

**EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS
INCLUSIVE EDUCATION**

J. N. MASHIYA

2003

EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

JOYCE NONTOKOZO MASHIYA

B Ed, BA (UNIZUL) PTD (NTUZUMA)

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Education in fulfillment or partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at the University of Zululand.

SUPERVISOR : PROF P T SIBAYA

CO-SUPERVISOR : MISS J D ADAMS

DATE : 31 October 2003

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to the people who assisted me in the completion of this research project. A list of names of all those who contributed to the study appears below. The order of presentation does not imply the ordinal importance of the services rendered.

Professor P T Sibaya, for his excellent guidance and advice in supervising this task.

Miss J D Adams, for her knowledge and advice with regard to the topic of inclusive education.

Miss E N Ngidi, who devoted her time to typing the manuscript. I want to thank her for the patience she showed whenever she was inconvenienced.

Miss N Kolosa, for computer work and assistance in the analysis of data.

Mr R Wilkinson for proof-reading and editing my work

Mr PAN Nkosi-kaNdaba, whose support and assistance is sincerely appreciated.

Dr D R Nzima, for helping me with the methodology and for always being willing to help whenever he was consulted.

Dr D P Ngidi, for his contribution and for providing continued support.

Mrs Fourie from the Department of Education (PGSES department), for guidance and interest shown in the research project.

The Regional Directors of Education, for allowing me to do research in schools in their regions.

The school managers, for allowing me to do research in their schools. In particular, I wish to thank Mrs Engelbrecht, Remedial Centre Manager, for her advice apart from allowing me to do research.

I thank the educators for completing the questionnaire, despite their busy schedules.

I gratefully acknowledge the support of my colleagues, the principal and staff of Mcuthungu Primary School. I thank them for being kind and understanding.

I would like to thank every single member of my family. Special gratitude goes to my beloved Madoda, for helping me with calculations, to Cebo and Sya for their invaluable input and finally to my one and only son Xolani, to whom this work is dedicated. May this manuscript be an inspiration to all my children, not forgetting my nieces and nephews, Smangele, Nokulunga, Mlondi and Zipho.

Finally I would like to extend my thanks and honour to the Almighty God, my Creator, from whom all things come.

ABSTRACT

The present investigation had three objectives. The first aim was to examine educators' attitudes towards inclusive education. The second aim was to determine the extent to which educators were influenced by factors such as qualifications, age, gender, phase, experience, and class size. The third aim was to find out whether educators who have contact with special education personnel, hold positive attitudes towards inclusive education.

The questionnaire was administered to groups of black and white educators teaching in mainstream settings, a remedial centre and in a pilot school for inclusive education in KwaZulu-Natal.

Fifty-eight percent of the educators were found to have negative attitudes towards inclusive education, whereas forty-two percent displayed a positive attitude towards inclusive education.

Results also indicated that the variables of age, gender, qualification, experience, grade and class-size have an influence on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education. The results furthermore show that fifty-nine percent of educators did not have contact with special education personnel and that the majority of this group hold negative attitudes towards inclusive education. Forty-one percent of educators had contact with special education personnel and the majority of this group had positive attitudes towards inclusive education. Therefore, it is concluded that educators' contact with special education personnel influenced their attitudes towards inclusion of disabled learners in mainstream settings.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work on "Educators' attitudes towards inclusive education" is my own work, both in conception and in execution and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete reference.

SIGNATURE

(J N MASHIYA)

DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
	iii
ABSTRACT	
DECLARATION	iv
CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER 1	
ORIENTATION	
1.1 <i>Motivation for the study</i>	1
1.2 <i>Statement of the problem</i>	9
1.3 <i>Aims of the study</i>	9
1.4 <i>Hypotheses</i>	9
1.5 <i>Definition of terms</i>	10
1.6 <i>Research methodology</i>	10

1.7	Plan or organisation of the study	12
-----	-----------------------------------	----

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Studies on the nature of educators' attitudes towards inclusive education	14
2.2	Studies on factors influencing attitude towards inclusive education	19
2.3	Studies on educators' contact with special education personnel	25
2.4	Conclusion	28

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	30
3.2	The research design	30
3.3	The sampling design	31
3.4	The research instrument	32
3.4.1	The nature of the question in relation to the aims	33

3.4.2	Validity and reliability	34
3.4.3	Scoring procedures	34
3.5	Method of data analysis	35
3.6	Procedures for conducting an empirical study	36
3.7	Conclusion	37

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.1	Introduction	38
4.2	The pilot study sample	38
4.3	Administration of the research instrument in the pilot study	39
4.4	Results of the pilot study	40
4.5	Factor analysis for 52 items	40
4.5.1	Description of the three factors	43
4.6	The final study sample	46

4.7	Administration of the research instrument in the final study	47
4.7.1	Formulation of the hypotheses	49
4.8	Results of the final study	49
4.8.1	Hypothesis number one	49
4.8.2	Hypothesis number two	51
4.8.3	Hypothesis number three	57
4.9	Conclusion	59

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

5.1	Discussions	60
5.1.1	Findings with regard to aim number one	60
5.1.2	Findings with regard to aim number two	60
5.1.3	Findings with regard to aim number three	61
5.2	Implications of findings	61
5.3	Recommendations	63
5.4	Limitations	63

5.5	Avenues for future research	64
5.6	Conclusion	65
	REFERENCES	66
	ANNEXURE A:	
	Original list of items used in a pilot study	71
	ANNEXURE B	
	Requests of permission to do research	78
	ANNEXURE C	
	Items used in a final study	81
	ANNEXURE D	87
	Response to questionnaire:	
	SECTION A:	87
	Personal information	
	SECTION B:	91
	Questionnaire on educators' attitude towards inclusive education	

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
4.1	<i>Distribution of subjects in the pilot study</i> 39
4.2	Factor analysis: Factor loadings of the 52 items 41
4.3	Factor 1: Severe disabilities 44
4.4	Factor 2: Behavioural disorders 45
4.5	Factor 3: Minor disabilities 46
4.6	Administration of the research instrument 47
4.7	Distribution of subjects in the final study 48
4.8	The nature of educators' attitudes towards inclusive education 50
4.9	The relationship between attitudes and educators' location (N=22) 51
4.10	The extent to which the variable of gender affects educators' attitudes towards inclusive education 52
4.11	The extent to which the variable of age affects educators' attitudes towards inclusive education (N=22) 53
4.12	The extent to which the variable of qualification affects educators' attitudes towards inclusive education 54

4.13	The extent to which the variable of teaching experience affects educators' attitudes towards inclusive education	55
4.14	The extent to which the variable of phase/grade affects educators' attitudes towards inclusive education	56
4.15	The extent to which the variable of class size affects educators' attitudes towards inclusive education	57
4.16	Contact with special education personnel	58

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION

1.1 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

The advent of a new democratic dispensation for South Africa brought ushered in many changes in the education system. In the Department of Education, changes commenced with the revision of the curriculum. The old system of teaching was replaced by outcomes-based education, which was introduced in 1996 and was implemented in grade one in 1997. The movement towards the establishment of an alternative education system seeks to eliminate the gross inequalities of apartheid and to provide adequate and equal facilities for all the people of the country Community Television Producers Association (CTPA) Report, (1998:9). The main focus of outcomes-based education is to educate a learner at his or her own pace, regardless of the differences that learners may have.

Educators were initially baffled by the new system of education because it gave rise to a change in teaching style and method. However, the new system requires educators who are fully trained as only well-qualified educators will be able to realize the envisaged critical outcomes by producing learners who can identify and solve problems and, since the system is learner-centered, are able to make decisions using critical and creative thinking. The impact of these changes often causes stress because educators have to try very hard to acquaint themselves with the new system (Ngidi, 1998:2).

The implementation of outcomes-based education was followed by the improvement of special schools. In the apartheid era special schools were provided on a racial basis (Education White Paper 6, 2001:5). The best was only reserved for whites. The curriculum was then modified to suite the diverse needs of learners. Democracy allowed all the learners with disabilities to be admitted in

special schools in order to receive equal attention regardless of race. Special schools for Blacks were underresourced and the conditions were made better to suite the standard of white schools, which were well-resourced in accordance with the apartheid policy.

Later on it was discovered that learners with disabilities were being deprived of their rights of mixing with other children who are normal. Furthermore, the curriculum and education system as a whole failed to respond to the diverse needs of the learners, resulting in massive numbers of drop-outs and failures (Education White Paper 6, 2001:5). Special schools were then seen as a better place for those children with severe and multiple handicaps who couldn't cope in regular schools (Green, 1991:84).

In October 1996, the Ministry of Education appointed the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training, and the National Committee on Education Support Services to investigate and make recommendations on all aspects of special needs and support services in education and training in South Africa (NCSNET & NCESS, 1997:1).

