

# Inclusive Education in Jordanian Schools: Special Education and General Education Teachers' Perspectives

## Abstract

This study was implemented in the context of primary public schools in Jordan purposing to investigate teachers' attitudes and knowledge variables regarding Inclusive Education (IE) of disabled children in ordinary classrooms. Mixed-method approach was applied to collect data from 1498 Special Education (SE) and General Education (GE) teachers working in different government schools in Jordan. the results of the present study have revealed that both groups of teachers had moderate attitudes toward the IE, but the SE teachers were highly efficacious in their attitudes. The t-test findings showed that there was a significant difference between both groups according to their gender regarding their attitude variables, in which the male teachers were found having slightly more positive attitudes compared to the female teachers. The qualitative results indicated that educators lack in-depth knowledge and understanding of the inclusion theme. The study concluded that the needed training and experiences in IE were substantial factors which may promote the inclusion practices. Positive change implications involve increased attitudes and in-depth knowledge for both groups of educators, more systematic execution of provision, and more successful IE of these children.

**Keywords:** Inclusive Education, Teacher Attitudes, Disabled Children. Jordan

## Introduction

Educational systems globally undergo essential modifications and reforms. Among some important reforms, these educational systems have specified a legislative framework to implement the IE for children with Special Education Needs (SENs) (Malak, 2013). Such reforms have to fully integrate these children in the public school settings, regardless of their weaknesses or strengths (Özokcu, 2018). For example, the 2004 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in the United States of America (USA), commands free and proper public education for all children, including those SENs. This Act mentioned that special education provision and related programs should be presented in the least-restrictive and most interactive environment, so that the children can get their stipulated opportunities and rights in education (National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities [NJCLD], 2005). Therefore, IE is incorporated into most of the education system policies worldwide (Özokcu, 2018), and at present, an all-embracing international agreement on the target of this program also exists.

This study investigates IE from the perspectives of the Jordanian SE teachers and ME teachers. The focal emphasis lies on the two themes of "attitudes" and "knowledge." This study also explores whether the demographic characteristics could associate with attitudes of teachers, who are regarded as the most significant actors in implementing inclusion. In practice, the findings of the present study shall contextually treat the abovementioned variables.

## **Inclusive Education (IE)**

The term of inclusion is fundamentally employed to explain anything from the physical integration of children with SENs in main-stream classrooms to the movement of general classes, teaching methods, and curricula (Alodat, Almakani & Zumberg, 2014; Author, 2015). Some main concepts, such as “integration,” “main-stream” and “inclusive education” are often used to clarify this present educational movement. This current expression for schooling these children conditions goals to obtain fit educational prospects within public schools consisting with their proper “age” and “grade” level, in their respective areas (UNESCO, 2010). In present times, this concept has been branded as ‘inclusion’. Such definition supports the “IDEA–2004”, which mandates instructing all children regardless their conditions in the same education placement without any exception (Kuittinen, 2017).

The movement to full-inclusion has led to various research types (M’mbijiweet al., 2018). Slee (2011) recounted many sub-topics related to the inclusion concept such as traditional special education studies that targets to reliable special education practices with the purpose of aligning it with the global IE, a line of studies that concentrates on the necessary provision of appraisals on the special education approach, as well as another line of studies that analyses the IE consistent with diverse identity groups depend on race, sexuality, gender and social-class. These research focus on some common fields of education, such as learning, teaching methods, administration, educational leadership and more. Studies which have been mainly unconvinced about the probability of the professed inclusion settings (i.e., integrating students with and without disabilities together into main-stream classrooms) are existed (Özokcu, 2018). Among studies which favour a more conventional special education system or segregation settings such as Mostert, Kavale, and Kauffman, (2008) in USA. Mostert and colleague have entered in critical discussions with other western scholars, such as Gallagher, Heshusius, Iano, and Skrtic (2004), who are enthusiastic advocates of “full-inclusion” for all children, irrespective of their needs (Author, 2015).

New educational system practices under the “inclusion principle” have received common consideration in the Jordanian context. Implementing IE goals, however, are seen as a daunting task with respect to present educational-policies linked with the local culture (Author, 2014, 2015). To clarify, IE in the third world and developing countries is remarkably different in developed-countries. In many developed-countries, full-inclusion indicates the process of integrating both special education and general education policies into one context, in which the latter are subsumed under IE as a united system to face the relegation of these SEN children. This educational system also applies to other marginalized children, such as those members of ethnic and religious minorities or residing in impoverished areas in addition to groupings that are gradually used in international issues and annual reports (e.g., UNESCO, 2010) (Gaad, 2011). In third world countries like Jordan, the term of “full-inclusion” refers to the integration of these SEN children with their counterparts in inclusive classrooms. The concept, however, does not mean the exclusion of

these individuals due to their conditions and needs apart from being disabled (Author, 2015).

