decrease. The coefficient (-3.500) of the (IV) signifies that the more and more being adequately trained to meet the needs of children with disabilities, it is the more and more it reduces the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

As being easily frustrated when teaching students with special needs value (-1.250) tends to

increase, the mean of enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease. It appears the more and more educators are easily frustrated when teaching students with special education needs it is the more that it decreases the intake of these disabled children into the mainstream schools. A positive shift in the value (-1.250) of educators are easily frustrated when teaching students with special education needs causes a negative change in the mean of enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream schools. This finding has revealed that the intake of children with disability is limited even though there is a positive shift in the value of the IV but does not correspond to intake of disability children into the mainstream schools.

The study identifies association between being believe that all children can learn in most environments and enrolment of children with disability which corresponded to an increase in the mean of the dependent variable (DV). This finding has revealed that as the value of the independent variable (IV) increases by (1.000), it positively affects the mean of the enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream school by increasing the intake of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

Per the study, it appears the more and more educators believe that academic progress is possible in children with special education needs positively affected the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools. The coefficient (0.750) has revealed that as educators continue to believe that academic progress is possible in children with special education needs then it is the more, they will increase the enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream schools.

In the study, children with special education needs should be placed in special education classroom was found to be statistically significant related to enrolment of children with disability. This revealed that the more and more children with special education needs are made to be placed in special education classroom, it is the more and more it corresponds to the increase in the mean of enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

#### *b) Educators' Challenges for Implementing Inclusive Education*

The study revealed that majority of the educators' does not ignore children with special education needs in their class. This was supported by the fact that educators ask pupils to help one another and also make children with disability to feel welcome in their class. The reason for this finding could stem from the fact that educators have been able to identify and assess learners that have learning disabilities and found that they have exceptional skills that when nurtured will immensely bring forth the best in them. This finding corroborates to [37] study that if the teacher is ignorant

of the underlying problem, it will be difficult for them to give appropriate support to the learners with disability.

Respondents asserted that they do not have appropriate logistics for teaching in the classroom. This was confirmed when all the respondents graciously confirmed that the schools have deficiencies in infrastructure. The implication of this lack of appropriate teaching materials might make a classroom atmosphere unfriendly for all the learners. The scarcity of logistics to use in the classroom when dealing with all the learners including those with special needs such as dyslexia might become a challenge to the class teacher. This finding is in line with [38] study that teachers face a lack of resources and materials to use in the teaching and support of children with disabilities such as dyslexic learners.

It appeared some parents do stay in touch with their ward's educators. However, majority of the educators are not certain parents/guardians do physically support their wards with their homework. The implication of this finding is that if parents/guardians do not physically support learners with their homework, it can go a long way to affect the children psychologically and emotionally. Parents staying in touch with their ward's educators could mean they want to know the behaviour of the child in school and how well the child is coping with his or her new environment. It could also mean that parents want to see the success of their wards hence endeavour to stay in touch with their wards' educators. This finding agrees to [39] study that success of children with disability depends on the effort that the teacher, parents and everyone else that is involved in these children's learning put.

The continuous changes in the school curriculum were revealed not adding strain to teachers' performance in classroom delivery. This was confirmed when educators voice out that they do not face any challenges of the new curriculum. With this, overwhelmingly majority subscribed that they have been sufficiently empowered to teach children with special education needs. This finding agrees to [40] study that for teachers to effectively teach and support learners with dyslexia, they need to have the relevant skills.

It was confirmed in the study that lack of empowerment makes teachers lose confidence in delivering lessons with children with special education needs. The implication of this finding could be that educators have noticed that if they are not adequately empowered, challenges can arise during their classroom delivery. In view of this, there is a need for the educators to be trained on how to deal with learners with learning disabilities so that educators can willingly own out to deliver their best to these children.

The study revealed a correlation between educators' challenges for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that even though

educators have challenges towards inclusive education but it does not negatively affect the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools. It emerged that six (6) of the components of educators' challenges for inclusive education have their  $p$ -value not greater than the standard 0.05 cut-off which indicates that the variables were not independent of each other and that there was a statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables. However, the remaining four variables which have their  $p$ -value greater than the cut-off indicates that the variables were independent of each other and that there was no statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables.

The multiple linear regression analysis on educator' challenges for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability revealed association between being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in their class and enrolment of children with disability. This association had revealed that even when educators are being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in their class rather makes it possible for children with disability to be enrolled more in the mainstream schools. The coefficient (0.600) of being ignorant about pupils with special education needs in their class rather signifies a positive shift in the mean of enrolment of children with disability in a mainstream school.

