

# General Education Teachers' Awareness Of The Requirements Of Full Inclusion For Students With Disabilities

Dareen Khlaifat

## Abstract

*The aim of this study is to identify the awareness degree of male and female teachers of general education of the full inclusion requirements. The descriptive approach that based on describing the general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities at public school setting was adopted. An electronic questionnaire was specifically prepared to achieve the aim of this study and sent to the study subjects via an electronic link. The study sample consisted of 153 males and 367 females (N=520) of general education teachers at the Eastern Province in kingdom of Saudi Arabia, in light of a number of the study variables.*

*The results indicated that the teachers have a high level of awareness in terms of the teaching adaptation requirements, followed by awareness of the environmental modification requirements, educational requirements, awareness requirements, and support requirements. The results also revealed that there are significant differences at the level of ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the domains of the inclusion requirements that are attributed to the gender variable in favor of female teachers, and in the domains of awareness of the inclusion requirements that are attributed to the variable of educational qualification between (diploma and bachelor's degree holders) in favor of the Bachelor's degree holders, between (diploma and postgraduate studies) in favor of postgraduate studies and between postgraduates and bachelor's degree holders in favor of the Bachelor's degree holders. The results of the awareness of the inclusion requirements among those with the experience of (5-10 years and 16 or more) and those with (11-15 and 16 or more) indicated that there are significant differences at the level of ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in favor of (16 or more) years of experience. Finally, the results revealed that there are differences in the degree of teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion that are attributed to the variable of whether teachers have relatives with disabilities or not in favor of having relatives with disabilities.*

**Key Words:** Full Inclusion, General Education, Awareness, Full Inclusion Requirements, Students with Disabilities.

## Introduction

The care of students with disabilities has gone through the stages of: rejection and isolation, institutional care, and finally the full inclusion which is considered one of the latest contemporary global trends in the field of providing educational services to students with

disabilities. Full inclusion aims to support the principle of all students receiving their education in classroom settings at a neighborhood regular school, in addition to taking advantage of the individual differences to develop the education quality in such schools. Thus, the educational methods and strategies are modified to meet the students' needs in a way that helps teachers diligently and actively work with both students with disabilities and students without disabilities to meet such needs and effectively participate in the educational process.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights to free and compulsory education for all children in 1966 marked the beginning of care for people with disabilities. In the same year, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was adopted, as stated in Article 13, which stipulates that primary education is compulsory and free for all. In 1989, the right of all children to obtain education without discrimination on any basis was guaranteed, and it was adopted by (189) countries. Afterwards, the first agreement on education for all was concluded through the "Conference on Education For All " held in 1990 in Jomtien and so it was called (Jomtien Declaration). In 1993, the Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities were approved, where Article (6) stipulates equal rights for all children and adults with disabilities to receive education. The standards also stipulate that education be in an integrated learning environment in a regular school. The Salamanca Statement and the Framework for Action on Special Needs Education held in 1994 confirmed that "Schools should accommodate all children regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions", followed by the World Education Forum (2000), where the Dakar Framework for Action stipulated that all children have access to education and complete free primary education by (2015). In 2000, it was agreed to declare the (E9) Education for All, at the fourth summit of the nine countries with high population densities. This was followed by focusing on "Education for All" in 2001, that is, the right of education for persons with disabilities, by linking "Education for All" with the "Salamanca Framework for Action" and the need to include children with disabilities, by working in six regions. All of this was concluded by the United Nations Convention of 2006 on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which strengthens the right of persons with disabilities to inclusive education in December 2011. It should be noted that education is a social, economic, and cultural right (Rieser, 2012).

Full inclusion is defined as a system of equality for students with disabilities. It includes a commitment to educating every child to the maximum extent possible, identifying the appropriate educational alternative, and teaching students in the most appropriate and diverse environment. In general, full inclusion means providing full education to all students in general education settings and at schools close to their place of residence, regardless of their circumstances of disability, academic level, need for services, or parents' desire (Al-Zaboun, 2013).

Florian, one of the pioneers in investigating full inclusion, defines it as "Providing the opportunity for persons with disabilities to fully participate in all academic activities, and work, consumption, recreational, societal and local activities that work on normalizing the local community." (Sheelagh & Sheelagh, 2005)

Full inclusion allows all students with disabilities to fully participate from birth until they graduate from the university and move into the local community. It provides the training and resources that aim to enhance equality among all students and to participate in all aspects of life. Full inclusion is based on nine basic principles: a person's value is independent of his/her abilities and achievements, every individual is capable of feeling and thinking, every individual has the right to communicate and be heard, all human beings need each other, true education can only occur within the context of real relationships, every individual needs support and

friendships from individuals of the same age, progress is achieved for all learners by building on what they can do rather than on their areas of weakness, diversity brings strength to all living systems, and focus should be on collaboration rather than competition. (Rieser et al., 2002)

According to data published by the UNICEF, that more than 80% of the children with disabilities lives in developing countries with little or no access to educational services that suit their needs. The government's involvement is very difficult and limited in terms of implementing inclusive schools, limited funding, facilities, and infrastructure, in addition to the insufficient human resources with competencies appropriate for their domains, as well as the low community engagement in understanding inclusive education.

The most important challenges that are associated with educating and accepting students with disabilities are: low expectations, increased responsibilities, the need for additional time and attention, and the preconceived notions that accompany such attitudes. This is why pre-service teacher preparation is considered an important stage for them to succeed in their work and to improve their attitudes. To make teachers succeed, there should be continuous training, classroom learning support, provision of resources and aids that teachers are capable of using them. This gives the teacher greater confidence and lower levels of burnout, and so teachers' attitudes towards teaching students and accepting them is improved. (Alfaro et al., 2015).