A joint report on the findings of these two bodies was presented to the Minister of Education in November 1997. The final report was published by the Department of Education in February 1998. The joint report of the two bodies recommended that education should promote education for all and foster the development of inclusive education that would enable all learners to participate actively in the education process so that they could develop and extend their potential and participate as equal members of the society (Education White Paper 6, 2001:6).

The Department of Education announced that all learners with disabilities must be admitted to regular schools, and that special education will be offered in ordinary schools and classrooms. This resulted in many parents withdrawing their children from isolated special schools because the ordinary schools now catered for

diversity, which put an end to discrimination against disabled learners. Inclusive education is now in full progress, although it is being carried out and implemented by educators who are used to the old method of teaching and are therefore trying hard to adapt to outcomes-based education.

According to the record, very few if any studies about educators' attitudes towards inclusive education have been conducted in the Republic of South Africa. The present study aims at investigating educators' attitudes towards inclusive education and factors that influence educators' attitudes as well as their access to specialists or special education personnel.

Many studies have been conducted in especially European countries where inclusive education was introduced many years ago. Some of these studies have provided relevant theoretical background to the present study and are briefly listed here. Carro (1997:1) studied the inclusion and the importance of special education personnel as applicable to Spain. Van Hove and van Hofstraeten (1997:1) studied mainstreaming of children with mental retardation in Belgium, while Alban-Metcalf (1997:1) dealt with the identification and assessment of pupils with special needs in England and Wales. Amaiz (1997:1) dealt with the involvement of personnel in inclusion in Murcia, while Hintz's study (1996:1) in Hamburg covered the different levels of integration which are influential in inclusion. Bayliss (1997:1) studied the integration of children with significant disabilities into mainstream schools in Italy.

Studies conducted by researchers in the United States of America include Brucker's study (1996:581) of the advantages of inclusion for students with learning disabilities; Brodsky's study (2001:19) in the training of special education teachers; Daane, Beirne-Smith and Diannes work (2000:1) on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion; McLaughlin's (1995:1) study on the link between special education and mainstream education, and Slee's work (2001:113) on the skills needed to implement inclusive education. There is also Vaughn and

Schumm's study (1995:264) on the participation of parents in inclusive education; Vaughn, Elbaum and Schumm's investigation (1996:598) into the degree of peer acceptance of self-concept, loneliness and social alienation in inclusion. Both of these studies were conducted in Miami. Hunt, Hirose-Hatae, Doering, Karasoff and Goetz (2000:305), in their study, dealt with parental involvement in inclusive school programmes in inclusive schools at San Francisco.

African studies outside South Africa include work by Charema and Peresuh (1996:76) on support services for special Education needs in areas south of the Sahara. Peresuh, Adenigba and Ogonda (1997:9) studied perspectives on special needs education in Nigeria, Kenya and Zimbabwe. Some of the very few studies conducted in South Africa include Skuy's work (1990:145) on skills and resources needed in inclusion; Engelbrecht and Forlin's (1998:1) study on the attitudes of educators with regard to inclusion and the degree of acceptance thereof; Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker and Engelbrecht's (1999:3) study on inclusion as a whole, and Green's research (1991:84) on the challenges of inclusion.

Due to the fact that inclusive education is newly implemented in South Africa, very few studies have been conducted and none of them deal with the educators' attitudes towards inclusive education, no studies appeared to have been conducted in the province of KwaZulu-Natal. The lack of research in this field prompted the researcher's interest in the subject. Studies carried out in several countries, including South Africa, indicate that educators always develop a certain attitude when dealing with disabled learners. This is well documented by Engelbrecht and Forlin (1998:1) in their South African study of teachers' social interactions with persons with disabilities, which reveals that educators have a negative attitude towards inclusive education. They come to the conclusion that educators experience considerable discomfort in social contact with persons with disabilities – especially when an educator has to deal with diversity in a classroom on his/her own (Skuy, 1990:49; Ngidi 1998:2).

Prejudice on the basis of race, gender, culture, disability and religion is the main factor which causes negative attitudes in educators (NCSNET & NCESS, 1997:15). Educators are therefore advised to approach inclusive education in what is considered to be the best approach, namely by working as teams (Daane, Beirne, Smith and Latham, 2001:1) It is a fact that different learning needs may result in negative attitudes, often resulting in inadequate and inappropriately trained education managers and educators (Education White Paper 6, 2001:18).

Vaughn, Elbaum and Schumm (1996:588) studied the effects of inclusive education in Miami and mainly focused on attitudes towards disabled learners. They concluded that learners who are disabled feel less accepted and that their educators do not perceive that they are inadequately prepared to meet their learners' educational needs.

The cause of stress and negative attitude towards inclusion is the result of the poor level of qualification among educators. Teachers are notoriously underqualified (Skuy, 1990:149). The level of education and training among the educators is very low, particularly with regard to teaching methods and skills that are required in teaching learners with disabilities. Studies advocate the proper training of teachers in order to help them develop the skills required in handling classes with diverse needs (Slee, 2001:113; Brodsky, 2001:19; Engelbrecht and Forlin 1998:1; Peresuh, Adenigba and Ogonda, 1997:9). The preparation of special education educators who function in inclusive educational situations is crucial. Educators should be multi-skilled in order to face the demands and needs of each and every unique learner and certain criteria are necessary (Arnáiz, 1997:1) to equip the educators with relevant teaching skills.

Simpson, Whelan and Zabel (1993:1) are of the opinion that if the existing classroom educators are to work effectively with diverse learners including students with limited English proficiency in the 21st century, they will need

additional training. They hold the view that there should be effective staff developmental programmes to nourish educators.

Despite the fact that educators often work in teams and possess many skills, there are fields in which they may not be good. That is why they should involve special education personnel or support services on a regular basis. This is seen as the key to reducing the barriers to learning (Education White Paper 6, 2001:21)

Children with special educational needs who are integrated in ordinary schools would need additional provision and support in order to benefit socially and educationally from inclusive education system. All the personnel involved should have a sound knowledge of the disabilities involved (Charema and Peresuh, 1996:76; Carro, 1997:1). The goals and objectives can be partially or wholly met in the regular classroom by utilizing special services and personnel. Inclusive education calls for the redesigning of the delivery of special services in order to yield good results (Brucker, 1996:581; Simpson, Whelan and Zabel, 1993). They are also of the opinion that there should be changes in special education personnel preparation and that qualified, direct service and leadership personnel should be increased, while education support services should be strengthened in order to ensure the feasibility of inclusive education (Education White Paper 6, 2001:23).

Green (1991:84) and Skuy (1990:152) studied inclusive education in South Africa and mainly focused on the conditions in black schools. Green (1991:84) holds the view that planned or intentional mainstreaming is an issue for developed countries, and that widely differing facilities are available to different groups within the population. Disabled learners need all sorts of equipment which will vary depending on the kind of disability. South Africa as a developing country is not yet ready for inclusive education.

White children with special needs were perceived to receive better education whereas about 600 000 black children with special needs were not attending

school, and others were struggling without additional help in ordinary classrooms due to the fact that educators are underqualified and the facilities are inadequate (Skuy, 1990:154).

Learning materials should be developed to assist learners with different needs. If there are learners with visual impairments, there must also be facilities for Braille available at the school (Education White Paper 6, 2001:21). Audio aids should be available for those with hearing defects. Since the conditions are unfavourable in black schools in rural areas, learners are still not going to benefit from inclusive education unless the conditions are improved with immediate effect. The government has developed a system of norms and standards since 1996. This system is improving the conditions in schools, but disabled learners should only be admitted to regular schools when all schools have acquired the relevant facilities to meet all sorts of diversities. Disabled learners will not benefit without the use of adequate resources (Vaughn and Schumm, 1995: 266).

Children learn better if their parents are involved in their schools. Alban-Melcalfe (1997:1) advocates greater parental involvement in assessment and educational provision for their children and encourages professional co-operation. Vaughn and Schumm (1995:264) are of the view that students and family should be considered first. Parents are a powerful force behind the establishment of inclusive education. Due to the fact that they tend to support the idea of inclusive education, they should be given a place in school programmes in order to make things happen (Hunt, Hirose-Hatae, Doering, Karsoff and Goetz 2000:305). The latter researchers are of the opinion that the school is for the community and that the community should therefore also be engaged in school matters and be allowed to render help where possible.

Price (2000:36) states that although parental involvement is ranked as an urgent need, her study indicates that they are not involved in the evaluation of inclusion. She furthermore believes that although educators stress the lack of parental

involvement in the assessment of school needs and development of resources, parents will play a major role if they are given a chance. The importance of community involvement is also stressed in her study.