Instituting an IE in Jordan remains a difficult and daunting task. Several challenges and issues, such as the lack of funding, attitudes and preparations of teachers, perspective of community, and administrative and policy support often hamper the process. Consequently, the integration movement in the country focuses on a specific group of disabled students who have been conventionally excluded from education opportunities, with the long term target of ultimately incorporating all excluded those with disabilities (Author, 2015). This requirement the IE of the children so that they can educate along with their normal peers. Such course of initiative would form the good basis for a qualified-education for all these children, regardless their disability conditions (Amr, 2011). Although IE approach is still in its infancy in the kingdom, the education system has consistently emphasized the incorporation of these individuals with SENs within the inclusive learning environments.

### **Attitudes and Knowledge for Teachers**

The attitudes of teachers regarding IE policy have been examined and given considerable attention, especially during the last three decades. The attitudes and perceptions of teachers have become recently the most researched area in the developed nations. The main reason is that learning and teaching attitudes are considered the key factor in successful instructional and pedagogical outcomes for all children regardless their needs and background (Amr, 2011). Teachers' "attitudes", however, refer generally to the outlooks/interpretations of educators on their public education and SEN students or on the things (state or fact) around them in an educational program (e.g., legislations and policies, curricula, and available education settings). These interpretations might be positive, neutral, or negative (Al-Ahmadi, 2009). In author word, "attitudes" can consider inclinations that outcome from a congregation of feelings, beliefs and behaviours as expressions of favour or disfavour toward an object or a person (Montes, Caballero & Rodríguez, 2016).

The literature conclude that knowledge and attitudes of teachers play a significant role in the integration of SEN children into main-stream classrooms (Amr, 2011). Attitudes are also important in developing social inter-action among students with and without disabilities, their teachers and their families (Author, 2015). To be well perceived by all those involved, IE needs to specified conditions, such as the existence of positive attitudes and perceptions, be met. Confirming the effect of teachers' attitudes on inclusion policies is also vital, and appropriate knowledge and attitudes contribute to the successful implementation of this setting (Al-Ahmadi, 2009). While, in contrast, the unwelcome or negative attitudes of teachers can also influence the way they address their children' needs in other educational environments, such as in IE.

Many researches have connected attitudes of teachers toward IE; specifically, their attitudes affect their behaviours toward disabled children, influencing the education environment and school outcomes. Forlin and

Chambers (2010) studied the effect of having practical experience with these children on the attitudes and concerns of teachers toward integration practices. They inferred that the understanding and knowledge of teachers about educational policies related to IE increased, and that their perceived levels of confidence and knowledge in becoming professional-educators also improved. They found also that the stress levels of teachers increased when told that they have children with SENs in their general classrooms. Simi (2008) investigated teacher educators and preservice teachers' attitudes, knowledge and understanding on special education and inclusive education concept. The findings indicated that both groups of teachers appeared to have limited knowledge and understanding on what principles special and inclusive education approach. Hodgkinson (2005), indicated that the majority of these teachers have limited knowledge and understanding of the implementation of inclusive education and they see it as a complex and multi-levelled concept (M'mbijiweet al., 2018).

Many studies have been carried out to examine the teachers' attitudes towards IE. Some of researchers concluded that certain educators had a positive attitude towards the IE of disabled children (Kim, 2011; Park & Chitiyo, 2011; Chhabra, Srivastava, & Srivastava, 2010). While, in contrast, other researchers have founded that form teachers have a negative attitude towards these children with SENs and inclusion practices (Sharma, Moore, & Sonawane, 2009; Hwang, 2011; Sahbaz & Kalay, 2010). A few studies have revealed that teachers have neither an undecided nor a negative attitude towards IE (Kuyini & Mangope, 2011; Sucuoglu et al., 2013; Hamaidi et al., 2012).

Attitudes of teachers to IE are generally influenced by the issues they face while carried out this setting. These problems involve (1) lack of training or teaching experience with disabled students and their programs, (2) shortage of school support services and its equipment and materials, (3) nature and severity of the child's disability, (4) large number of students in classrooms, (5) shortage of time per period or classroom time for educators to support inclusion, and (6) poor parental participation and support (Amr, 2011; Author, 2015; Sucuoglu et al., 2013).

### **Jordanian Context**

Jordan is relatively a small country with a population of 6,249,000 million people in 2011 (Jordan Statistical Yearbook, 2011) and is rapidly growing due to Syrian and Iraqi refugees and others. Jordan is a developing country suffering from limited natural resources and instability and conflicts in the neighbouring-countries. The Jordanian education system is responsible for providing free and appropriate education for students with and without disabilities, because it is their fundamental-right. The kingdom is ranked in 2008 first at the Arab level and fourth at the inter-national level with medium probability of achieving the aim of "Education for All" (Alodat et al., 2014). It is also considered an educated community; around 89% of the population can

1 read and write, 25% are public school students, and more 23% hold a college  
2 or bachelor degree (Author, 2014).

3 The exact number for students with disabilities in Jordan is currently  
4 not available (Author, 2015). Taking into consideration the estimated  
5 prevalence of disability by the United Nations (UN) is globally 10%; this  
6 means that the kingdom of Jordan is expected to have nearly 600,000 children  
7 with SENs. Although the Ministry of Education (MoE) indicated 16,870  
8 students with SENs enrolled in government schools, the real number of out of  
9 school (un-enrolment) those students is unknown (UNICEF, 2015). Among  
10 the different kinds of disability, blindness and healthy and physical disabilities  
11 are showed to be dominant. The baseline study of disabilities revealed that  
12 24.6% of children aged 0-to-14 and 5.1 % of children aged 15-to-19 have  
13 special education needs (Department of Statistics, 2010). UNICEF (2015)  
14 indicates that, however, there is no functioning national system for the  
15 detection and assessment of disabled children, and no coherent-data to track or  
16 respond to their needs.