Inclusive education encounters the challenge of the conceptual terminology of people with disabilities. This affects the policy coherence and service provision. In addition, inclusive education encounters the challenges of: lack of school knowledge about people with disabilities. This has serious repercussions on the enrollment process and the inclusion or adaptation of curricula afterwards, with the result of having a negative impact on the school's readiness to include the child; the system's lack of strategic leadership in terms of the skills required to provide quality education for students with disabilities and weakness in diversity planning regarding curriculum reform; providing students with appropriate learning opportunities through the curriculum and obtaining appropriate assessment and post-assessment services; lack of training on how to prepare and use the individualized educational program; the heavy study load on the regular teacher and the poor resources; insufficient institutional and systemic support for inclusive education; negative teachers' attitudes; harmonizing the education process in a way that meet students' individual needs to ensure progress in learning. It is classified as a lack of flexibility on the part of teachers since it is related to professional competence; continuous professional development ; weakness in providing information to parents, especially with regard to decision-making regarding their child with disabilities; lack of participation of parents of children with disabilities; lack of inclusion and integration services, or coordination between them, and parents' low expectations due to their negative experience in previous schools. (Travers et al., 2010)

### **Successful Full Inclusion Requirements**

Inclusive education is a form of educational service that provides equal rights and equity to all children in order to receive the education that is consistent with all advantages and disadvantages. Through inclusive education, All children, regardless of their diverse characteristics and abilities, can continue learning in an excellent way until their cognitive abilities develop. Inclusive education depends on fundamental changes in the educational framework to accommodate the diversity of all students. Comprehensive integration is achieved through inclusive schools that provide educational services to all children fairly, in terms of curricula. Study, intervention, education and evaluation according to the characteristics of each child, and training them in acceptance and mutual respect despite the differences, obstacles and shortcomings of other peers. (Rasmitadila et al., 2018).

The access of students with disabilities to regular schools requires the availability of prerequisites that must be met by the educational system and the school staff before including the students. These prerequisites are: First, making sure that students have access to the school building, the supporting devices and software, and to the curricula. Second, changing the peer attitudes towards those students which can be achieved by inviting students with disabilities to talk about themselves. Third, diversifying the use of curricula to benefit from the different strengths and abilities of these students. Fourth, developing collaborative learning and ensuring effective coordination of educational support. Fifth, involving parents in planning and follow-up. Sixth, developing the empowerment and self-representation of those students through respecting their opinions and desires. Seventh, training the staff in the field of equality and continuous guidance through organizing in-service training programs to help them in making the inclusion process succeed. Finally, forming an administrative committee to supervise the process of developing the inclusion policy. (Rieser et al., 2002).

The most important requirements of full inclusion are: identifying the educational needs that are appropriate to the abilities and physical capabilities of students with mental disability, and their individual social and psychological needs, preparing teachers, planning and implementing appropriate strategies in terms of educational evaluation, preparing individualized educational programs, classroom control rules, and the physical classroom environment, training and play plans and schedules, etc. Moreover, there should also be focus on changing the attitudes of teachers, administrators, students, and parents of students with and without disabilities, preparing teachers and increasing their knowledge of ways to deal with students, teaching methods, choosing appropriate teaching aids and activities for students, and preparing tests and work sheets that are appropriate for the students' needs. (Al-Attayah, 2012)

Moreover, the process of including students into the regular classroom setting requires students to have several properties and skills through which they can perform in the regular classroom setting. Students must have the necessary capabilities to work within the cognitive range present in the classroom setting. They must also have the necessary skills to interact with their peers in the recreational and social activities. They must have the ability to rely on themselves to perform most of the self-care skills and the daily life activities. Finally, they must have the emotional stability necessary to adapt to the classroom environment requirements. (Suc et al., 2016).

### **Previous Arabic and Foreign Studies**

Many studies have investigated the attitudes towards full inclusion, but there is a clear scarcity - according to researchers' knowledge - about awareness of the requirements of full inclusion, especially in the Arab world. The following studies are the most prominent studies that about the dealt with the topic of full inclusion requirements and teachers' awareness of them:

A study was carried out by Yazicioglu (2020) with the aim of revealing the opinions of school principals and advisors working in Anatolian high schools regarding inclusive education. The study data were collected through focus group interviews. The study was conducted in Ankara during (2018-2019) the sample were (school principals and guidance teachers) from different Anatolian secondary schools. The results indicated that there are serious problems in terms of inclusive education practices in the secondary schools. and emphasize that The necessary educational environment are not provided for students with special educational needs, and also teachers do not have the necessary experience in inclusive education.

Vučković et al., (2019) conducted a study to determine teachers' attitudes about inclusive education in Serbia. (970) teachers from various specializations responded to a questionnaire without identifying the participant. The teachers were from primary and secondary schools

from urban and rural areas, and the results showed that teachers support inclusion, and that there is a similarity in teachers' responses towards inclusive education. However, there is still a need to implement inclusive education, especially educating faculty members and involving experts in planning and developing individual educational plans.

The purpose of the study carried out by Rasmitadila et al., (2018) was to Exploring teachers' perceptions of the level of readiness of public primary schools to become inclusive primary schools and the factors that limit them. The study used quantitative survey research, involving 115 participants who were public primary school teachers in Indonesia. Respondents were selected using a multistage random block technique. The data was collected using an open questionnaire, and the data was analyzed using percentage descriptive analysis. The results found that the level of readiness of public primary schools to become comprehensive schools consists of (ready (20%)), not ready (49.60%), and not ready (30.40%). And the obstacles In shaping government primary schools to be inclusive are six factors (availability of facilities and supporting infrastructure (24.35%)), teacher skills (23.48%), availability of special assistant teachers (20%), mentality of parents and community (14.78%), availability of funds (9.57%) ), Government participation (7.82%) Inclusive education must continue to be studied by the government and schools.

Khan et al., (2017) carried out a study were perceptions of primary school teachers towards inclusive education in government schools in Islamabad were investigated as inclusive education is supported by Sight savers and other international organizations. The study was conducted in six randomly selected primary schools. A purposive sampling method was used to select (54) teachers (trained and untrained in comprehensive education) working in the same schools. To collect data, a structured questionnaire (Likert scale) and a structured interview were used. The results of the study revealed that inclusive education is desirable as teachers believe that all learners regardless of their disability should be in regular classrooms, with a preference for children with mild disabilities, and not very optimistic about children with severe disabilities.

Another study was conducted by Juma et al., (2017) to examine Teachers' insights into developing inclusive teacher education by drawing on collaborative action research conducted by 20 primary school teachers in Tanzania. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and self-reflective journals kept by the teachers and the first author. Qualitative content analysis revealed the need to include inclusive education and action research in pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula and that school-based organizational learning and collaboration between the school and both the community and the university may enhance collaborative school cultures and inclusive in-service teacher education.

Danner & Fowler (2015) carried out the attitudes of general education early childhood teachers (Montessori and non-Montessori) toward including children with disabilities and providing them with access to the curriculum were surveyed. Both groups reported similar and positive support for inclusion within their schools. Montessori teachers have less knowledge about comprehensive education and less special education professional development than their non-Montessori counterparts.