The present researcher endorses the idea that disabled learners should be included in regular schools in order to avoid discrimination. Bayliss (1998:1) agrees that learners with special needs see themselves as a disadvantaged group that is excluded from mainstream education experience, even though they may be physically integrated. Educators should accept learners with minor disabilities. It is a fact that there are learners who are neither educable nor trainable. Van Hove and van Hofstraeten (1997:1) and Green (1991:84) share the idea that not all learners will benefit from inclusive education, therefore special schools should be reserved for those with severe and multiple handicapping conditions.

The significance and contribution of the present study will ideally be manifested in the following possible benefits:-

It will reveal existing attitudes among educators with regard to inclusive education and attempt to provide suggestions of ways to eliminate and discourage negative attitudes, while promoting positive approaches.

Educators will learn to adjust themselves according to their qualifications, age, gender and experience since there are learners whose needs are demanding due to the severity of their handicapping condition.

Through this study educators will be motivated to make use of support services and personnel available to implement inclusive education.

Educators will learn to control their attitudes towards inclusion and accept every learner as a unique individual who needs guidance and support.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

- 1.2.1 What is the nature of educators' attitude towards inclusive education?
- 1.2.2 To what extent are the educators' attitudes influenced by the following factors such as age, gender, qualifications, teaching experience, phase or grade taught and class size
- 1.2.3 Do educators' contact with special education personnel influence their attitudes towards inclusive education?

The present study intends to answer these questions.

1.3 AIMS OF STUDY

The following specific aims have been formulated:-

- 1.3.1 To examine educators' attitudes towards inclusive education.
- 1.3.2 To determine the extent to which educators' attitudes are influenced by the following factors such as age, gender, qualifications, teaching experience, phase or grade taught and class size.
- 1.3.3 To find out whether educators contact with special education personnel influence their attitudes towards inclusive education.

1.4 HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses will be formulated and based on the above mentioned aims of the study.

1.5 DEFINITION OF TERMS

1.5.1 INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

The term inclusive education in this study means the integration of children with special educational needs as part of the regular class. This is the type of education which will ensure that children with special educational needs are educated alongside with their non-disabled peers in an ordinary class setting. This implies that the provision of services and support is brought into the mainstream.

1.5.2 EDUCATORS

'Educators' refers to teachers, and the terms may be used interchangeably. The term 'teachers' denotes people who teach others, especially in a school. It will be used synonymously as facilitators, people who facilitate learning.

1.5.3 ATTITUDES

In this study the term 'attitude' will refer to the educators' way of thinking and to their degree of acceptance of inclusive education.

1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.6.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

A descriptive research will be used as it concerns itself with the current status of events. It describes existing achievement, attitudes, behaviours or other characteristics of a group of subjects (McMillan and Schumacher, 1993:192). Price (2000:42) maintains that this research method is useful as a preliminary step in order to describe how things are and, as inclusion is a new initiative in South Africa, this research design will be valuable in evaluating the situation in schools.

The study will show the attitudes of educators towards inclusion, the skills they possess, and their access to physical and human resources. As data will be collected from educators who are teaching in schools, this work may be considered to be a field study according to Price's terms (2000:42).

1.6.2 LITERATURE STUDY

An in-depth literature review of the studies on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education will be done.

1.6.3 SAMPLE

Purposeful sampling will be used, with subjects drawn from those schools one which provides inclusive education, and the other one which provides remedial education. Inclusive education schools are very scarce at the moment and the researcher therefore has access to only targeted school that practice inclusion. Random sampling will also be used with subjects drawn from those schools which provide regular education. Ryndak, Jackson and Billingsley (2001:105) maintain that information should be collected from information-rich sources, which is the reason why the researcher makes use of purposeful sampling.

The study will consist of primary school educators in the province of KwaZulu-Natal who are teaching in one inclusive school, four regular schools and one remedial centre. Schools in KwaZulu-Natal are divided into four broad regions. Each region consists of a number of districts, and each district consists of a number of circuits.

1.6.4 METHOD OF SAMPLING

Subjects will be drawn from a larger population of primary school educators who are teaching in inclusive, remedial and regular schools in KwaZulu-Natal. Schools with or without learners with Special Education Needs (LSEN) will be considered.

1.6.5 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Questionnaire consisting of closed-ended questions will be used as research instruments.

1.6.6 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

Data will be analysed qualitative and quantitatively.

1.7 PLAN OR ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

1.7.1 CHAPTER ONE

This chapter consists of a motivation for investigation in this field, a statement of the problem, the aims of the study and a plan for the organisation of the whole scientific report.

1.7.2 CHAPTER TWO

This chapter will consist of the review of the relevant literature.

1.7.3 CHAPTER THREE

This chapter will consist of the research design, methodology and instruments used to collect data.

1.7.4 CHAPTER FOUR

Chapter four concerns itself with presentation, interpretation and analysis of data. The three hypotheses will also be formulated in this chapter.

1.7.5 CHAPTER FIVE

Chapter five presents discussions, recommendations and limitations of the study. Avenues for future research are also presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 STUDIES ON THE NATURE OF EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

An educator's attitude is of crucial importance in the teaching-learning situation, as it is the educators who make learning possible. As regular educators are faced with teaching heterogeneous classes consisting of children who are not handicapped together with those who are handicapped, their task is made much more difficult than that of the special educators who deal only with handicapped learners. If this is indeed the case, the question arises as to how they manage to cope with the situation.

Many studies indicate that educators' attitudes towards inclusive education are negative. These include studies by Hoover (1984:34), Davies and Green (1998:98), Daane, Beirne-Smith and Dianne (2000:2), Mushoriwa (2000:142), Avramidis, Bayliss and Burden (2000:192), Sadek and Sadek (2000:1), Bothma Gravett, and Swart (2000:2001) Marshall, Ralph and Palmer (2002:209). Hoover (1984:349) conducted a study on educators' attitudes towards inclusion with specific attention to children with learning, emotional and behavioural disorders in the mainstream. The subjects involved in the study did not have special class experience but were randomly assigned to work in a special education self-contained room. The results revealed that due to their lack of experience, the subjects in this study appeared to have a negative attitude, while experienced special education teachers involved in the study tended to be more positive.

Daane, Beirne-Smith and Dianne (2000:2) investigated the perceptions of elementary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education which was in force for two years. The study was conducted in a school district of approximately 8 000 students. The setting was mostly rural but included some suburban areas. All 324

elementary general education teachers, 42 elementary special education teachers and 15 administrators were included in the study. The survey used a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 4, with 24 possible response items ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree.' The results indicated that all the respondents agreed that students have a right to be in the general education classroom, but all three groups disagreed with the notion that the teaching of the disabled within a general education classroom would be effective. They all agreed that general education teachers do not always feel prepared to teach students who have special needs and that special and general education teachers often lacked the skills in teaming and collaboration needed to teach students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

The National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and the National Commission in Education Support Services (NCESS) (1997:29) confirms the fact that many educators express the fear that they do not know how to teach learners with disabilities and would therefore prefer not to have them in their classes. This fear is often manifested in the form of a certain attitude, either positive or negative. Davies and Green (1998:97) assert that educators with negative attitudes will reject the learners.

Davies and Green (1998:98) in their study set out to test two hypotheses, namely the degree to which teachers are willing to tolerate learners with special educational needs and the supposition that primary school teachers are not willing to teach such learners in their ordinary classrooms. The random sampling approach was used in this study, which concentrated on two co-educational state primary schools randomly selected from among the schools for children classified as Coloured, Black and White under the apartheid categories of the previous government in South Africa. Among the 113 teachers that responded to the questionnaire, 26 were males and 87 were females with ages ranging from 20 to 60. The findings of this study indicate that teachers are influenced by the nature

of the special need and that teachers are more accepting of special needs in children if they are in contact with special educators who favour integration.

Mushoriwa (2000:142) conducted a study which explores the attitudes of primary school teachers in Harare towards inclusive education with special reference to blind children. He used the 400 Likert-type questionnaire items as well as interviews to collect information from 150 educators. The survey research method was used to measure current attitudes of primary schools teachers towards inclusive education and the inclusion of blind children in regular classes in particular. The findings of this study indicate that teachers do not like the inclusion of blind children in regular classrooms. The majority of teachers also felt that blind children are not socially accepted in regular classes.

Avramidis, Bayliss and Burden (2000:193) conducted a study on educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in a single local education authority in the United Kingdom. The researchers divided the educators' attitudes into three components, namely the cognitive component, conative component and affective component. The study sample comprised of 81 primary and secondary school teachers. The analysis revealed that teachers who have been implementing inclusive programmes showed more positive attitudes. Results also showed that teachers with university based qualifications appear to have more positive attitudes and to be more confident in dealing with learners with special educational needs (LSEN). This means that educators who had started implementing inclusive education as well as those who have a university-based background hold a more positive attitude than those who lack such experience.