17 The priority aim in Jordanian educational policies, like in many  
18 developing countries, has been to ensure that students with ant without  
19 disabilities have access to equal educational opportunities, in the first instance  
20 basic-education (Amr, 2011). To ensure this target, the kingdom has created  
21 different types of public schools like schools for normal students, special  
22 education schools for students with different-disabilities and main-stream  
23 schools which include both all students including SENs, but the option of  
24 main-stream schools usually are being limited (Author, 2015). The Jordan  
25 MoE enhanced de-centralization to the school and directorate levels,  
26 developing the “Education Management Information System” (EMIS), and  
27 providing the “International Computer Driving License” (ICDL) and Intel  
28 Teach Program credential to all public general and special education teachers  
29 since 2003. A number of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) took  
30 voluntarily the initiative to sit-up schools and centres for children with SENs  
31 (Amr, 2011; UNICEF,2015).

32 There have been important developments with respect to special  
33 education policies and programs since 1990s. The first education act for the  
34 Welfare of Disabled People (WoDP) (12\_1993) in Jordan was issued to  
35 recognize in their rights, which its stipulated that equal health-care, education,  
36 work is a right for children with SENs each according to their own abilities  
37 (Alodat et al., 2014). In order to create the best educational services and  
38 environments, the previous law WoDP replaced by a new law that it’s called  
39 the Act on the Rights of Disabled People (RoDP) (31\_ 2007) in 2007. The  
40 RoDP seeks to ensure that these children have every opportunity to educate  
41 within IE in the Jordanian schools and universities, where appropriate and  
42 experience as little or no segregation as possible (Author, 2015).  
43 Unfortunately, though these various provisions of the law supporting the  
44 inclusive education of SEN students in Jordan has passed since 1993, it is not  
45 practically practiced as requested in the real-world with these students (Al-  
46 Bustanji et. al, 2018).

## Purpose and Questions of the Study

Given the movement about more inclusive education classroom in public schools, there has been a growing increasingly in advocating an education wide support system for these SEN children, in which all school teachers can play together a very significant role in this process. Creating such an approach needs to be depended on in-depth and common understanding of the teachers' attitudes and their knowledge for this setting. An inclusion policy and pertained practices, however, are not basically part of teacher education designed to prepare the pre-and-in-service teachers in Jordan. Given the MoE's objectives related to IE policy, these teachers will face full-inclusion that many have inexperienced before. Based on the hypothesis that attitudes of teachers regarding integration could have an important effect on the success of current education plans and policies, and the fact that comparative studies between GE and SE teachers' attitudes about inclusive practices in the Jordanian context are mostly not existing, the object of the present study was to investigate of teachers' attitudes regarding IE in public elementary schools. Mixed method approach will provide information on why attitudes and their knowledge variables of educators is vital to implement the IE. Thus, the present investigation attempts to answer the study questions as following:

- 1) What are the attitude levels of the SE and GE teachers toward IE for disabled children in Jordan?
- 2) Is there any mean difference in the attitudes between SE teachers and GE teachers toward IE for disabled children in Jordan, according to their gender, age, and experiences?
- 3) Are there statistically significant differences between SE teachers and GE teachers' attitudes towards IE for disabled children in Jordan?
- 4) what do school teachers know about IE in Jordan?

## Methodology of the Study

### *Participants and Procedure*

The study design involved the application of mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative), as it was thought that it could supply in-depth understanding of the current situation. The qualitative data were gathered through the semi-structured interview, and field observations and practices. An interview guide with a group of open ended questions that demand written responses regarding IE was developed and applied in this regard. The quantitative dataset was collected utilizing structured research questionnaire which included closed-multiple choice questions that allowed respondents to give their own-understandings.

The used measurement for data collection tools was mailed to selected school mangers administrating 1498 teachers from different public schools across several educational directorates of Jordan. The data was collected from a total of nine educational directorates, Capital, Sahab, Deir Ala, Alkoura,

Irbid, Ajlone, Al-Kark, southern badia, and Aqabal located among nine geographical-regions. Respondents who are a SE and GE teachers were randomly selected among schools from participating directorates. after approval granted by the MoE, all the survey packages used herein were sent to the managers of the schools. The managers provided the measurement for the school teachers who were a volunteer to participate in the present study and returned the survey by regular email. Of the 1498 educators contacted, 847 completely answered the study measurement and returned them to their school managers. The teachers responded the measurement with a success rate of 56.46%. The distribution of respondents according to their specialist field (special education or general education) is as follows: 67.41% were GE teachers, and 32.59% were SE teachers; 54.26% of the respondents were females and the remaining 45.74% were males. The revised data gathered, however, were moved to the computer environment for an analytic process.