A qualitative study was conducted by Newton et al., (2014) which focused On teachers' perception of the adaptation of inclusive education policies and procedures in The Bahamas and its implications for adult education. (18) teachers participated in the K-12 educational system in the Bahamas. The results revealed that there is a misunderstanding about the definition of inclusive education. There are factors that affected teachers' perception of comprehensive education: lack of training, insufficient resources and administrative support, teachers' attitudes, and insufficient information related to comprehensive education.

The study carried out by Buhere & Ochieng, 2013 adopted a descriptive survey design to investigate the cases and challenges in resource use for inclusive education in primary schools, issues and challenges from a Kenyan perspective, a descriptive survey was used. For 150 schools that applied inclusion in Bungoma County, Kenya, and the proportion of (20) classes varied greatly, the sample consisted of (30) head teachers, (120) regular teachers, and (8) special education teachers (sample 158). Two questionnaires (for teachers responsible for the inclusive education process and one for regular teachers), observation, schedules and interviews were used. Data were collected for (30) teachers responsible for the inclusive education process, (120) regular teachers, interview schedules for (8) special education teachers, and a timetable for observation. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data, and the results indicated that inclusive education was not supported in an organized manner. Teachers lack knowledge in dealing with available resources, and the available learning resources are insufficient and inappropriate.

Slavica (2010) carried out survey research through the 5-level Likert scale, on a sample of (105) primary school teachers working in Herzegovina-Neretva Canton (specific for its education reform implementation). The aim was to examine the attitudes of direct implementers of education reform and inclusive education (2003-2009)-primary school teachers, with particular reference to: teachers' acquaintance with inclusive education requirements; their involvement in its designing, planning and organization; relevant professional education; school preparedness for inclusive education; level of partnership with relevant disciplines; and evaluation of the inclusive education implementation. The results indicated exactly the lack of the mentioned as the main issues of the implementation of inclusive education within compulsory primary schools in Herzegovina-Neretva Canton. Therefore, this paper gives a kind of guidelines for the improvement of inclusive education. These guidelines are directly derived from the teachers' everyday experiences, problems, proposals, notes and suggestions.

The aim of the study carried out by El-Azab (2017) was to identify the quality assurance requirements for including children with simple disabilities in inclusive kindergartens in light of international standards, and the availability of the inclusive kindergarten standards in kindergartens in Minia Governorate, Egypt. The sample consisted of (180) female teachers. To achieve the aim of the study, a questionnaire was adopted. The results indicated that the level of achieving the inclusive kindergarten standards in Minia was low on the dimensions of ( family participation, vision and mission, self-assessment , administration and teachers, inclusive services and programs, organizing and managing the learning environment and professional practices of kindergarten female teachers.

Al-Attayah's study (2012) also aimed to identify the most important inclusion requirements for students with special needs that are available in regular schools from the point of view of teachers of students with special needs and regular students, in addition to the locational and equipment needs that are appropriate for the inclusion environment and most available in the regular school and the appropriate educational choice. The study adopted the descriptive survey approach. The study sample consisted of (98) male and female teachers, including (10) male and female teachers who teach students with special needs, and (88) general education teachers who teach ordinary students in schools where there are programs for including students with special needs affiliated with the Ministry of Education in the State of Qatar. The current study adopted the following tools: Full Inclusion Requirement Checklist, and a questionnaire for the locational and equipment needs of the inclusion Environment. After processing the data, the study results revealed having some obstacles to including students with special needs with regular students that can be summed up as: insufficient class time to follow up all students, the regular curricula and teaching methods are not compatible with students with special needs,

having some unruly students in class may cause problems for students with special needs, teachers and regular students are not prepared to be included with students with special needs and to deal with them, and students with special needs lack the required discipline, as they keep moving around with others.

### **Comment on Previous Studies:**

Upon reviewing the previous studies, it can be concluded that there is interest in the views and perceptions of school teachers regarding full inclusion, such as the study conducted by Khan et al., (2017), and about the teachers' view of the readiness of schools for inclusive education, such as the study carried out by Rasmitadila et al., (2018). The researcher believes that all the studies that investigated teachers' awareness and perceptions of the requirements of full inclusion have adopted the descriptive approach, and so, this approach was adopted for the current study.

The researcher also concludes the scarcity of the studies that were dedicated for studying the awareness degree of male and female regular education teachers of the requirements of full inclusion, especially in the Arab world. To the researcher's knowledge, no studies have been conducted examining this topic in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The current study differs from previous studies in that it seeks to identify the awareness degree of general education school teachers in terms of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities in the Eastern Province of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia according to the variables of : gender, academic qualification, years of experience, and teachers' having relatives with disabilities.

### **Study Significance:**

Countries all over the world are interested in inclusive education, which aims to increase the number of inclusive schools they have. Awareness of the full inclusion in public education is linked to the achievement and success of full inclusion. The significance of this study lies in the importance of its topic in the Arab and foreign libraries due to the progress of time and the development of inclusive education and the policies supporting it and increased awareness about it. Full inclusion is important in the field of special education, and it is connected to the development and acceptance of students with disabilities in mainstream inclusive schools, and the degree of their awareness of full inclusion requirements, which has a very important impact on inclusive education and its success. The significance of this study is represented in the following:

### **Theoretical Significance:**

1. Provide information about the awareness degree of general education teachers in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia of the full inclusion requirements.
2. Provide awareness about the relation of some variables such as: gender, academic qualification, years of experience, and teachers' having relatives with disabilities) with the awareness degree of general education teachers of the full inclusion requirements for students with disabilities.
3. The study is expected to contribute to spreading awareness about inclusion requirements and enrich the information of readers, researchers, and education policy makers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

### **Practical Significance:**

- Develop a peer-reviewed tool to investigate the awareness degree of general education teachers of the requirements of full inclusion.

- Develop recommendations on increasing general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion.

### **Aims**

This study aims to identify the awareness degree of male and female general education teachers in the Eastern Province in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of the full inclusion requirements. Specifically, the current study aims to:

1. Determine the awareness degree of general education teachers of the full inclusion requirements.
2. Determine the factors and variables that contribute to raising the awareness degree of general education teachers at the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia of the full inclusion requirements.

### **Study Problem and Questions**

The right to learn in general education is considered one of the most important rights of students with disabilities. Despite the pronounced development in trends towards full inclusion of students with disabilities, there is still a clear lack of general education teachers' understanding towards full inclusion and awareness of its requirements and its success requirements. This leads to a defect in integrating students with disabilities into schools, along with having negative attitudes towards it. Due to the significance of general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities in making inclusion succeed, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the awareness degree of general education teachers of the full inclusion requirements?
2. What is the relation of the awareness of general education teachers of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities with the following variables: gender, academic qualification, years of experience, and teachers' having relatives with disabilities?