Avramidis et al., (2000:199) preferred to divide the concept attitude into three components because they believed that an attitude represents a combination of three conceptually distinguishable reactions to a certain object. For this reason the questionnaire was divided into three parts. Closed and open-ended questions

were administered to a sample of educators. The survey involved 23 mainstream schools, 14 primary and nine secondary schools representing urban, suburban and rural areas. The participants were identified in terms of gender, age, teaching experience, phase taught, professional development, experience, area of school, size of school and the size of the classroom. Results showed that participants demonstrated a lack of confidence in meeting the requirements of students with special educational needs (SEN), and teachers with substantial training in special education held significantly higher positive attitudes than those with little or no training about inclusion.

Sadek and Sadek (2000:1) also conducted a study of attitudes towards inclusive education in Egypt – and like Avramadis et al., (2000:199), they divided attitude into three categories, namely academic attitude, social attitude and psychological attitude. Their study was based on 100 teachers – 50 from public schools and 50 from special schools; 100 parents – 50 from public schools and 50 from special schools; 40 administrators – 20 from public schools and 20 from special schools; and 100 students from both types of schools, in equal proportions. Since the researchers focused on educators, it may be assumed that the results involving other participants would have been neglected.

According to the results, teachers' academic attitude towards the inclusion of disabled learners with their able-bodied peers was negative, while they showed a highly positive social attitude towards such an inclusion in terms of socialization between the two groups. In the case of disabled learners who show intelligence, the dominant psychological attitude to the mixing of the two groups was just average, while the psychological attitude towards inclusion of less intelligent disabled learners was below average. The results show that educators are positive about the social aspects of inclusion of disabled learners since it allows them to socialise with their siblings. However, on an intellectual and psychological level attitudes toward the education of the disabled alongside their able-bodied peers are found to be more ambivalent and range from negative to positive.

According to research, most educators' attitudes are influenced by the nature of the disability and vary with the type of disability (Avramidis et al., (2000), Davies and Green (1987) and Mushoriwa (2001). Mushoriwa (2001:142) asserts that educators have a negative attitude towards the inclusion of blind children in regular classes. The nature of the special need also influences an educator's attitude, as Davies and Green (1998:100) confirm. Avramidis et al., (2000:193) state that inclusion would be feasible for pupils with physical disabilities, while the inclusion of pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties could be a big problem.

Bothma et al., (2000:2001) conducted a study on primary school educators' attitudes towards inclusive education in two government primary schools in a middle-class suburb of Gauteng. The purpose of the research was to explore the attitudes of a selection of primary school teachers towards the policy of inclusive education. The findings reported that teachers felt that LSEN would be best served in separate educational facilities which are remedial or special schools or special classes, rather than taking them into the mainstream. The teachers involved in the study stated that they were not trained to cope with LSEN. This shows that educators' attitudes towards inclusive education in Gauteng are negative.

Marshal et al., (2002:209) also conducted a study on mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with speech and language difficulties. The study showed that ninety five percent of respondents were in favour of mainstream schooling for a child who stammers. Stammering is common in schools and it does not hinder the learning of a child. The study, however, showed a less positive attitude to children with severe speech difficulties.

2.2 STUDIES ON FACTORS INFLUENCING ATTITUDE TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

The existence of negative attitudes among some educators is the result of certain inevitable factors which educators experience in their interaction with disabled learners in the field. Factors to be taken into consideration are qualifications, age, gender, phase, experience and class size. As these factors are very influential in the teaching and learning situation, the present study is interested in establishing the extent to which these factors influence educators' attitudes towards inclusive education.

The qualifications of educators are a major factor in black schools. Most educators are operating without relevant or minimum qualifications. According to Skuy and Partington (1990:152) and Green (1991:85), a large number of educators are notoriously under-qualified. The low level of qualification causes uncertainty among educators.

A variable of educators' qualifications was used by Avramidis et al. (2000:200) in their study on educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs. The study indicated that educators holding diplomas and in-service training certificates in special education tend to have a more positive attitude towards inclusion, while educators with substantial training in special education have significantly higher positive attitudes than those with little or no training.

Avramidis et al. (2000:202) in their research findings discovered that forty percent of teachers felt the need for systematic intensive training, either as part of their certification programmes as intensive and well planned in-service training or as an ongoing process with specialists acting as consultants. According to McLaughling (1995:6), building inclusive schools will require intensive ongoing professional development as well as a critical re-examination of the preservice

education of special education teachers. Teachers from the mainstream need to increase their skills in teaching diverse learners since studies show that they lack experience (Green, 1991:85).

Avramidis and Norwich (2002:139) in a study conducted on educators' attitudes towards inclusion, contend that the knowledge gained through formal studies during pre and in-service training is very crucial. The findings indicate that teachers who had been trained to teach students with learning difficulties expressed more favourable attitudes and emotional reactions to students with special educational needs than did those who had no such training.

Experience also extends to contact with children with special educational needs. This alone can cause negative attitudes. Avramidis and Norwich (2002:138) contend that teachers with much experience with disabled persons had significantly more favourable attitudes towards integration than those with little or no experience. This is manifested in the study conducted on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education. Peresuh et al., (1997:13) conducted a study in perspectives on Special Needs Education in Nigeria, Kenya and Zimbabwe. Their study indicated that educators in these countries cope well with learners with special educational needs, since educators are sent to different colleges for in-service training. The three countries used strategies such as workshops, seminars, exchange visits and distance education. Such strategies could also be useful in South Africa to assist educators in handling diversity.

In their study, Avramidis et al., (2000:199) included the variable of the ages of educators and although their findings concluded that age did not reveal significant differences in the attitude component, it did affect the teaching-learning situation, especially given the demands of diversity. Aging educators seem to be incapable of acquiring new skills, even if they are exposed to in-service training courses. They tend to continue using teaching methods that they were taught when they

were at colleges or universities and this may contribute to a negative approach in an inclusive education.

Avramidis and Norwich (2002:137) were also interested in determining the attitudes of educators towards inclusion based on the variable of age. Their findings showed that younger teachers have been found to be more supportive of integration because they came from pre-service training and were well equipped with skills that are required to teach the LSEN. Their preparedness could also be seen as a reason for their acceptance of integration.

In their study of attitude, Avramidis et al., (2000:202) included the factor of gender in inclusive education and came to the conclusion that gender does not contribute to significant differences in the attitude component.

Mushoriwa (2001:146) conducted a study on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education with specific reference to blind children. The variable of gender was included in the study and the findings indicated that females had a more positive attitude towards blind children than males. The results showed that 50,3 % of females were positive and that 49,7 % of males were negative about having blind children in their classrooms.

As slightly more than half (0,3%) of the females were positive about teaching blind children and only 0,3% less than half of males were negative about teaching them the study concludes that there is no relationship between gender and attitude towards including blind children in regular classes.

Avramidis and Norwich (2002:137) conducted a study on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education in which the main focus was to find out whether gender had any effect on the choice. The findings revealed that female teachers had a greater tolerance level for integration and for special needs persons than did male teachers. Harvey (1985), as cited by Avramidis and Norwich (2002:137),

asserts that there is a marginal tendency for female teachers to express more positive attitudes towards the idea of integrating children with behaviour problems than male teachers.

It is also clear that educators' attitudes toward teaching in inclusive situations vary according to the phases of teaching involved. Hoover (1984:37) confirms that elementary teachers' attitudes tend to be negative due to high demand placed on the educator in elementary schools, where even non-handicapped children depend almost entirely on their educators. This situation is exacerbated in the case of handicapped children, especially when educators are inadequately trained to handle children with barriers. Alper and Retish (1972) as cited by Hoover (1984:35) state that the attitudes of pre-service elementary teachers were even less positive towards inclusion of children with special educational needs.

In secondary schools educators tend to have more positive attitudes, but they still seem adverse to the idea of educating the disabled, especially those with behavioural disorders, including the mentally retarded and those with multi-disabling conditions, in the regular classroom situation, as reported by Luseno (2001:3). According to a workshop report on Human Resource Development in support of inclusive education (2003:2), teachers in higher education seem to be more responsible and positive towards students with disabilities who are included in their courses.

According to a report by the Human Resource Development in Support of Inclusive Education Sub-Region Workshop of Central and Eastern Europe, about half of over a hundred students studying in nine faculties in higher education have disabilities. Their teachers try to adjust programmes and teaching methods to the needs of the students who have disabilities and the study reveals that teachers seem to be responsible and positive towards students with disabilities.

According to a study conducted by Avramidis and Norwich (2002:137), high school teachers display significantly more positive attitudes towards integration than junior high school and elementary school teachers. The junior high school teachers were significantly more positive than elementary school teachers.

According to Davies and Green (1998:97), experience plays a major role in the education of children with diverse needs and their study confirms that a lack of knowledge and experience with exceptional children and mainstreaming affects classroom teachers' attitudes and recommendations about placements.