#### *Data Collection and Analysis Tools*

The Scale of Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Classrooms (STATIC) (Cochran, 2000) revised and adapted into Jordanian context by Researcher was used in order to identify the level of teachers' attitudes towards IE for SEN children. The scale consists of 20 items and four sub dimension, namely, (1) dealing with the "advantages and disadvantages" of IE (7 items); (2) dealing with "professional issues" regarding IE (5 items); (3) dealing with "philosophical issues" related to IE (4 items); and (4) dealing with the "logistics" of IE (4 items). Point Likert-type items' scores obtainable of scale was categorized into a five ordinal level scale (strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), neutral (N), agree (A), and strongly agree (SA). A teacher's high score on the measurement indicates a more positive tendency and high level of attitudes regarding inclusion. The Cronbach's reliability coefficient was found to be .89.25 for the entire measurement, and .93, .85, .89, and .90 for the sub dimensions, respectively. These values indicated that these sub-dimensions are adequate and reliable and that it may be used for the actual research.

SPSS software was used in this study to analyse the data collection. The following statistical tests were utilized in present study: Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies, percentages, means, and Standard Deviations(SDs) used to test the first question while hypothesis performed utilizing t-test, and one-way ANOVA at 0.05 significance level. The overall mean score was used to interpret it as follows: 1.00 to 2.33, it was considered low; 2.34 to 3.66, it was considered moderate; 3.67 to 5, it was considered high. Thematic analysis also was used to interpret data collected from the semi-structured interviews.

## **Results**

### **Research Question 1.**

The GE teachers and SE teachers' responses on attitude measurement are illustrated in Table 1.

*Table 1* Percentages, Means, and SDs of the Responses Based on the Attitudes Scale

Items	Percentage (%)					M.	SDs.
	SD.	D.	N.	A.	SA.		
1.	23.5	25.0	14.3	22.6	12.7	2.72	1.281
2.	43.8	33.4	14.1	6.3	7.4	1.98	1.204
3.	29.4	25.3	11.6	17.5	9.1	2.53	1.309
4.	31.0	23.4	17.3	21.7	11.6	2.62	1.465
5.	27.1	23.0	28.3	15.3	6.2	2.51	1.115
6.	15.0	11.2	19.9	31.8	30.9	3.36	1.451
7.	6.8	9.1	18.5	36.1	27.6	3.72	1.272
8.	19.2	24.5	6.2	23.6	27.5	3.13	1.416
9.	5.9	12.1	10.4	26.2	43.1	3.92	1.354
10.	6.8	20.4	10.5	36.7	28.0	3.56	1.159
11.	9.1	19.2	12.6	22.2	32.6	3.53	1.464
12.	28.0	23.3	15.4	14.4	22.8	2.78	1.428
13.	26.1	24.5	11.6	23.1	12.8	2.81	1.457
14.	41.5	34.8	12.9	7.5	5.5	1.92	.994
15.	15.2	18.6	26.0	18.1	22.2	3.16	1.302
16.	6.5	2.9	12.9	31.6	43.8	4.00	1.237
17.	36.4	29.8	14.6	11.5	7.0	2.26	1.169
18.	28.6	44.2	15.5	9.3	4.2	2.15	1.240
19.	42.0	39.2	14.9	3.9	7.1	1.86	.933
20.	22.0	27.7	9.3	13.4	20.4	2.92	1.533
Total	23.2%	23.6%	14.7%	19.5%	19.2%	2.90	1.294

Result from Table 1 disclosed percentages, means, and SDs responses of the teachers on the attitude available for IE in Jordan. The overall mean score of school teachers' attitudes was 2.90 (SDs = 1.294). A score closes to 3 on the attitudes sub-scale refers to respondents' "moderate attitudes" toward statements that indicate their attitudes towards IE. Therefore, SE and GE teachers possessed "moderate or natural" attitudes. Statistically, the means and SDs of all items for both groups of teachers showed moderate attitudes toward the school inclusion of disabled children. Specifically, SE teachers had a mean score of 3.15 and SDs of 1.184, while GE teachers had a mean score of 2.66 and SDs of 1.177.

## Research Question 2.

Findings related to differences in attitude variable toward inclusion attributed to SE and ME teachers' characteristics and the total score of questionnaire (STATIC) as follows:

**Attitude and Gender.** Result from Table 2 yielded that 'male' and 'female' teachers had significantly different attitudes regarding integration



settings ( $t=-2.670$ ,  $P=0.002^*$ ). The finding also revealed that 'male' teachers had more positive attitudes toward inclusion ( $M=2.98$ ,  $SD=0.555$ ) than female teachers ( $F=2.83$ ,  $SD=0.551$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis for the research question can be rejected.

*Table 2 T-test Results of the Attitude Variable Based on the Gender Groups*

Group Statistics of Teachers' Attitudes				(Levene's Test)		T-test for Equality of Means		
Position	Gender	Mean	SD	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig.
SE Teachers	Male	3.19	0.328	2.22	.138	-2.042	135	.004*
	Female	3.11	0.613	2			1	
ME Teachers	Male	2.73	0.557	0.34	.556	-1.852	220	.074
	Female	2.56	0.572	5			1	
Total	Male	2.98	0.555	3.37	.068	-2.670	317	.002*
	Female	2.83	0.651	4				

**Attitude and Age.** The ANOVA test results are illustrated in Table 3. The statistically significant differences have not been found between mean both groups of SE and GE teachers in terms of age levels. In both two groups the best results were attained by the participants of the first group, that is those who reported a mean score of 3.15 ( $SDs=0.524$ ) and the ANOVA test between the means gave ( $F=1.002$ ,  $P=0.411$ ).