### **Study Limitations:**

- Time Limitations: This study was conducted within the time period of 2022-2023.
- Space Limitations: The Eastern Province of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- Human Limitations: General education male and female teachers who are at work at the time of conducting the study.

### **Study concepts:**

This study adopts the following procedural definitions:

#### **Awareness of Full Inclusion Requirements:**

Knowledge and awareness of full inclusion requirements, including materials, tools, and human and material resources to ensure the inclusion success.

#### **Regular Education Teachers:**

Teachers working in regular education for students without disabilities, whether in regular or inclusive schools, who are at work at the time of conducting the study.

**Students with Disabilities:** Students suffering from long-term deficiencies in physical, sensory, or mental functions, which prevent them from easily dealing with the life requirements, such as learning, playing, socializing, and accessing school and the curriculum.

### **Method & Procedures**



**Research Approach:**

In light of the study aims and the questions that it attempts to answer, the researcher used the descriptive approach, which is based on describing public school teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities, using a questionnaire prepared specifically for this study after reviewing previous theoretical literature.

**Study Population:**

The study population consisted of male and female public-school teachers located in the Eastern Province of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

**Study Subjects:**

The study was carried out on (520) of male and female public-school teachers in the Eastern Province of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In light of a number of study variables, the electronic questionnaire will be sent to those teachers via an electronic link, in coordination and cooperation with the university, the Ministry of Education and the Planning Department in Saudi Arabia. Table (1) shows the distribution of the sample according to the study variables.

**Table (1) Distribution of Sample According to the Study Variables**

Variables	Variable levels	No.	%
Gender	Male	153	29%
	Female	367	70.58%
	Total	520	100%
Academic Qualification	Secondary and Lower	10	1.92%
	Diploma	57	10.96%
	Bachelors	371	71.35%
	Postgraduate Studies	82	15.77%
	Total	520	100.0%
Years of Experience	Less than 5 yrs.	52	10.0%
	5-10 yrs.	130	25.0%
	11-15 yrs.	132	25.38%
	16 yrs. &more	206	39.62%
	Total	520	100.0%
Having relatives with disabilities	Yes	132	25.38%
	No	388	74.62%
	Total	520	100.0%

**Study Tool:**

The researcher reviewed the theoretical literature related to the requirements of full inclusion, the conditions that must be met to accredit the school to be environmentally inclusive, and then she returned to the requirements of inclusive education and teacher specifications in inclusive education, such as the study carried out by Rasmitadila et al., (2018), and the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, especially the provision of accessibility, mobility and education, in addition to many booklets issued by countries such as Jordan on the standards for accrediting inclusion schools. Based on the reality of teachers in the field, and through communicating with a number of teachers and taking their opinions on the requirements for full inclusion, (37) paragraphs were formulated that covered the following six domains of study: educational requirements (8) paragraphs, environmental modifications (5)

paragraphs, teaching adaptation requirements ( 8) paragraphs, awareness requirements (6) paragraphs, cooperation requirements (4) paragraphs, and support requirements (6) paragraphs, on a five-point verbal scale according to a Likert scale, ranging between I am aware to a very great degree = 5, and I am aware to a very slight degree = 1.

### **Questionnaire Validity:**

To confirm the questionnaire validity, it was presented to a group of specialists in special education, measurement and evaluation, and teachers in general education, in order to review it in light of the following criteria: the paragraph clarity (clear, unclear), the suitability of the paragraph to its domain (belonging, not belonging), and the paragraph linguistic wording ( sound, unsound), the paragraph nature (positive, negative), and any other comments deemed appropriate by the reviewers. The modifications proposed by the viewers were made, either by deletion or modification, and so, the questionnaire appeared in its final form.

### **Questionnaire Reliability:**

The questionnaire reliability was verified after it was applied to (118) teachers outside the main study sample using the Cronbach alpha equation, as shown in Table (2).

**Table 2: Reliability Coefficients of the Study Instrument**

Domains	No. of Phrases	Internal Consistency Factor
Educational Requirements	8	.822
Environmental Modification Requirements	5	.836
Teaching Adaptation Requirements	8	.903
Awareness Requirements	6	.094
Cooperation Requirements	4	.863
Total Requirements	6	.888
	37	.58

Table (2) shows that the reliability coefficients for the questionnaire and its sub-domains ranged between (.822 - .958), all of which are acceptable for the study purposes.

### **Study procedures:**

After preparing the final version of the questionnaire, reviewing it, and applying it to a survey sample to verify its reliability, it was uploaded to the Google Drive link as an electronic questionnaire that can be answered electronically. This contributes to ease of application, speed of obtaining responses, and analyzing them using the (SPSS) program.

### **Statistical Processing**

To answer the study questions, the following statistical methods were used:

1. Cronbach Alpha Coefficient to calculate the reliability coefficient using the internal consistency method.
2. Means, standard deviations, and relative importance for describing the study sample's responses to the questionnaire domains.
3. T-test for independent samples to examine the differences between the means of the study sample's responses to the domains of the questionnaire on awareness of the full inclusion requirements according to the variable of gender, obtaining training, experience in inclusive education, and the variable of teachers' having relatives with disabilities.

4. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of the means of responses to the domains of awareness of inclusion requirements according to the variable of academic qualification, years of experience, and Tukey's test for post-hoc comparisons.

To judge the degree of general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities, based on the means of the research sample's responses to the study questionnaire, the researcher relied on dividing them based on the equation of the number of categories of the answer scale to find the length of the category = 0.8, as follows: The means that range between (1 - less than 1.8 = very low level), means ranging between (1.8 - less than 2.6 = low level), means ranging between (2.6 - less than 3.4 = medium level), means ranging between (3.4 - less than 4.2 = high level), and means ranging from (4.2 - 5 = very high level).

### Results

#### Results Related to the First Question: **What is the awareness degree of general education teachers of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities?**

To describe the awareness degree of general education teachers in the Eastern Province about the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities, including: educational requirements, environmental modifications, teaching adaptation, awareness, cooperation, and support requirements for the educational process, which is needed in the process of including students with disabilities into inclusive education, means, standard deviations, and the relative importance of the paragraph were used, as shown in Table (3).