According to Davies and Green (1998:100), educators with insufficient experience of teaching of disabled learners are less accepting of inclusive education than those with high experience. According to their study, which included the variable of experience, 21 % of teachers felt that they could manage a child who required a modified curriculum without consultative support and felt capable of handling diversities. Many of the participants in the study were highly experienced teachers.

Slee (2001:119), Peresuh, Adenigba and Ogonda (1997:13), Vaughn et al., (1996:599) and Vaughn and Schumm (1995:266) in their studies included the variable of experience. Their research findings disclose that many teachers do not feel that they have the knowledge or skills to appropriately plan for and instruct students with learning disabilities. The studies further indicate that educators perceive themselves as not prepared to handle a class of diverse needs – hence proving that a lack of experience causes a negative attitude towards disabled learners who are integrated in the mainstream.

In his study which included inexperienced participants who were teaching children with learning, emotional and behavioural disorders in the mainstream, Hoover (1984:34) found that lack of experience tended to result in a negative attitude, while experienced participants tended to be more positive.

The study of educators' attitudes by Avramidis and Norwich (2002:137), which included the experience variable, indicated that teachers with fewer years of experience tend to be more supportive of integration. The study also reveals that acceptance of a child with a physical disability was ranked highest among educators with less than six years of teaching experience and declined among those with six to ten years of teaching experience. The conclusion may be made that the most experienced educators were the least accepting.

Class sizes also play a major role in the teaching of children with disabilities. In Black schools, classrooms are generally overcrowded (Green, 1991:85) and it becomes very difficult to attend to the normal children's needs. As individualisation is not possible, the situation tends to worsen when LSEN have to be addressed in the same learning environment.

Davies and Green (1998:100) conducted a study on educators' attitudes towards the mainstreaming of learners with special educational needs in primary schools. One of the interviewees in the study remarked: ". . . and also I am concerned about the number of children in the class, 45 is too much! We have got these shacks here and this is the nearest school. We want to help them. I have got the patience, but you can't give 100 % to each one." In the light of the above statement, educators' attitudes are influenced adversely by the number of learners in a single classroom. If the classroom is overcrowded, an educator's attitude is likely to be negative.

Davies and Green (1998:97) also contend that teachers are more accepting of special needs if the class numbers are decreased – proving that attitudes of educators are affected by the size or number of children that they are engaged in.

Avramidis et al. (2000:202), in their research findings which include the variable of class size, show that about 35% of educators agree that their class sizes should be reduced to fewer than 20 students, if students with significant disabilities were

to be included. The respondents complained about overcrowded classes which caused a lack of space. Teachers felt that they would not have the time to give adequate individual attention to the learners with special educational needs, considering the high pupil numbers in their classrooms (Davies and Green, 1998:99).

2.3 STUDIES ON EDUCATORS' CONTACT WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

One of the factors that affect educators in inclusive education is the degree of contact with special education personnel. In order to develop positive attitudes among educators, a *sound and continuous form of contact* between educators and special education personnel should exist. *Too little or no contact encourages misunderstandings and uncertainty about how educators should handle certain disabilities.* According to Mushoriwa (2001:142) it is difficult to promote inclusive practices in situations where mainstream classes are large and resources, including teaching aids, equipment and support staff, are rare. Davies and Green (1998:97) are of the view that teachers are more accepting of special needs children if they are in contact with a special educator who favours integration. The National Commission on special needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and the National Commission in Education Support Services (NCESS) (1997: 2) maintain that human and other resources that provide support to individual learners will help to *minimise and even remove barriers to learning.*

According to Charema and Peresuh (1996:77) the main objectives of the support services which include special education personnel are "to provide appropriate quality specialist support to the learning of the disabled child in the mainstream, to equip the child with the necessary skills for independent learning, to prepare, support, equip and advise parents and mainstream teachers on how best to help children with special needs and to offer in-service training to mainstream teachers."

The kind of specialists needed is determined by the type of barriers learners may have. Inclusive schools enroll learners with all sorts of handicaps. Price (2002:2) states that 2 317 schools within Gauteng province are registered as having learners with special educational needs within their schools. The study shows that there are children who are intellectually handicapped, physically disabled, severely learning-disabled, autistic, sensory-impaired, those with cerebral palsy, and others who are juvenile offenders, but also children who are gifted.

Since studies show that all types of handicapped learners are enrolled in our schools, it is necessary for specialists with relevant specialisation to maintain contact with educators, since the specialists provide quality special support for the learning disabled child in the mainstream. They also equip the child with the necessary skills for independent learning.

According to Charema and Peresuh (1996:77) approaches differ from country to country depending on the administration, quality of personnel involved and the economic resources available. In their studies conducted south of the Sahara in the developing countries, they found six models that were employed in inclusive schools. These include the regular classroom model, consultant teacher model, pre-school model and the self-contained special class model. In their study of these models, the researchers took a closer look at these models and identified the areas which needed to be reconsidered and redressed. The research findings indicated that African developing countries should not wholly embrace the models used in the developed countries, but should instead work together to develop appropriate regional solutions and pull their resources together in order to establish training facilities and adopt models that best suit their conditions. It was found that the models presently employed were not relevant to the needs of the developing countries, which instead, required clear policy, administration and objectives to direct support service personnel. Some of the models, such as the itinerant teacher model, should be implemented from birth in order to overcome

educational difficulties in later life. Contact with Special Education Personnel in countries south of the Sahara seemed to be less effective due to the above mentioned problems.

Charema and Peresuh (1996:76) also studied support services for Special Education Needs in countries south of the Sahara. In their study they revealed that specialist methods of consultation with educators are not effective and rather inefficient. They contend that specialist teachers either spend more time helping mainstream teachers and less time teaching individual pupils, or vice versa. Their study indicated that there is no evidence to suggest that either method is more effective than the other one. This study shows clearly that the contact between educators and specialists is not stable, possibly due to the small number of specialist available. This may be the main reason for shortcomings in countries south of the Sahara.

According to this study, the problems mentioned above may also be applicable to South Africa, in that the contact between special education personnel and the educators in inclusive school is unpredictable. This problem is at the centre of this study, since there is no evidence of studies conducted in South Africa with regard to the contact between educators and special education personnel.

Avramidis et al., (2000:191) in their study of educators' attitude towards inclusion, included a variable of educators contact with specialists in special Education. The study findings reveal that there is inadequate available support from the external specialists. They contend that included students with SEN demand extra time and full support from such personnel.

According to the White Paper on Education of 6 July (2001:29), support service in South Africa will be strengthened and have at its centre new district-based support teams that will comprise staff from provincial district, regional and head offices and from special schools. The primary function of these district support

teams will be to evaluate programmes, diagnose their effectiveness and suggest modifications. At the institutional level, institutional support teams will be established. District support teams will provide the full range of education support services, such as professional development in curriculum and assessment to the institutional level support teams. The implementation of the resolutions stated in the White Paper will make things simpler and make it possible for everyone to feel free to cope with learners with special educational needs.

2.4 Conclusion

Most studies indicate that educators have negative attitudes towards inclusive education. The nature of the negative attitude emanates from factors which are very influential and unavoidable. Educators should be placed according to their abilities in order to be able to enhance the abilities of disabled learners to reach proper adulthood and to have all their educational needs met wholly. All the relevant physical and human resources should be within reach of the educators, including in-service programmes for those who are in need of such services and strong pre-service programmes for those who are still in tertiary institutions.

Mushoriwa (2001:146) feels that the policy makers and educationists in general need to pause for a while and seriously consider what teachers, parents and those with disabilities themselves think and feel about inclusive education. It is of no use mainstreaming disabled learners when they are not welcomed in the mainstream. The writer's feelings are that educators should be given a chance to nourish and equip themselves with the necessary skills to handle diversities. The government, in turn, should improve the physical conditions of schools to create conducive environments for those who cannot be educated without the relevant infrastructure and materials.

In one of the studies conducted by Avramidis et al (2000:202), the researchers contend that if special needs children were to be mainstreamed, it would be

necessary to physically restructure the school in order to accommodate children with different needs in terms of classroom layout, special chairs, tables and other requirements. Without such restructuring, the mainstreaming of the disabled will be meaningless and fruitless.

According to the White Paper on Education of 6 July (2001:28), the ministry of education in South Africa sees the strengthening of educational support services as the key to reducing barriers to learning. With the strengthened support services, there is no doubt that all educators will have the courage to work with learners with disabilities and therefore the attitude of each educator will improve for the better.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with the methods that the researcher will use to conduct a research study. The methods of sampling, collecting and analysing data, as well as the research design, will be discussed.