*Table 3 ANOVA Results of the Attitude Variable Based on the Age Groups*

Group Statistics of Teachers' Attitude				ANOVA		Tukey's Test
Position	Age groups	M	SD	F	Sig.	
SE Teachers	less 30 to over 46 years	3.15	.554	1.002	.411	-
ME Teachers	less 30 to over 46 years	2.66	.532	1.647	.263	-
Total both groups	less 30 to over 46 years	2.90	.541	1.321	.693	-

**Attitude and Experience.** The statistically significant differences also have not been found between mean both groups of SE and GE teachers across experience levels. In both two groups the best results were attained by the participants of the first group, that is those who reported a mean score of 3.15 ( $SDs=0.1536$ ) and the ANOVA test between the means gave ( $F=2.045$ ,  $P=.057$ ). The ANOVA test results are revealed in Table 4.

*Table 4 ANOVA Results of the Attitude Variable based on the Experience Groups*

Group Statistics of Teachers' Attitude				ANOVA		Tukey's Test
Position	Groups	M	SD	F	Sig.	
SE Teachers	less 1 to over 21 years	3.15	1.536	2.045	.057	-

ME Teachers	less 1 to over 21 years	2.66	1.501	3.142	.082	-
Total both groups	less 1 to over 21 years	2.90	1.516	3.339	.067	-

**Research Question 3.** T-test statistics of the mean ratings of GE teachers and SE teachers to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between them on Attitude Scale are showed in Table 5.

*Table 5* GE and SE Teachers Psychometric Characteristics for Summated Attitude Scale

Items	No.	GE M.	GE SDs.	SE M.	SE SDs.	P-value
Advantages and Disadvantages	7.	2.86	.697	3.19	.688	.083
Professional Issues	5.	2.45	.710	3.21	.632	.375
Philosophical Issues	4.	3.23	.754	3.62	.683	.097
Logistics concerns	4.	2.06	.658	2.77	.693	.004*
Total Test	20.	2.66	.569	3.15	.523	.143

Result from Table 5 revealed GE teachers had a mean score of 2.66 (SDs=0.568) and SE teachers had a mean score of 3.15 (SDs=0.523;  $P=0.143$ ). These findings indicate that no statistically significant difference existed in teachers' overall attitudes regarding IE for disabled children between SE teachers and GE teachers, but special teachers had high level mean scores comparing with general teachers. Meanwhile, t-test results only disclosed that a statistically significant difference existed in the attitudes of GE and SE teachers regarding "logistical concern areas" ( $P=0.004^*$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis for the research hypothesis cannot be rejected.

**Research Question 4.** The semi-structured interview questions developed to know how much educators' knowledge and understanding had on the term of IE. Thus, teachers were asked to define the concept of inclusion according to their current understanding. Many educators, especially GE teachers shared similar views that the IE term was completely new to them. The ideas of the teachers are abstracted in these extracts:

*"I really don't know... I have no idea whatsoever on process of the integration before". (A5/G)*

*"Inclusion is a new concept and term to me... Never come across it (IE) during my preparing and work here at the MoE". (A2/G)*

*"I have no knowledge nor understanding about this theme as GE teachers. I never hear it (IE) during the university courses". (A9/G)*

Whereas many participants who have some knowledge and understanding regarding IE, were responded in typical way the same question. Teachers expressed this concept as follows:

1 *"Inclusion would be education that care and provision to meet the*  
 2 *needs of each student in the ordinary classes despite their background,*  
 3 *gift, ability or disability etc. ". (A13/S)*

4 *"I think that, it (IE) is a type of education regard to handicapped*  
 5 *children into the regular schools". (A15/S)*

6 *"It (IE) is a new education that had just recently legalized... whereby*  
 7 *disabled students should be integrated into the public schools and all*  
 8 *parts of development in the community". (A1/S)*  
 9

## 10 **Discussion Based on Major Results**

11  
 12 Although the literature indicated a non-systematic relationship between  
 13 teachers' attitudes and geographical area of the teachers surveyed (El-Ashry,  
 14 2009), these findings are consistent with other research conducted in Jordanian  
 15 context. For example, Al-Zyoudi (2006) found that Jordanian educators  
 16 generally had moderate or neutral attitudes as well as revealed that disabled  
 17 children should have a chance to attend IE. Meanwhile, this result supported  
 18 and confirmed findings carried out in developed countries and a recent review  
 19 of 26 researches that concluded that the majority of educators hold relatively  
 20 moderate attitudes towards the inclusion of disabled students (De-Boer, Pijl &  
 21 Minnaert, 2011). Interestingly, these findings presented similar views from  
 22 other researchers (Forlin et al., 2010; Gao, 2011; M'mbijiweet al., 2018).