**Table (3): Means and Standard Deviations of the General Education Teachers' Awareness Degree in Terms of the Full Inclusion Requirements**

Domains	M	SD	Awareness Degree
Educational Requirements	4.0269	.86296	High
Environmental Modification Requirements	4.0319	.88914	High
Teaching Adaptation Requirements	4.0692	.90226	High
Awareness Requirements	3.9971	.96881	High
Cooperation Requirements	4.0337	.93210	High
Support Requirements	3.9846	.93802	High
Total Requirements	4.0258	.85042	High

Table (3) shows that the general education teachers awareness regarding the requirements of full inclusion are high, as the means for this domain ranged between (3.98-4.06) on a five-point Likert scale, with the highest mean of (4.06) for awareness of the requirements for teaching adaptation, followed by the mean of (4.03) for awareness of the requirements of both environmental modifications and cooperation, and (4.02) for awareness of educational requirements. Meanwhile, the lowest mean was (3.99) for awareness requirements, followed by the awareness of support requirements, with a means of (3.98).

#### Results Related to the Second Question: **Does the awareness degree of general education teachers of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities differ according to the different variables of: (gender, academic qualification, years of experience, and teachers' having relatives with disabilities)?**

To answer the second study question, means and standard deviations of the study sample's responses to its domains were calculated according to its variables. A t-test was also conducted for independent samples to examine the differences in the means of the study sample's responses to the questionnaire's domains according to the variables of (gender, teachers' having relatives with disabilities). The ANOVA analysis was carried out to examine the differences in the means of the study sample's responses to the questionnaire domains according to the variables of (academic qualification, years of experience), as follows:

**First: Gender Variable:**

To examine the differences between the means of the domains of general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities according to the gender variable, the t-test value for the independent samples was calculated as shown in Table (4).

**Table (4) Results of T-test for the Independent Samples to Examine the Differences between the Means of the Domains of Awareness of the Requirements of Full Inclusion According to the Gender Variable**

Domains	Gender:	No.	M	SD	T-Value	Free Degree	Significance
Educational Requirements	M	153	3.8979	.84712	-2.210	518	.28
	F	367	4.0807	.86494			
Environmental Modification Requirements	M	153	3.8575	.87920	-2.909	518	.004
	F	367	4.1046	.88432			
Teaching Adaptation requirements	M	153	3.8766	.89026	-3.170	518	.002
	F	367	4.1495	.89626			
Awareness Requirements	M	153	3.7179	.90387	-4.315	518	.000
	F	367	4.1135	.97236			
Cooperation Requirements	M	153	3.8317	.89168	-3.219	518	.001
	F	367	4.1178	.93682			
Support Requirements	M	153	3.7233	.90668	-4.166	518	.000
	F	367	4.0936	.93051			

Table (4) Shows that there are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in terms of teachers' awareness degree in all the domains of :(educational requirements, environmental modifications, teaching adaptation, awareness, cooperation requirements, and support requirements) that are attributed to the gender variable in favor of the females. In addition, the highest means among females was (4.14) for awareness of the teaching adaptation requirements, while the lowest means was (4.08) for awareness of educational requirements. Meanwhile, the males recorded the highest means of (3.89) for awareness of educational

requirements, and the lowest means of (3.71) for awareness of educational requirements. The t-test values of the domains were (-2.210, -2.909, -3.170, -4.315, -3.219, -4.166) respectively.

### Second: Academic Qualification Variable:

To measure the extent to which the degree of general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities varies according to the academic qualification, the means and standard deviations of the responses were calculated as shown in Table (5), and a one-way analysis of variance(ANOVA)was administered for the means of the responses as shown in Table (6). Afterwards, Tukey's test was administered for post-hoc comparisons to examine the differences between the means of the domains of the awareness of the inclusion requirements, according to the academic qualification variable, as shown in Table (7).

**Table (5) Means and Standard Deviations of Responses to the Domains of Awareness of Full Inclusion Requirements According to the Academic Qualification Variable**

Awareness Requirements	Academic Qualification	No.	M	SD
Educational Requirements	Secondary and Less	10	3.8375	1.09299
	Diploma	57	3.3684	.68278
	Bachelor	371	4.1580	.85390
	Postgraduate Studies	82	3.9146	.76474
	Total	520	4.0269	.86296
Environmental Modification Requirements				
	Secondary and Less	10	4.0800	1.02068
	Diploma	57	3.3263	.77333
	Bachelor	371	4.1623	.87096
	Postgraduate Studies	82	3.9268	.79474
	Total	520	4.0319	.88914
Teaching Adaptation requirements				
	Secondary and Less	10	4.0375	1.04922
	Diploma	57	3.3640	.77571
	Bachelor	371	4.2059	.87646
	Postgraduate Studies	82	3.9451	.84713
	Total	520	4.0692	.90226
Awareness Requirements				
	Secondary and Less	10	3.9333	1.03697
	Diploma	57	3.3392	.82072
	Bachelor	371	4.1433	.95045
	Postgraduate Studies	82	3.8008	.92757
	Total	520	3.9971	.96881
Cooperation Requirements				

	Secondary and Less	10	4.0250	.98918
	Diploma	57	3.4430	.73651
	Bachelor	371	4.1732	.92241
	Postgraduate Studies	82	3.8140	.90156
	Total	520	4.0337	.93210
<b>Support Requirements</b>				
	Secondary and Less	10	3.8833	1.02755
	Diploma	57	3.3070	.76298
	Bachelor	371	4.1348	.92120
	Postgraduate Studies	82	3.7886	.88038
	Total	520	3.9846	.93820

Table (5) shows that teachers' awareness of full inclusion requirements was highest among graduates of Bachelor's degree holders, followed by secondary school or less, then postgraduate studies, then diploma in all requirements except for (educational requirements), where the highest means was among the bachelor's degree holders, then postgraduate studies, followed by secondary or less, and then the diploma holders. Below is a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the means.