3.2 THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design will take the form of a descriptive study. A descriptive research method is considered to be the most appropriate approach for this study because it describes existing attitudes and behaviours, which is the goal of this study as applied to educators' approaches to inclusive education (Price, 2000:49). A descriptive research method not only concerns itself with the current status of things but also focuses on a group of subjects, as the present study focuses on a group of about 122 educators teaching in six government primary schools. The aforementioned research design is therefore considered to be best suited to the present study, which investigates educators' attitudes towards inclusive education in their day-to-day interaction with learners with special educational needs (LSEs).

Among the many researchers who studied educators' attitudes towards inclusive education and who used the aforementioned research design, were Marshall et al. (2002), Bothma et al., (2000:2001), Davies and Green (1999), Hoover (1984), and Price (2000).

Marshall et al. (2002:203) applied the descriptive method to an experimental sample of students studying at the University of Manchester's Department of

Education, while Bothma et al. (2000:201) used the same method on two groups of primary school teachers teaching in government primary schools in a middle-class suburb of Gauteng. Davies and Green (1998:98) applied the descriptive method to two co-educational state primary schools, while Hoover (1984:34) used this approach in focusing on 10 elementary schools within one local district. Price (2000:49) asserts the view that this research method is useful as a preliminary step in order to describe how things are and, as inclusion is a new initiative, is of the opinion that this research design will be valuable in evaluating the situation in schools

The present study also made use of this design to describe the attitude of six groups of educators' attitudes towards inclusive education.

3.3 THE SAMPLING DESIGN

The study sample was drawn from a population of primary school educators teaching in various schools, including a remedial centre and four mainstream schools in Empangeni and one inclusive school located in Estcourt. Two of these schools were targeted through purposeful sampling and, since the educators were in contact with the disabled learners, they provided the relevant information. This method was followed in accordance with the advice of Ryndak, Jackson and Billingsley (2001:105), who maintain that information should be collected from information-rich sources. Among four mainstream schools located in Empangeni, two are rural area schools and two are township schools.

Among the many researchers who studied educators' attitudes towards inclusive education, very few used purposeful sampling. Bothma et al. (2000:2001) used this method in their study. Purposeful sampling has to do with the selection of information-rich cases. Educators teaching in inclusive schools are the ones who are knowledgeable about inclusive education because they interact with integrated learners. They are therefore likely to have relevant answers to the researchers'

questions. It is believed that purposeful sampling is necessary in the South African situation, since inclusive schools are very limited.

The other four regular schools were randomly selected since there were many schools to choose from. Many researchers have used *random sampling* in places where inclusive education had started long ago, because they had a number of inclusive schools to choose from. Mushoriwa (2001:143), Luseno (2001:3), Baylis et al. (2000:198) and Davies and Green (1998:98) are among those who used random sampling.

Purposeful and random sampling approaches were used in this study.

3.4 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

A Likert-type questionnaire, designed to create a convenient and relaxed atmosphere for respondents, was used to reveal educators' attitudes and feelings towards inclusive education. The closed-ended questions were used

Many researchers who had studied educators' attitudes towards inclusive education in particular have used the Likert-type questionnaire. These include Avramidis et al. (2002), Luseno (2001), and Mushoriwa (2001). Avramidis et al. (2002:203) used a Likert-type questionnaire in attempting to ascertain the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with the general concept of integration as related to a range of *disabling conditions*. Luseno (2001:3) used 36 Likert-statements and 19 open-ended questions to assess the perceptions of secondary special education teachers working in inclusive settings in Virginia. Mushoriwa (2001:143) also used a Likert-like scale because of its reliability in obtaining the total attitude score for each respondent.

The Likert-type questionnaire used in this study tested whether respondents strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed or felt undecided about the

concept of inclusion. It also revealed their attitude towards the concept of inclusion.

3.4.1 THE NATURE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN RELATION TO THE AIMS

The questionnaire was divided into two sections, namely Section A, which consists of *personal information* covers the second and the third aims of the study.

The second aim of the study concerns the variables of age, gender, experience, phase, qualifications and class-size. These variables have seldom appeared in studies on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education. Sadek and Sadek (2000:4) involved three variables, i.e. of gender, qualifications, and class-size. In their findings they discovered that females showed more positive attitudes than males, that educators were competent, and that the size of the class affected educators' attitudes. Davies and Green (1998:100) included the variable of class-size and also found that it affected the attitude of educators. Avramidis et al. (2000:191) and Avramidis and Norwich (2002:137) also made use of all the variables that this study employed and concluded that the variables affected educators' attitudes. The variable of educators' contact with special education personnel will be included in Section A. This variable is contained in the third aim of the study. Section B will consist of Likert statements covering the first aim of the study, which includes the nature of educators' attitudes towards inclusive education.

According to Nene (1969:36) an attitude is made up of three components. These components are the *cognitive component*, which consists of the beliefs about an attitude object, the *feeling component* which refers to the emotion which is associated with the attitude object, and the *action tendency component*, which includes all types of behavioural readiness associated with the attitude. These components form part of the present study.

Section B consists of 38 items that have been divided into three components. The first component, which is the cognitive (belief) component, consists of 6 items. The second component, namely feeling, consists of 25 items, while the action tendency, the third component, consists of 7 items

3.4.2 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

A pilot study was conducted in order to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. A questionnaire was piloted with a group of 20 educators who are teaching in mainstream settings. Only twenty educators were used in the initial pilot programme which preceded a more comprehensive study.

An internal consistency method of item analysis was used in a test run to check the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire. Internal consistency has to do with correlation among the items. If the items are linked and related to one another, this will prove that there is internal consistency among them, (Gold, 1984:38).

3.4.3 SCORING PROCEDURES

A Likert-type rating scale with five response categories was used, namely: strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (U), disagree (DA) and strongly disagree (SD).

Many researchers, including Avramidis et al. (2000:98), Mushoriwa (2001:145), Kulinma and Silverman (2000:81) and Price (2000:53) made use of this type of scale with five categories in the continuum. In this study, a scale was devised by assigning the values of 5,4,3,2 and 1 to those statements which are positively worded, while those which are negatively worded were assigned the values of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

The questionnaire consists of 38 items. The total score for each respondent was obtained by summing the values of the 38 independent items. The highest possible score is 190 (38 x 5), which indicates the most positive attitude, while the lowest possible score is 38 (38 x 1), which indicates the most negative attitude. In order to determine whether the respondents' attitudes are positive or negative, the total scores for all research participants are added and divided by their number in order to determine the mean. Therefore, individual totals above the mean indicate positive attitudes, while an individual total score equal to or below the mean indicates negative attitude.

3.5 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

Two groups emerged on the basis of total scores: the group with high scores showing a favourable (positive) attitude towards inclusive education, and the group with low scores indicating an unfavourable (negative) attitude towards inclusive education.

The chi-square test of independence was used in line with Davies and Green (1998:99), who used a statistical analysis of response frequencies using a chi-square test (χ^2) in their study of educators' attitudes towards inclusive education. In this study the chi-square was used as an inferential statistic with nominal data such as frequency counts.

The four main, basic assumptions in the use of the chi-square test include random and independent sampling of the data, mutual exclusiveness of all categories (which simply means that each observation qualifies for one and only one category), the assumption that the expected frequencies are at least 10 in each category, and finally, that the groups are independent.

In this study two groups were formed, namely the positive group (which favours inclusive education) and the negative group (which is not in favour of inclusive education). These two groups were mutually independent from one another. The expected frequencies could not be less than 5 since the minimum amounted to 38x1.

3.6 PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Permission for the study was obtained from the Regional Chief Directors (RCD) of Empangeni and Ladysmith. They were informed about the research project and copies of relevant documents, including the questionnaire, were sent to them. The Research Units of Empangeni and Ladysmith Regions furnished the researcher with addresses and telephone numbers of the targeted schools.

Permission to carry out the research study was obtained from the relevant school principals and the research project and the aims of the questionnaire were explained to them. Questionnaires were posted to the pilot school since it is located in a distant area. The rest of the questionnaires were hand delivered to schools that were in close proximity to the researcher. The pilot school was selected due to the fact that it is the only one in KwaZulu-Natal that is implementing inclusive education. The posted questionnaires were sent off with franked and self-addressed return envelopes and a cover letter, explaining the nature of the research project to schools. The participating schools also received a copy of the letter of approval issued by the Department of Education, together with the researcher's contact telephone number and address.

Permission to conduct the research was obtained from the Research Unit, Department of Education and Culture, KwaZulu-Natal. A copy of the research questionnaire with the letter of request were sent to the Regional Directors.

3.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter focused on the research method used in the study. The methods that were used in this study were tested and used by other researchers and they are believed to be most relevant which will yield best results.

The following chapter will focus on the presentation and analysis of data obtained from the fieldwork. Data analysis based on the three aims of this study and its findings are presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter concerns itself with the detailed field work procedures for both the pilot study and the final study. Data obtained from the pilot and final study will be presented, analysed and interpreted. Three hypotheses will be formulated and tested in this chapter.