Also, the association found between parents stay in touch with their wards teachers and enrolment of children with disability into mainstream schools revealed that when the value of independent variable (IV) that is "parents stay in touch with their wards teachers" increases the mean of enrolment of children with disability also tends to decrease. The coefficient (-0.200) of the (IV) signifies that the more and more parents stay in touch with their ward's teachers, it is the more and more it reduces the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

As going through training on the new curriculum value (-0.400) tends to increase, the mean of enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease. It appears the more and more educators go through training on the new curriculum it is the more that it decreases the intake of these disabled children into the mainstream schools.

The study identifies association between teachers face challenges of new curriculum and enrolment of children with disability which corresponded to a decrease in the mean of the dependent variable (DV). This finding has revealed that as the value of the independent variable (IV) increases by (-0.400), its negatively affects the mean of the enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream school by decreasing the intake of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

Per the study, it appears the more and more educators have more workload on their shoulders, it is

the more and more that it increases the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools. The coefficient (0.400) has revealed that as educators continue to have more workload, it is the more that it influences the intake of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

In the study, educators teach concepts they do not understand was found to be statistically significant related to enrolment of children with disability in to the mainstream schools. This revealed that the more and more educators teach concepts they do not understand, it is the more and more it decreases the mean of enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

### c) *Socio-Economic Status of Educators*

The study revealed that educators cannot provide basic needs for their families. Several of the educators attested to the fact that their life is being figured as a weary-faced person. Educators' life being figured as weary-faced person was confirmed when they were certain that they have low economic status. The implication of this finding is that educators might not own out to give their best in terms of delivery and this can affect the academic progress of the students. Even though, it was confirmed in the study that educators are able to provide adequate learning facilities at home for their wards. This might mean that educators are aware that learning facilities could help their children to do well academically and that they endeavour to provide them for their children.

The study revealed a correlation between educators' socio-economic status for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Even though educators confirmed they have low socio-economic status but it does not negatively affect the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools. It emerged that four (4) of the components of educators' socio-economic status have their  $p$ -value not greater than the standard 0.05 cut-off which indicates that the variables were not independent of each other and that there was a statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables. However, only one variable has its  $p$ -value greater than the cut-off indicating that the variable was independent of each other and that there was no statistically significant correlation between the categorical variables.

The multiple linear regression analysis on educator' socio-economic status for inclusive education and enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream school revealed association between educators being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home for their children and enrolment of children with disability. This association had revealed that even though educators are being able to provide



adequate learning facilities at home for their children it does not correspond to the more intakes of children with disabilities into the mainstream schools. The coefficient (-1.000) of being able to provide adequate learning facilities at home for their children signifies a negative shift in the mean of enrolment of children with disability in a mainstream school.

Furthermore, the association found between educators' life being figured as a weary-faced person and enrolment of children with disability into mainstream schools revealed that when the value of the independent variable (IV) that is "educators' life being figured as a weary-faced person" increases the mean of enrolment of children with disability also tends to decrease. The coefficient (1.000) of the (IV) signifies that the more and more educators' life is being figured as a weary-faced person, it is the more and more it increases the enrolment of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

As educators' economic status value (-1.000) tends to increase, the mean of enrolment of children with disability tends to decrease. It appears the more and more educators' economic status value tends to increase it is the more that it decreases the intake of these disabled children into the mainstream schools.

The study identifies association between educators often absent from school and enrolment of children with disability which corresponded to a decrease in the mean of the dependent variable (DV). This finding has revealed that as the value of the independent variable (IV) increases by (1.000), its negatively affects the mean of the enrolment of children with disability in the mainstream school by decreasing the intake of children with disability into the mainstream schools.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, quantitative and cross-sectional survey plan were used to investigate educators' strategies for inclusive education, educators' perceptions and attitudes for inclusive education, challenges educators encounter for implementing inclusive education and educators' socio-economic status for implementing inclusive education in the Kadjebi District, Ghana.

Overwhelmingly majority of the educators confirm that they do not build a welcoming school environment for pupils with disability let alone to enrol them in the mainstream school. The study recommends that effort should be made by all stakeholders, including the Government of Ghana, the Kadjebi District Education Directorate, the family and organisations in the district to make adequate support to provide the appropriate logistics for teaching and learning to help educators to be able to deliver in the classroom.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am thankful to the participants and the research assistants for sacrificing their time to help me obtain data for the study.