**Table 6 Results of ANOVA Analysis for the Means of Responses to the Domains of Awareness of Full Inclusion Requirements According to the Academic Qualification Variable**

<b>Awareness Domains</b>	<b>Source of Variance</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>Freedom Degrees</b>	<b>Mean Squares</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>Statistical Sign.</b>
Educational Requirements						
	Between Groups	32.485	3	10.828	15.783	.000
	Within Groups	354.013	516	.686		
	Total	386.498	519			
Environmental Modification Requirements						
	Between Groups	35.611	3	11.870	16.347	.000
	Within Groups	374.699	516	.726		
	Total	410.310	519			
Teaching Adaptation Requirements						
	Between Groups	36.545	3	12.182	16.286	.000
	Within Groups	385.963	516	.748		
	Total	422.508	519			
Awareness Requirements						

	Between Groups Within Groups Total	35.803 451.331 487.135	3 516 519	11.934 .875	13.645	.000
Cooperation Requirements						
	Between Groups Within Groups Total	31.066 419.845 450.911	3 516 519	10.355 .814	12.727	.000
Support Requirements						
	Between Groups Within Groups Total	37.788 418.866 456.655	3 516 519	12.596 .812	15.517	.0000

Table (6) Shows that there are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in terms of the awareness domains of full inclusion requirements that are attributed to the academic qualification variable. To determine the sources of differences between the means, Tukey test was conducted for post-hoc comparisons, as shown in the following table:

**Table (7) Results of Tukey's Post-comparison Test to Examine the Differences Between the Means of the Awareness Domains of Full Inclusion Requirements, According to the Academic Qualification Variable.**

Domains	Qualification	Diploma	Bachelor	Postgraduate Studies
Educational Requirements	Secondary and Less	.46908	-.32052	-.07713
	Diploma		-.78960*	-.54621*
	Bachelor			.24338
Environmental Modification Requirements	Secondary and Less	.75368*	-.08226	.15317
	Diploma		-.83595*	-.60051*
	Bachelor			.23543
Teaching Adaptation Requirements	Secondary and Less	.67346	-.16836	.09238
	Diploma		-.84183*	-.58109*
	Bachelor			.26074
Awareness Requirements	Secondary and Less	.59415	-.20997	.13252
	Diploma		-.80413*	-.46163*
	Bachelor			.34249*
Cooperation Requirements	Secondary and Less	.58202	-.14818	.21098
	Diploma		-.73020*	-.37104
	Bachelor			.35916*

Support Requirements	Secondary and Less	.57632	-.25144	.09472
	Diploma		-.82775*	-.48160*
	Bachelor			.34615*

\*Significant at ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

Table (7) shows that the binary differences between the means of the awareness domains of full inclusion requirements, for those holding diploma and bachelor's degree are statistically significant in favor of the bachelor's qualification, between diploma and postgraduate studies in favor of postgraduate studies, and between the bachelor's and postgraduate studies in favor of the bachelors.

### Third, Years of Experience

To measure the extent to which the degree of general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities varies according to years of experience, the means and standard deviations of the responses were calculated as shown in Table (8). The ANOVA analysis was administered for the means of the responses as shown in Table (9). Afterwards, Tukey's test was administered for post-hoc comparisons to examine the differences between the means of the domains of the awareness of the inclusion requirements, according to the years of experience variable, as shown in Table (10).

**Table (8) Means and Standard Deviations of Responses to the Domains of Awareness of Full Inclusion Requirements according to the Years of Experience Variable**

Awareness Domains	Experience Levels	No.	M	SD
Educational Requirements	Less than 5 yrs.	52	4.0889	.80377
	5-10 yrs.	130	3.8375	.89622
	11-15 yrs.	132	3.8201	.86040
	16 yrs. & more	206	4.2633	.79918
	Total	520	4.0269	.86296
Environmental Modification Requirements	Less than 5 yrs.	52	4.0231	.80260
	5-10 yrs.	130	3.9215	.93560
	11-15 yrs.	132	3.8409	.89638
	16 yrs. & more	206	4.2262	.84131
	Total	520	4.0319	.88914
Awareness Requirements	Less than 5 yrs.	52	3.9832	.83762
	5-10 yrs.	130	3.9337	.96149
	11-15 yrs.	132	3.8684	.92507
	16 yrs. & more	206	4.3052	.81388
	Total	520	4.0692	.90226
Cooperation Requirements	Less than 5 yrs.	52	3.8846	.88040
	5-10 yrs.	130	3.8462	1.00678
	11-15 yrs.	132	3.7563	.96929
	16 yrs. & more	206	4.2751	.90143
	Total	520	3.9971	.96881
Cooperation Requirements	Less than 5 yrs.	52	3.8990	.93968
	5-10 yrs.	130	3.9096	.94879
	11-15 yrs.	132	3.8674	.91501
	16 yrs. & more	206	4.2524	.89340



	Total	520	4.0337	.93210
Support Requirements	Less than 5 yrs.	52	3.9071	.88464
	5-10 yrs.	130	3.8397	.97391
	11-15 yrs.	132	3.7816	.90450
	16 yrs. & more	206	4.2257	.90190
	Total	520	3.9846	.93802

Below is the ANOVA analysis for the response means.

**Table (9) Results of ANOVA Analysis for the Means of Responses to the Domains of Awareness of Full Inclusion Requirements According to the Years of Experience Variable**

Awareness Domains	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	Freedom Degrees	Mean Squares	F value	Statistical Sig.
Educational Requirements	Between Groups	22.027	3	7.342	10.395	.000
	Within Groups	364.471	516	.706		
	Total	386.498	519			
Environmental Modification Requirements	Between Groups	14.181	3	4.727	6.157	.000
	Within Groups	396.130	516	.768		
	Total	410.310	519			
Teaching Adaptation Requirements	Between Groups	19.572	3	6.524	8.355	.000
	Within Groups	402.935	516	.781		
	Total	422.508	519			
Awareness Requirements	Between Groups	27.191	3	9.064	10.168	.000
	Within Groups	459.943	516	.891		
	Total	487.135	519			
Cooperation Requirements	Between Groups	16.449	3	5.483	6.512	.000
	Within Groups	434.462	516	.842		
	Total	450.911	519			
Support Requirements	Between Groups	20.459	3	6.820	8.068	.000
	Within Groups	436.195	516	.845		
	Total	456.655	519			

Table(9) shows that there are significant differences at the level of ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the domains of awareness of full inclusion requirements that can be attributed to the experience variable. To identify the sources of differences between the means, Tukey test was conducted for post-hoc comparisons, as shown in Table (10):

**Table (10) Results of Tukey's Post-comparison Test to Examine the Differences Between the Means of the Awareness Domains of Full Inclusion Requirements, According to the Year of Experience Variable.**

Domains	Qualification	5-10	11-15	16 and more
Educational Requirements	Less than 5	.25144	.26887	-.17441
	5-10		.01742	-.42585*
	11-15			-.44327*
	Less than 5	.10154	.18217	-.20314
	5-10		.08063	-.30468*

Environmental Modification Requirements	11-15			-.38530*
Teaching Adaptation Requirements	Less than 5	.04952	.11480	-.32205
	5-10		.06528	-.37156*
	11-15			-.43685*
Awareness Requirements	Less than 5	.03846	.12830	-.39047*
	5-10		.08984	-.42893*
	11-15			-.51877*
Cooperation Requirements	Less than 5	-.01058	.03161	-.35339
	5-10		.04219	-.34281*
	11-15			-.38500*
Support Requirements	Less than 5	.06731	.12549	-.31868
	5-10		.05818	-.38598*
	11-15			-.44416*

\*Significant at ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

Table (10) shows that the binary differences between the means of all the awareness domains in terms of full inclusion requirements among those with the experience of (5-10 years, and 16 or more) and between (11-15, and 16 or more) are significant in favor of 16 and more. This indicates that the awareness of the inclusion requirements increases as teachers gain more experience.