23 Teachers strongly believed that IE will require exclusive training in this  
 24 regard, which should be required for SE and GE teachers (Item 16), and they  
 25 also agreed that students who have SENs should be placed in special education  
 26 settings (Item 7). The reason for such opinions is that school teachers could  
 27 have in challenges teaching individuals with cognitive difficulties or lack  
 28 inclusion training, especially among main-stream educators. While, educators  
 29 who expressed that they did not support IE were concerned with several issues,  
 30 such as whether school managers were favourable of integration (Item 19). A  
 31 study done by Hamaidi et al. (2012) determined the gap between theory of  
 32 inclusion and actual practices in schools of Jordan. They showed that this gap  
 33 is affected by economic issues as well as administration and technical support,  
 34 which is negatively influenced by the provision needed to achieve IE  
 35 (Sucuoglu et al., 2013). In addition to the 'disability' concept is an indefinite in  
 36 it-self, and children' needs may barely be conceptualized in a single-dichotomy  
 37 of special and general education options. Both groups expressed concern on  
 38 whether teachers were adequately trained to address the learning aims and  
 39 needs for these SEN students.

40 The IE policy stipulates that educating environments of all children  
 41 should rightly reflect, to the extent possible, the society in which they will be  
 42 effective and productive. Present data could indicate that both groups have  
 43 "neutral" attitudes, but the attitudes of these SE teachers are more sportive  
 44 regarding integration than GE teachers. This result has been confirmed in  
 45 previous research (Tisdall, 2007), which argue that SE groups have more  
 46 positive attitudes toward inclusion than GE groups. This may be attributed to  
 47 the tendency of Jordanian's SE educators to have more special education  
 48 courses and workshops. These findings are validated by other studies (Gao,

2011). Educators' willingness to include SEN students into integration is associated to the number of special-education courses and training in which they have taken (Al-Bustanji et. al, 2018). Another reason, Jordan's GE educators have less positive attitudes about theme of IE due to the fact that they tend to have more of a realistic attitude regarding the amendment of Act RoDP in 2007. The key-word may be the teacher preparation and training.

The Jordanian schooling legislations ensure the mitigation of the classroom size and limits the number of SEN students in a single main-stream class. These policies might be inadequate when the IE of a disabled student is implemented. It appears that extra work hands are usually required and needed. The lack of extra-support might be one of the major reasons for the Jordanian educators' more negative evaluations (items, 7,9,16) for inclusion in public schools. The extra work problem seems that need to first be considered (Gao, 2011). The significance of extra work support is clarified by the observed relation between school teacher stress and support absence in a case in which students who have SEN were placed in ordinary classes.

For the differences in the attitude variable based on teacher gender, statistically significant difference was found between male and female teachers in each group. The present analysis confirmed that gender (male) and special education variables had a more significant influence on teacher attitude than the general education variable. As the research evidence seems inconsistent (Montes, Caballero & Rodríguez, 2016), this study did not assume that males or females held more favourite attitudes about SEN children or the integration practice. When evidence of gender differences exists, such finding may ascribe to the effect of other variables, such as amount of information or years of specialized experience held.

The mean t scores of both groups of GE teachers and SE teachers were compared for the total STATIC. The findings did not indicate significant differences in the attitude variables of both groups towards IE in the total p-value (0.143). The results were agreed with earlier findings of Kieran (2012). Given that SE participants had typically more training and experience for teaching disabled children, the trend in both attitudes and training of the educators was expected. Forlin et al. (2010). also reported the value of teaching experience and training on educators' attitudes towards IE (Author, 2015).

Not all of the STATIC dimension followed the same pattern of findings. The area of "logistics of inclusion" yielded a statistically significant difference between both groups of teachers' attitudes, whereby GE groups had more concerns regarding IE in comparison with the SE groups in the dimension. The reasons for the observed-differences in this dimension between the teachers remain un-certain in present compare, but some guesses could be made. Kieran (2012) concluded that educational interventions for children are obtainable less than half the time in the general classes, and such programs are not orderly executed. GE participants may have voiced more concern with inclusion-logistics due to fewer provision and interventions were irregularly implemented. It could be proposed that with more relevant experiences on how to interventions are provided, these educators' attitudes toward IE provision would increase and become even more positive and be more likely to promote this setting. Jordanian schooling system, however, was more segregating due to

special education provision was provided in separate-schools. This explanation may be partly interpreted the differences between SE and GE teachers' attitudes in Jordanian schools.

With respect to participants' knowledge and understanding on the theme of IE, Participants who most of them from GE teachers answered that the theme and term were a quite new and abstract concept for them. This answers reflect an absents of in-depth understanding and enough knowledge on mainly components to IE concept. By contrast, many teachers seem to have in-depth knowledge of what IE is all about. Special teachers may be already had an enough knowledge in inclusive and special education programs as compared to the GE teachers who are not specialist in the SE field. The main reason back to fact that the theme of inclusive education doesn't formally include at universe education. Another reason is that little or no opportunities are available for GE teachers to study specialized courses or attend workshops for specialized/inclusive education settings during their track employment in Jordan.