4.2 THE PILOT STUDY SAMPLE

The aim of conducting a pilot study is to test validity and reliability of the questionnaire. The pilot study was conducted among primary school educators in Empangeni District. Educators used as a pilot study sample were not included in a final study sample.

4.3 ADMINISTRATION OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT IN THE PILOT STUDY

TABLE 4.1 DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS IN THE PILOT STUDY (N=20)

Criteria	Levels		
Gender	Males	Females	
	8	12	
Age In Years	31 – 40	41 – 50	
	11	9	
Qualification	Matric + 3years (REQV13)	Matric +4years (REQV14)	
	12	8	
Teaching Experience In Years	0 – 10	11 – 20	
	9	11	
Class Size	31 – 60		
	20		
Phase Taught	R- 3	4 – 6	7 – 9
	10	5	5
Contact with special Education personnel	Yes	No	
	6	14	

The researcher administered the questionnaire to primary schools educators. These educators are teaching in mainstream settings. Educators were given a week to complete the questionnaire. They did not encounter difficulty in completing the questionnaire because instructions were clearly stated, although few items were not completed.

4.4 RESULTS OF THE PILOT STUDY

The questionnaire was returned, and the items were analysed. The SPSS computer programme was used to analyse data.

4.5 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR 52 ITEMS

By doing factor analysis the researcher intended to extract three factors. Factor analysis was able to identify three factors that were needed.

TABLE 4.2 FACTOR ANALYSIS: FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE 52 ITEMS

ITEM	FACTOR			ESTIMATED COMMUNALITY
	1	2	3	
1.	.399	.357	-.028	.939
2.	.430	-.203	.493	.956
3.	.497	.218	.106	.927
4.	.522	.198	.123	.967
5.	.593	-.247	.465	.891
6.	-.123	.329	.358	.840
7.	.258	.257	-.100	.877
8.	-.192	-.188	-.443	.938
9.	.746	.148	.091	.946
10.	.319	.125	-.615	.959
11.	-.147	.033	.186	.991
12.	.343	-.174	.402	.872
13.	.461	-.134	-.393	.945
14.	.769	-.104	-.501	.977
15.	.630	.041	.322	.967
16.	.558	.232	-.381	.956
17.	.400	.056	.297	.884
18.	.050	.679	-.109	.944
19.	.683	-.306	-.063	.933
20.	.818	-.116	-.222	.921
21.	.318	.788	.252	.965
22.	-.013	.478	.001	.982
23.	.262	-.253	.478	.971
24.	.582	-.282	-.236	.900

25.	.006	-.307	-.104	.991
26.	.604	.163	.011	.986
27.	.696	.222	.126	.972
28.	-.019	.323	.015	.875
29.	.451	-.452	-.101	.895
30.	.222	-.208	-.334	.744
31.	.552	.399	.064	.961
32.	.421	.058	-.540	.990
33.	-.321	-.220	-.085	.902
34.	.363	.042	-.031	.903
35.	.082	-.382	.228	.898
36.	.320	-.521	-.031	.928
37.	.136	-.450	-.340	.917
38.	.433	.612	.273	.930
39.	.233	.642	.190	.873
40.	.425	-.690	.053	.975
41.	.612	-.242	.155	.970
42.	.100	-.191	-.168	.929
43.	.290	-.581	.215	.936
44.	.275	-.308	.531	.956
45.	.366	.095	.058	.937
46.	.253	-.309	.189	.861
47.	.787	-.067	-.076	.953
48.	.585	.191	-.101	.896
49.	.414	.462	-.573	.982
50.	.096	-.029	.748	.979
51.	.734	-.086	-.316	.951
52.	.429	.106	.569	.973

BOLD TYPE INDICATES THE HIGHEST LOADING ON A FACTOR

The first column in table 4.2 contains the number of items. The second column contains factor one loading, the third column contains factor two loadings, the fourth column contains factor three loadings and the last column which is the fifth column contains an estimated communality of an item. These factor loadings are expressed as correlation coefficients between factors and items. It gives an extent or degree to which an item is related with the factor.

Table 4.2 shows that items 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 40, 41, 45, 47, 48 and 51 have the highest loadings on the first factor. All these items which are in factor one measure the attitude towards severe disabilities component. Items 18, 21, 22, 38, 39 and 49 measure the attitude towards behavioural disorders. Items 2, 6, 12, 23, 44, 50 and 52 measure the attitude towards minor disabilities.

The cut-off point of ,330 was chosen for this pilot study. All the items below the cut-off point of ,330 were discarded. Using ,330 as the cut-off point 14 items were discarded and the item numbers are 7, 8, 10, 11, 25, 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 42, 43 and 46. All items above the cut-off point were retained, 38 items were retained and the item numbers are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52.

Out of 52 items, 14 were discarded from the final scale. Therefore, the total number of the items in the questionnaire for the final study is 38.

4.5.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE THREE FACTORS

The three factors namely severe disabilities, behavioural disorders and minor disabilities are described below.

FACTOR 1:**TABLE 4.3 SEVERE DISABILITIES**

ITEM	LOADING	ESTIMATED COMMUNALITY
1.	.399	.939
3.	.497	.927
4.	.522	.967
5.	.593	.891
9.	.746	.946
13.	.461	.945
14.	.769	.977
15.	.630	.967
16.	.558	.956
17.	.400	.884
19.	.683	.933
20.	.818	.921
24.	.582	.900
26.	.604	.986
27.	.696	.972
29.	.451	.895
31.	.552	.961
32.	.421	.990
34.	.363	.903
40.	.425	.975
41.	.612	.970
45.	.366	.937
47.	.787	.953
48.	.585	.896
51.	.734	.951

The table above consists of items about severe disabilities. Severe disabilities include disabilities like mentally challenged learners, lame, blind, deaf and dumb, learners with no limbs and those who relieve themselves in class, such disabilities hinder learners from reaching out their educational goals if put in mainstream settings. They are an important issue. These types of disabilities demand of educators to have assistance teachers to help since an educator alone cannot cope with the whole situation.

FACTOR 2:

TABLE 4.4 BEHAVIOURAL DISORDERS

ITEM	LOADING	ESTIMATED COMMUNALITY
18.	.679	.944
21.	.788	.965
22.	.478	.982
38.	.612	.930
39.	.642	.873
49.	.462	.982

Table 4.4 consists of items on behavioural disorders. All problems that have to do with behaviour are packed in this factor according to the internal-consistency reliability. Behavioural disorders mentioned include delinquent, disobedient, aggressive, overactive and those learners who do not listen to instructions. All these problems have to do with behaviour of a learner, where the kind of assistance needed is mainly social workers and psychologists.

FACTOR 3:**TABLE 4.5 MINOR DISABILITIES**

ITEM	LOADING	ESTIMATED COMMUNALITY
2.	.493	.956
6.	.358	.840
12.	.402	.872
23.	.478	.971
44.	.531	.956
50.	.748	.979
52.	.569	.973

This table shows items on minor disabilities. This factor deals with those learners who have minor learning disabilities such as those who are labeled slow learner, the highly gifted ones, learners who are partially sighted, stammering ones, nervous and those who are limping. These disabilities are not very much demanding since these kind of learners are found in mainstream schools and educators cope with them.

4.6 THE FINAL STUDY SAMPLE

Six schools were selected as a study sample in KwaZulu-Natal.

4.7 ADMINISTRATION OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT IN THE FINAL STUDY

TABLE 4.6 DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS IN A SAMPLE (N=6)

PROVINCE	REGION	DISTRICT	SCHOOLS IN THE SAMPLE
KwaZulu-Natal	Ladysmith(Ukhahlamba)	Estcourt	1
	Zululand	Empangeni	5

The table above shows the regions where empirical study was conducted. In KwaZulu-Natal, two regions were selected: Ladysmith (Ukhahlamba) region, Escourt district, only one school was selected. Zululand region: Empangeni district, five schools were selected.

Ladysmith region was purposefully selected because there is only one pilot school for inclusive education in KwaZulu-Natal and the Zululand region was randomly selected as well as the four schools for regular education whereas the one which is the remedial centre was also purposefully selected.

**TABLE 4.7 DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS IN THE FINAL STUDY
(N=122)**

CRITERIA	LEVELS			
	Gender	Males	Females	
	33	89		
Age in years	21 – 30	31 – 40	41 – 50	50+
	18	54	36	14
Qualification	Matric +3yrs (REQV13)	Matric +4yrs (REQV14)	Matric +5yrs (REQV15)	
	12	64	46	
Teaching experience in years	0-10	11-20	21-30	31+
	33	51	25	13
Phase/grade Taught	Grade R – 3	Grade 4 – 6	Grade 7 – 9	
	53	43	26	
Class size	0-30	31-60		
	40	82		
Contact with special education personnel	Yes	No		
	50	72		

Table 4.7 shows the distribution of subjects in the final study sample. The questionnaire was administered to 122 educators.