#### Fourth: Teachers' Having Relatives with Disabilities

To measure the extent to which the awareness degree of general education teachers of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities varies according to the variable of teachers' having relatives with disabilities, a t-test was used for the independent samples as shown in Table (11).

**Table (11) Results of T-test for the Independent Samples to Examine the Differences between the Means of the Domains of Awareness of the Requirements of Full Inclusion According to the Variable of Teachers' Having Relatives with Disabilities**

Domains	Having Relatives	No.	M	SD	T Value	F.D	Sign.
Educational Requirements	Yes	132	4.1989	.77855	2.666	518	.008
	No	388	3.9684	.88318			
Environmental Modification Requirements	Yes	132	4.1682	.89539	2.045	518	.041
	No	388	3.9856	.88338			
Teaching Adaptation Requirements	Yes	132	4.2188	.86194	2.212	518	.027
	No	388	4.0184	.91107			
Awareness Requirements	Yes	132	4.1503	.91075	2.109	518	.035
	No	388	3.9450	.98349			
Cooperation Requirements	Yes	132	4.1591	.86452	1.794	518	.073
	No	388	3.9910	.95129			
Support Requirements	Yes	132	4.1414	.87818	2.232	518	.026
	No	388	3.9313	.95273			

Table (11) shows that there are differences in the awareness degree of teachers in all awareness domains of full inclusion requirements that can be attributed to the variable of teachers' having relatives with disabilities in favor of teachers' having relatives with disabilities. The highest means was (4.2) in the domain of awareness of teaching adaptation requirements. It is logical for this domain to be high, given the community's interest in education, its suitability for students with disabilities, and the difficulties that students and their families encounter in education. In addition, having a relative with disabilities allows teachers to get informed of the problems that these families encounter in educating their children in the inclusive education.

### Discussion

Countries all over the world have called for providing the necessary educational services to students with disabilities. International organizations such as the United Nations have focused on the necessity of supporting the education of students with disabilities in inclusive education institutions that provide educational services to all students without discrimination or bias, as indicated by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's Kingdom's Vision 2030. In view of this, it is necessary to pay attention to those students' needs to facilitate the process of including them into the school community along with their colleagues without disabilities. Therefore, it was necessary to educate teachers and those working with them about those students' needs and the full inclusion requirements that contribute to facilitating the learning process.

Despite the significance of teachers' awareness of the full inclusion requirements, there are many countries that do not provide sufficient information to teachers about it. Therefore, researchers were interested in investigating the awareness degree of general education teachers in the Eastern Province about the full inclusion requirements and their relationship to the variables of gender, academic qualification, years of experience, and teachers' having relatives with disabilities.

The results of this study (**in terms of the first question**) indicated that teachers are highly aware of the full inclusion requirements, including teaching adaptation, environmental modifications, and cooperation requirements. This indicates that the teachers have a high degree of knowledge about disability and its characteristics, they keep on following them up, and they are aware of what is going on in the field of supporting people with disabilities. This is also due to the intensive awareness campaigns about people with disabilities that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia carries out on a large scale, about their requirements in life in general and in facilitating their education in particular. Moreover, the requirements for adapting education are among the clearest requirements that a teacher may witness on a daily basis. This can be observed through the fact that the requirements for support and awareness scored the lowest mean because they cannot be seen and known simply by looking and observing, but rather require explanation and guidance, as indicated by the results of the study carried out by Yazicioglu, 2020) of having serious problems in the inclusive education practices in the Anatolian secondary schools, as teachers do not have the necessary experience in inclusive education.

The results of this study are consistent with the study carried out by Vučković et al., (2019), which indicates that teachers support inclusion. With similarities in terms of teachers' responses towards inclusive education, along with the need to educate faculty members and involve experts in planning and developing individualized educational plans. The results of this study are also consistent with the study carried out by Khan et al., (2017) which looked into the perceptions of primary school teachers towards education teachers believe that all learners regardless of their disability should be in regular classrooms, with a preference for children with mild disabilities, and not very optimistic about children with severe disabilities.

The results of this study differ from the results revealed by a study carried out by Danner & Fowler (2015) where Montessori teachers reported to have less knowledge about comprehensive education and less special education professional development than their non-Montessori counterparts.

The results of this study also differ from the results revealed by the study carried out by Slavica (2010), which found out that there is a lack of (teachers' knowledge of inclusive education requirements, participation in designing, planning and organizing relevant professional education; school readiness for inclusive education; level of partnership with relevant subjects; and evaluation of the implementation of inclusive education).

The results of this study also differ from the results revealed by the study carried out by El-Azab, which indicated that the level of achievement of inclusive kindergarten standards in Minya Governorate / Egypt is low on the dimensions of (family participation, vision and mission, self-evaluation standard, administration and teachers, inclusive services and programs, organization and management of the learning environment, and professional practices of kindergarten teachers).

This was confirmed by the study carried out by Juma et al., (2017) to examine teachers' insights into the development of inclusive education for teachers, about the need to include (inclusive education) and action research into pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula, and the importance of the education being based on the collaboration between the school with community and universities.

The results of this study (**in terms of the second question**) regarding the relationship of gender to the degree of teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion indicated that female teachers have a higher degree of awareness than male teachers in all domains of: (educational requirements, environmental modification requirements, teaching adaptation requirements, awareness requirements, cooperation requirements, and support requirements). This can be attributed to the fact that females, by virtue of their maternal instinct, are more attentive and considerate to the needs and requirements of children. Females also discuss students' topics among themselves while talking in the break or during times of discussing students' development and problems. Although there are no studies that have examined the impact of gender on the awareness of student requirements, the result is logical and generalizable.