This research's limitations involve the low-return rate of the present survey, which may have pre-disposed the findings to a methodical error. This probability, however, is lowered by the observation that perception of teachers regarding IE have not been observed to be connected with the mentioned return rate of the study tool. The number of "GE" participants in the selected sample were exceeded the number of "SE". This did not appear to be a big problem due to insignificant differences were found between the teacher categories. Nevertheless, the participant views on the size of needed resources and support might somewhat be unreasonable and exaggerated, especially if they have no personal-experience in the execution of school inclusion.

### **Implications of the Study**

- The national education institutions should review their current planning and curriculum so that IE goals can also be a part of their educating courses and training programs.
- MoE should provide the prepared and trained teachers to treat this challenge through a sufficient-knowledge base, incorporate a new practical instructional-techniques as well as development of required attitudes and skills that would be useful to succeed IE.
- MoE should build and promote opportunities for collaboration between GE and SE approach into professional development and teacher preparation programs for all involved.
- The government should obviously formulate a new legislation on the definition of inclusion process, including all the different aspects and types of disabilities.

### **Conclusion**

IE is considered a new practice in education of disabled children, and it is a philosophy and approach that will follow and continue into the future

education. Therefore, the present study addresses attitudes and knowledge of teachers regarding integration approach and how those variables are reflected in their behaviors in this setting. There are, however, many reasons why IE goals is not fully implemented or supported in Jordan. There is lack of in-depth understanding, knowledge and attitudes for teachers that impact negatively on the development of IE practices. Another reasons are such as a lack of resources, support, and integrated-teachers training, at both the SE and GE level, to work and problem-solve collaboratively with all students regardless their disabilities. Public schools in rural and remote areas may be also have teachers concerned with other things such as lack of facilities, drop-out rates, violence, and drugs. Even with all the helps and supports, carrying out integration provision remains to be a daunting task. Attitudes of educators are the most significant aspect in developing a successful-integration classes. More information of teachers' attitudes regarding integration are needed to execute the new types of educational practices for SEN students into the regular classes.

## References

- Al-Ahmadi, N. A. 2009. *"Teachers' perspectives and attitudes towards integrating students with learning disabilities in regular Saudi public schools."* (Doctoral dissertation). The College of Education of Ohio University, Ohio.
- Al-Bustanji, M. A., H. A. Almakani., M. Beirat and N. T. Al Bdour. 2018. "Preservice Special Education Teachers' Levels of Knowledge of Behaviour Modification Principles." *Journal of Studies in Education*, 8(1), 35-50.
- Alodat. A., H. Almakani and M. Zumberg. 2014. "Inclusive Education within the Jordanian Legal Framework: Overview of Reality and Suggestions for Future." *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(5), 220-226.
- Al-Zyoudi, M. 2006. "Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education in Jordanian schools." *International Journal of Special Education*, 21 (2), 55-63. Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ843606.pdf>
- Amr, M. 2011. "Teacher education for inclusive education in the Arab world: the case of Jordan." *Springer*, 41, 399-413. DOI 10.1007/s11125-011-9203-9
- Chhabra, S., R. Srivastava and I. Srivastava. 2010. "Inclusive education in Botswana: the perceptions of school teachers." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, Chhabraol, 20(4), 219-228.

- 1 Cochran, H. K. 2000. "Differences in teachers' attitudes toward inclusive  
2 education as measured by the Scale of Teachers' Attitudes Toward  
3 Inclusive Classrooms." *Paper presented at the annual meeting of  
4 the Mid-Western Educational Research Association*, Chicago, IL.
- 5 De-Boer, A., S. J. Pijl and Minnaert. 2011. "Regular primary schoolteacher's  
6 attitudes towards inclusive education: a review of the literature."  
7 *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(3), 331-353.
- 8 Department of Statistics. 2010. "*Disability in Jordan. Labour and  
9 unemployment.*" <http://dosweb.dos.gov.jo/>
- 10 El-Ashry, F. R. 2009. "General education pre-service teachers' attitudes toward  
11 inclusion in Egypt". (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Florida.  
12 Retrieved from: [http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0024244/elashry\\_f.pdf](http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0024244/elashry_f.pdf)
- 13 Forlin, C., and D Chambers. 2011. "Teacher preparation for inclusive  
14 education:increasing knowledge but raising concerns, Asia-pacific."  
15 *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 17-32.
- 16 Gaad, E. 2011. "*Inclusive education in the Middle East.* Abingdon:  
17 Routledge."
- 18 Gallagher, D. J., L. Heshusius, R. P. Iano and T. M. Skrtic. 2004. "*Challenging  
19 orthodoxy in special education.*" Denver: Love.
- 20 Gao, W. 2011. "Enhancing preservice teachers' sense of efficacy and attitudes  
21 toward school diversity through preparation: A case study of on U.S.  
22 inclusive teacher education program." *International Journal of Special  
23 Education*, 26 (2), 1-16.
- 24 Hamaidi, D., M. Homidi and L. Reyes. 2012, "International views of inclusive  
25 education: a comparative study of early childhood educator's  
26 perceptions in Jordan, United Arab Emirates, and the United States of  
27 America." *International Journal of Special Education*, 27(2),94-101.  
28 Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ982864.pdf>
- 29 Hodgkinson, A. 2005. "Conceptions and misconceptions of inclusive education.  
30 A critical examination of final-year teacher trainees' knowledge and  
31 understanding of inclusion." *Research in Education*, 73, 15-28.
- 32 Hwang, Y. 2011. "Attitudes towards Inclusion: gaps between belief and  
33 practice." *International Journal of Special Education*, 26(1), 1-22.  
34 <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>
- 35 Jordan Statistical Yearbook. 2011. "Department of Statistics. Issue No. 62.  
36 Amman: Jordan." The Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with  
37 Disabilities. 2007. Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.  
38 Amman: Jordan.
- 39 Kieran, L. P. 2012. "*High school teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of  
40 students with high-functioning Autism.*" (Doctoral Dissertation). Walden  
41 University. Retrieved from: ProQuest digital dissertations  
42 database (UMI 3499743)
- 43 Kim, J. 2011. "Influence of teacher preparation programs on pre-service  
44 teacher's attitudes toward inclusion." *International Journal of Inclusive  
45 Education*, 5(3), 355-377.
- 46 Kuittinen, E. 2017. "Inclusive education from teachers' perspective:  
47 Explorking Chilean teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy." Master's