### *Declaration*

### *Ethical Approval*

Ethical approval (with ID number UHAS-RCE A./10/111/21-22) to conduct the study was taken from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ho, Ghana.

### *Consent to Participate in the Study*

In the field, verbal consent was taken before a participant could take part in the study.

### *Consent to Publish*

Participants were told that the study was strictly academic and that the results would be published for the purposes of contributing to building academic literature.

### *Competing Interests*

No competing interest existed.

### *Funding*

The study was self-funded

### *Availability of Data and Materials*

The data is only available to the author hence it was a primary data.

*Author(s) Contribution:* Conceptualise the study, data curation, formal analysis, writing – review & editing, and methodology.

*Author Contribution:* Writing – original draft, Software and proof reading.

## REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. UNICEF. (09 Nov 2021). Nearly 240 million children with disabilities around the world, UNICEF's most comprehensive statistical analysis finds. Retrieved on 13/1/2025 from: <https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/nearly-240-million-children-disabilitiesaroundworld-unicefs-most-comprehensive>
2. Hayes, A.M., & Bulat, J. (2017). Disabilities Inclusive Education Systems and Policies Guide for Low- and Middle-Income Countries [Internet]. Research Triangle Park (NC): RTI Press; 2017 Jul. Retrieved on 13/1/2025 from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK554622/> doi: <https://doi.org/10.3768/rtipress.2017.op.0043.1707>.
3. Horner, R. H., & Halle, J. W. (2020). Implications of Emerging Educational Reforms for Individuals With Severe Disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 45(2), 75-80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1540796919872210>
4. Bani Odeh, K., & Lach, L.M. (2024). Barriers to, and facilitators of, education for children with disabilities

- worldwide: a descriptive review. *Front Public Health*. 11,1294849. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1294849. PMID: 38292375; PMCID: PMC10824976.
5. Šćepanović, M., Nikolić, S., & Mitrović, N. (2024). Perspective Chapter: Individual Support Services in Inclusive Education – Pros et Contrats (Polemic). *IntechOpen*. doi: 10.5772/intechopen.114080
6. UNICEF (2020). Inclusive education: every child has the right to quality education and learning [Online]. Retrieved on 13/1/2025 from: <https://www.unicef.org/education/inclusive-education>
7. Limeri, L.B., Carter, N.T., Choe, J. et al. (2020). Growing a growth mindset: characterizing how and why undergraduate students' mindsets change. *IJ STEM Ed* 7, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00227-2>
8. Komabu-Pomeyie, SGMA. (2020). "The Challenges Of Inclusive Education Policy Implementation In Ghana: Stakeholders' Perspectives" (2020). Graduate College Dissertations and Theses. 1206. <https://scholarworks.uvm.edu/graddis/1206>
9. Naami, A., & Mort, KS-T. (2023). Inclusive education in Ghana: How prepared are the teachers? *Front. Educ.* 8,1056630. doi: 10.3389/educ.2023.1056630
10. Kwame Larbi Mantey, E., Vanderpuye, I., & Asamani, L. (2023). An Assessment of Inclusive Education Experiences of Teacher-Trainees with Sensory Impairment in Colleges of Education in Ghana. *Open Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 75–92. Retrieved from <https://www.scipublications.com/journal/index.php/ojer/article/view/692>
11. Strogilos, V., Lim, L., & Binte Mohamed Buhari, N. (2021). Differentiated instruction for students with SEN in mainstream classrooms: contextual features and types of curriculum modifications *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(3), 850–866. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1984873>
12. Bibiana, R. I., King'endo, M., Wangila, E., & Thurania, S. (2020). Policy strategies for effective implementation of inclusive education in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*. 12(1), 28-42, DOI: 0.5897/IJEA PS2019.0622
13. Winzer, M., & Mazurek, K. (2017). The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Reconstructing disability. *The Wiley Handbook of diversity in special education* 3, 1-1.
14. Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. (2016). *Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools* (fourth edition). Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
15. Ackah-Jnr, F. R. & Danso, J. B. (2019) Examining the physical environment of Ghanaian inclusive schools: how accessible, suitable and appropriate is such environment for inclusive education? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(2), 188–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1427808>
16. Gyimah, E. K. (2021) Safety in inclusive schools: What about persons with special educational needs and disabilities? *Support for Learning*, 36(4), 650–663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12385>
17. Maciver, D., Hunter, C., Adamson, A., Grayson, Z., Forsyth, K. and Mcleod, I. (2018) Supporting successful inclusive practices for learners with disabilities in high schools: a multisite, mixed method collective case study. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 40, 14, 1708–1717. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2017.1306586>
18. Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., van Ewijk, R. et al. (2022). Teachers' Beliefs About Inclusive Education and Insights on What Contributes to Those Beliefs: a Meta-analytical Study. *Educ Psychol Rev* 34, 2609–2660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0>
19. Agbenyega, J. S. & Klibthong, S. (2022). Giving voice: inclusive early childhood teachers' perspectives about their school leaders' leadership practices. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2052761>
20. Mcleskey, J. L., Rosenberg, M. S. & Westing, D. L. (2018). *Inclusion: Effective Practices for all Students* (third edition). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
21. Sharma, U., Sokal, L., Wang, M. & Loreman, T. (2021). Measuring the use of inclusive practices among pre-service educators: a multi-national study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 107, 103 506. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103506>
22. Kaushik, V., & Walsh, C. A. (2019). Pragmatism as a Research Paradigm and Its Implications for Social Work Research. *Social Sciences*, 8(9), 255. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8090255>.
23. Khanna, P. (2019). Positivism and Realism. In: Liamputtong, P. (eds) *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*. Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4\\_59](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_59).
24. Aggarwal R, & Ranganathan P. (2019). Study designs: Part 2 - Descriptive studies. *Perspect Clin Res*. 10(1):34-36. doi: 10.4103/picr.PICR\_154\_18. PMID: 30834206; PMCID: PMC6371702.
25. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Table for determining sample size from a given population. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
26. Martínez-Mesa, J., González-Chica, D.A., Duquia, R.P., Bonamigo, R.R., & Bastos, J.L. (2016). Sampling: how to select participants in my research study? *An Bras Dermatol*. 91(3), 326-30. doi: 10.1590/abd1806-4841.20165254. PMID: 27438200; PMCID: PMC4938277
27. Althubaiti, A. (2022). Sample size determination: A practical guide for health researchers. *J Gen Fam*