**In terms of the relationship of general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities to academic qualification**, the results indicated that the awareness of the inclusion requirements among bachelor's degree holders was higher than among those holding diplomas and postgraduate certificates. This may be due to the awareness degree of bachelor's students as they are more exposed to teaching courses related to disabilities and they deal with the students with disabilities directly in the field training course during the university stage more the holders of diploma and postgraduate studies. In addition, their cognitive maturity is greater due to the fact that they are exposed to a greater number of academic courses required for graduation, and they devote themselves to research and knowledge about others for a period of time that is longer than that devoted by the graduate certificate holders. This is confirmed by the results revealed by the study carried out by Al-Attayah (2012) which indicated that one of the obstacles to the inclusion process is that teachers and regular students are not prepared to be included with students with special needs and to deal with them.

In terms of the relationship of years of experience to the teachers' awareness degree of the requirements of full inclusion, the results confirmed that the more experience the teachers are and the more years of teaching, the greater the awareness of the inclusion requirements. This

is due to the fact that teachers with the longest years of experience have the greatest opportunity to get to know students with disabilities as they have a longer period of time to get to know these requirements through their presence in the field and their being exposed to experiences with these categories of students. These results are consistent with the results of the study carried out by Al-Attiyah (2012) which indicated that one of the obstacles to the inclusion process is that teachers and regular students are not prepared to be included with students with special needs and to deal with them.

The results of the study carried out by Buhere& Ochieng (2013) confirmed that the reason for the weakness of inclusive education is that teachers lack knowledge of handling the available resources, and the available learning resources are inadequate and inappropriate.

**In terms of the relationship of general education teachers' awareness of the requirements of full inclusion for students with disabilities to teachers' having relatives with disabilities,**

The results indicate that the teachers who have relatives with disabilities have more awareness of the inclusion requirement. This is due to their exposure to previous experience with the needs of children with disabilities in the family, and so they transfer this experience to the field of work in inclusive education with students with disabilities. This confirms that the communication and the family closeness among relatives that the people of Saudi Arabia are distinguished with contributes to understanding and knowing the properties, needs and requirements of people with disabilities and spreading awareness about them. This is also due to the extent of interconnectedness between families and relatives in the Eastern Province of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The previous results are consistent with the results revealed by the study carried out by Newton et al., (2014) that there are five comprehensive factors that influenced teachers' perception of inclusive education, namely: lack of training, insufficient resources and administrative support, teachers' attitudes, and insufficient information related to inclusive education.

**Recommendations**

1. To carry out in-depth research into the extent to which teachers apply full inclusion at schools, their awareness of the full inclusion requirements and their understanding of it according to qualitative research.
2. To hold workshops and raising awareness about the full inclusion requirements in general, and about cooperation between teachers and families to make inclusive education for students with disabilities succeed.
3. To intensify efforts to conduct awareness campaigns at the local media level about the importance of full inclusion and its requirements.

**References:**

Elazab,A.M, ,(2017).**Quality Assurance Requirements for the Inclusion of Children with Simple Disabilities in the Inclusive Kindergarten in Egypt in the light of International Standards**, Journal of Childhood/ Faculty of Education for Early Childhood, Cairo University, Issue (26) , May, 2017.

Al-Attiyah, A.A.,(2012). **Requirements for Integrating Children with Special Needs with their Regular Peers from the Point of View of their Teachers**, Journal of Childhood and Education. No. 10, V. 1, y. 4, April 2012.

Alfaro, V., Kupczynski, L.& Mundy, M. (2015). **The relationship between teacher knowledge and skills and teacher attitude towards students with disabilities among elementary, middle and high school teachers in rural Texas schools**. Journal of Instructional Pedagogies Volume 16: 1-8.

Buhere, Pamela; Ochieng, Pamela, (2013), **Usage of selected resources for inclusive education in mainstream primary schools: issues and challenges from a Kenyan perspective**, problems of Management in the 21st century Volume 8, 2013.

Danner, Natalie and Fowler. Susan A., (2015), **Montessori and Non-Montessori Early Childhood Teachers' Attitudes Toward Inclusion and Access**, Journal of Montessori Research 2015, Volume 1, Issue 1

Juma, S., Lehtomäki, E., & Naukkarinen, A. (2017). **Developing inclusive pre-service and in-service teacher education: Insights from Zanzibar primary school teachers**. International Journal of Whole Schooling, 13(3), 67-87

Khan. Itfaq Khaliq, Hashmi. Shujahat Haider, Khanum. Nabeela, (2017), **Inclusive Education in Government Primary Schools: Teacher Perceptions**, Journal of Education and Educational Development, Vol. 4 No. 1 (June 2017)

Newton. Norrisa, Hunter-Johnson. Yvonne, Gardiner-Farquharson. Beulah L, and Cambridge. Janelle, (2014), **Bahamian teachers' perceptions of inclusion as a foundational platform for adult education programs**, international journal of special education Vol 29, No: 3, 2014

Rasmitadila, Tambunan. Anna Riana Suryanti, Rachmadtullah. Reza, (2018), **Elementary School Teachers' Perceptions of Public Inclusive Elementary School Readiness Formation**, international journal of special education Vol.33, No.3, 2018

Rieser, Richard. (2012), **Implementing Inclusive Education**. (2nd), UK, Commonwealth Secretariat.

Rieser, R. Champan, M. Skitteral, J. (2002), **Inclusion In Early Years, Disability quality In Education Course Book**, London.

Slavica. Pavlovic. (2010). **Inclusive Education: Proclamations or Reality (Primary School Teachers' View)**, Online Submission, US-China Education Review v7 n10 p62-69 Oct 2010, October 2010, Volume 7, No.10 (Serial No.71) US-China Education Review, ISSN 1548-6613, USA

Suc, L. Bukovec, B. Zveglic, M. Karpljuk, D. (2016). **Primary School Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education in Slovenia: A Qualitative Exploration**. Journal of Universal Excellence, (1): 30-46.

Travers, Joseph., Balfe, Tish., Butler, Cathal., Day, Therese., Dupont, Maeve., McDaid, Rory., O'Donnell, Margaret & Prunty, Anita. (2010), **Addressing The Challenges & Barriers to inclusion in Irish School**, Special Education Department, St Patrick's College.

Vučković. Smiljana Đukićin, Ivkov-Džigurski. Anđelija, Bibić. Ljubica Ivanović, Jovanov. Jelena Milanković and Stojšić. Ivan, (2019), **Teachers' views of inclusive education in Serbian schools**, South African Journal of Education, Volume 39, Supplement 2, December 2019 S1, Art. #1722, 10 pages, <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v39ns2a1722>

Yazicioglu. Tansel, (2020), **Determining the Views of School Principals and Guidance Teachers on Inclusive Practices at Anatolian High-Schools**, Journal of Education and Learning; Vol. 9, No. 1; 2020