- 1 Thesis in Special Education. University of Jyväskylä.  
 2 Department of Education and Psychology.
- 3 Kuyini, A. B., and B. Mangope. 2011. "Student teachers' attitudes and  
 4 concerns about inclusive education in Ghana and Botswana."  
 5 *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 7(1), 20-37.
- 6 M'mbijiwe. J. M., N. Jagero, B. M. Mburugu, and H. K. Barchok. 2018.  
 7 "Relationship Between Curriculum Content Management and  
 8 Transition of Public Primary School Learners with Disabilities to  
 9 Secondary School in Kenya." *European Journal of Special Education*  
 10 *Research*, 3 (4), 72-79. Doi: 10.5281/Zenodo.1296133
- 11 Malak, S. 2013. "Inclusive education reform in Bangladesh: pre-service  
 12 teachers' responses to include students with special educational needs in  
 13 regular classrooms." *International Journal of Instruction*, 6(1), 196-  
 14 214.
- 15 Montes, P. A. G., J. N. Caballero and C. A. Rodríguez. 2016. "English  
 16 teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education: A literature review."  
 17 *Avances en Educación Humanidades*, 1 (1), 61-74.
- 18 Mostert, M. P., K. A. Kavale and J. M. Kauffman. 2008. "*Challenging the*  
 19 *refusal of reasoning in special education*." Denver, CO: Love.
- 20 National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities [NJCLD] 2005.  
 21 "*Responsiveness to intervention and learning disabilities*." Retrieved  
 22 January 20, 2008, www. ldonline.org/nj eld
- 23 Özokcu, O. (2018). "The Relationship Between Teacher Attitude and Self-  
 24 Efficacy for Inclusive-Practices in Turkey." *Journal of Education and*  
 25 *Training Studies*, 6, (3), 6-12. <http://jets.redfame.com>
- 26 Park, M., and M. Chitiyo. 2011. "An Examination of Teacher Attitudes  
 27 Towards Children with Autism." *Journal of Research in Special*  
 28 *Educational Needs* 11 (1): 70-78
- 29 Sahbaz, U., and G. Kalay. 2010. "The determination of views of pre-school  
 30 student teachers. related with inclusion." *Journals of Mehmet Akif*  
 31 *Ersoy University Education Faculty*, 19, 116-135.
- 32 Sharma, U., D. Moore, and S. Sonawane. 2009. "Attitudes and concerns of pre-  
 33 service teachers regarding inclusion of students with disabilities into  
 34 regular schools in Pune, India." *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher*  
 35 *Education*, 37 (3), 319-331. DOI:10.1080/13598660903050328
- 36 Simi, J. 2008. "Teacher Educators' and Pre-service Teachers' Attitudes,  
 37 Knowledge and Understanding on Special Education and Inclusive  
 38 Education in the Solomon Islands." (Master Thesis). The University of  
 39 Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- 40 Slee, R. 2011. "*The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive*  
 41 *education*." Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- 42 Sucuoglu, B., Bakkaloglu, H., Iscan, F., Akalin, S., & Demir, S. 2013.  
 43 "Inclusive Preschool teachers: Their attitudes and knowledge about  
 44 inclusion." *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*,  
 45 5(2), 107-128.
- 46 Tisdall, E. K. M. 2007. "Social Inclusion or Exclusion? Recent Policy trends in  
 47 Scottish children's services for disabled children' in Education, Social



- 1 Justice and Interagency Working: Joined up or fracture policy?” Eds. S.
- 2 Riddell and L.Tett. London: Routledge, 188-200.
- 3 UNESCO. 2010. “*EFA global monitoring report: Reaching the marginalized.*”
- 4 [Http://Www.Unesco.Org/En/ Free /Reports/2010-Marginalization.](http://Www.Unesco.Org/En/Free/Reports/2010-Marginalization)
- 5 UNICEF 2015. “Jordan Country Report on out-of-School Children.” Middle
- 6 East and North Africa out-of-School Children Initiative.
- 7
- 8
- 9

FOR REVIEW ONLY