- Med. 2022 Dec 14; 24(2):72-78. doi: 10.1002/jgf2.600. PMID: 36909790; PMCID: PMC10000262
28. Bhardwaj, P. (2019). Types of Sampling in Research. *Journal of the Practice of Cardiovascular Sciences* 5(3), p 157-163, Sep–Dec 2019. | DOI: 10.4103/jp cs.jp cs\_62\_19
29. Cheung, A., & Man, P.W. (2012). "Factors affecting the implementation of curriculum reform in Hong Kong", *International Journal of Educational Management* 26(1), 3954.
30. Bell, L., & Stevenson, S. (2015). Towards an analysis of the policies that shape public education: Setting the context for school leadership, *Management in Education*. 29(4), 146150.
31. Fransson, G., & Grannäs, J. (2012). Dilemmatic spaces in educational contexts – towards a conceptual framework for dilemmas in teachers work. *Teachers and Teaching*, 19(1), 4–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.744195>.
32. Bennett, H. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research* (71), 171-188.
33. Odongo, G. & Davidson, R. (2016). Examining the attitudes and concerns of the Kenyan teachers toward the inclusion of children with disabilities in the general education classroom: A mixed methods study. *International Journal of Special Education*, 31(2), 209– 227.
34. Baar, R. (2016). Attitudes of German student teachers on inclusion. *Journal of Research In Special Educational Needs*, 161. doi: 10.1111/1471-3802.12143, Database: Education Source.
35. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211. Retrieved from <https://iri.hse.ru/data/816/479/1225/Oct%2019%20Cited%20%231%20Manage%20THE%20THEORY%20OF%20PLANNED%20BEHAVIOR.pdf>
36. De Laat, S., Freriksen, E., & Vervloed, M. P. (2013). Attitudes of children and adolescents toward persons who are deaf, blind, paralyzed or intellectually disabled. *Research in developmental disabilities*, 34(2), 855-863. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2012.11.004>
37. Peer, L. & Reid, G. (2016). *Breaking down barriers for educators*. London: Routledge.
38. Mackey, M. (2004). Inclusive education in the US Middle school general education teachers' approaches to inclusion. *International Journal of Instruction*, 7(2).
39. Pastoriko, F.M., Hidayati, K. & Rasmuin, R. (2019). What the high school students say about mathematics homework. *Journal Riset Pendidikan Matematika*, 6(2), 222-232.
40. Carton, A. & Fruchart, E. (2013). Sources of stress, coping strategies, emotional experience: Effects of the level of experience in primary school teachers in France. *Educational Review*, 66(2), 245-262. doi: 10.1080/00131911.2013.769937