4.7.1 FORMULATION OF THE HYPOTHESES

From the aims stated in chapter one, the following theoretical hypotheses were formulated.

- (i) Educators hold negative attitudes towards inclusive education
- (ii) There is no relationship between attitude and respondents' characteristics, such as age, gender, qualification, experience, grade taught and class size.
- (iii) Contact with special education personnel has no influence on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education.

4.8 RESULTS OF THE FINAL STUDY

In the analysis of data, hypotheses, are tested and the results are presented in the tables.

The three hypotheses are tested in this study. Each hypothesis is reiterated.

A total score for each individual was obtained by summing all the scores to individual items. There were thirty eight items altogether. A high total score indicates a positive attitude and a low total score indicates a negative attitude towards inclusive education. A general mean score was obtained by adding the total scores for the respondents and dividing this sum by the number of items, i.e. $\Sigma X = 13\ 406$, and $n = 122$, therefore, the general mean score is 109.

4.8.1 HYPOTHESIS NUMBER ONE

Reiteration of hypothesis number one.

"Educators hold negative attitudes toward inclusive education."

To test this hypothesis the nominal data will be subject to chi-square analysis.

TABLE 4.8 THE NATURE OF EDUCATORS ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (N=122)

ATTITUDES	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
51	71
$\chi^2=3,27$	df=1
	p>0.5

A χ^2 value of 3,27 at df=1 is not significant. We uphold H_0 and reject H_1 . The hypothesis that educators hold negative attitude towards inclusive education has been confirmed.

Hypothesis number one has been confirmed. In this study fifty eight percent of educators hold a negative attitude towards inclusive education and forty-two percent hold positive attitude towards inclusive education.

TABLE 49 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES AND EDUCATORS' LOCATION (N=122)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Urban school	20	2
Rural school	6	29
Township school	16	40
Inclusive school	9	0
	$\chi^2=49,1$	df=3
		p<.05

A χ^2 of 49.1, at df=3 is found to be significant. We uphold H_1 and reject H_0 . The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between educators' attitudes and educators location has been confirmed.

Environment plays the very important role in as far as inclusion is concerned. One hundred percent of educators' who are in inclusive setting have a positive attitude towards inclusive education. Ninety one per cent of educators in urban school are in favour of inclusive education whereas nine percent of educators have the negative attitude towards inclusive education.

4.8.2 HYPOTHESIS NUMBER TWO

Reiteration of hypothesis number two.

"There is no relationship between attitude and respondents' characteristics such as age, gender, qualification, experience, grade taught and class size

To test this hypothesis a chi-square analysis will be used to all the above variables, as the data are categorical.

TABLE 4.10 THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE VARIABLE OF GENDER INFLUENCES EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (N=122)

GENDER	ATTITUDES		
	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
Females	41	48	
Males	10	23	
	$\chi^2=5.68$	df=3	p<.05

A χ^2 of 5,68 exceeds the tabled value at the level of significance which is 0,05 (3,84). Therefore the calculated value is greater than the tabled value, where df=1. This means that we uphold H_1 and reject the H_0 . Results are significant. They are not due to chance factors. Male and female educators differ significantly in their attitudes towards inclusive education. This is significant in our chosen level.

The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between educators' attitude towards inclusive education and gender has been confirmed in this study.

TABLE 4.11 THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE VARIABLE OF AGE AFFECTS EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (N=122)

ATTITUDES		
AGE IN YEARS	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
21-30	5	13
31-40	19	35
41-40	18	18
51+	9	5
	$\chi^2=9.24$	df=3
		p<.05

A χ^2 of 9,24 at df=3 is significant. We reject H_0 and uphold the H_1 . The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between educators' attitudes and age is confirmed.

The hypothesis is confirmed. We conclude that there is a relationship between the respondents' age and the attitude towards inclusive education.

TABLE 4.12 THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE VARIABLE OF QUALIFICATION AFFECTS EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (N=122)

QUALIFICATION	ATTITUDES		
	POSTIVE	NEGATIVE	
M+3 (REQV13)	5	7	
M+4 (REQV14)	28	36	
M+5 (REQV15)	18	28	
	$\chi^2=10.48$	df=2	p<.05

A χ^2 of 10.48 at df=2 is significant. We uphold the H_1 and reject the H_0 . The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between educators' attitudes and qualification is confirmed.

The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between educators' attitude towards inclusive education and qualification is confirmed. The results proved that forty one percent of educators with the minimum qualification was positive, and fifty nine percent educators of the same educational level had negative attitudes.

TABLE 4.13 THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE VARIABLE OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AFFECTS EDUCATOR'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (N=122)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN YEARS	ATTITUDE		
	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
0-10	16	17	
11-20	20	31	
21-30	9	16	
31+	6	7	
	$\chi^2 = 4,44$	df=3	P>.05

In compiling the table above, the objective was to determine whether the variable of teaching experience affects educators' attitudes towards inclusive education.

A χ^2 value of 4,44 at df=3 is not significant. The calculated value is less than the tabled value. We uphold the null hypothesis H_0 and reject the alternative hypothesis H_1 . The hypothesis that there is no relationship between the educators' attitudes towards inclusive education and teaching experience has been confirmed..

TABLE 4.14 THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE VARIABLE OF PHASE OR GRADE AFFECTS EDUCATORS ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (N=122)

PHASE/GRADE	ATTITUDE		
	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
R-3	27	25	
4-6	18	25	
7-9	5	21	
	$\chi^2 = 11,12$	df=2	p< .05

In table 4.14 above we wanted to find out the extent to which educators' attitudes are affected by this variable of phase or grade.

A χ^2 value of 11,12 at df=2 is significant. We reject the H_0 and uphold the H_1 .

The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between educators' attitudes towards inclusive education and the phase or grade taught has been confirmed. The results show that there is a relationship between educators' attitudes towards inclusive education and the phase or grade in which an educator teaches.

TABLE 4.15 THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE VARIABLE OF CLASS SIZE AFFECTS EDUCATORS ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (N=122)

CLASS SIZE	ATTITUDE	
	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
0-30	29	11
30-60	22	60
$\chi^2 = 25,7$ $df=1$		$p < .05$

In table 4.15 we wanted to find out the extent to which educators' attitudes are affected by the variable of class size which is the number of learners in a classroom.

A χ^2 of 25,7 value at $df=1$ is significant. The calculated value is greater than the tabled value of .05. (3.84). It is therefore significant and we uphold the H_1 and reject the H_0 . The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between the educators' attitudes and class size has been confirmed.

The results show that there is a relationship between the educators' attitudes towards inclusive education and the class size (which refers to the number of learners being taught by a single educator).

4.8.3 HYPOTHESIS NUMBER THREE

Reiteration of hypothesis number three.

"Contact with special education personnel has no influence on educators' attitudes towards inclusive education."

In this hypothesis we want to find out whether educators who have contact with special education personnel are favourably disposed towards inclusive education. To test this hypothesis a chi-square test will be used.

TABLE 4.16 CONTACT WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL (N=122)

	ATTITUDES		
	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
Yes	30	20	
No	21	51	
	$\chi^2=14,5$	df=1	p<.05

A χ^2 value 14,5 exceeds the level of significance which is .05(3,84) at df=1. Therefore it is significant and we reject the null hypothesis H_0 and uphold the H_1 . The hypothesis that contact with special education personnel has an influence on educators attitudes towards inclusive education is confirmed.

The results show that fifty-nine percent of educators did not have contact with special education personnel and that the majority of this group hold negative attitudes towards inclusive education. Forty-one percent of educators had contact with special education personnel and the majority of this group had positive attitudes towards inclusive education. Therefore, it is concluded that educators' contact with special education personnel influenced their attitudes towards inclusion of disabled learners in mainstream settings.

4.9 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, data of the pilot and of the final study were presented, analysed and interpreted. In the following chapter, discussions, recommendations and limitations will be made.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS OF RESULTS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

5.1 DISCUSSIONS

The study intended to find answers to the following questions:

- (i) What is the nature of educators' attitudes towards inclusive education?
- (ii) To what extent do the following factors affect educators' attitudes: age, gender, qualification, experience, phase or grade taught and class size.
- (iii) Do educators' contact with special education personnel influence their attitudes towards inclusive education?

5.1.1 FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO AIM NUMBER ONE

The results show that most educators have negative attitudes towards inclusive education. This study supports the theories of Avrimidis, Bayliss and Burden, (2000:193), Davies and Green (1998:98), Mushoriwa (2000:142) and Marshall, Ralph and Palmer (2002:209). Their research findings are in agreement that educators seem to have negative attitudes towards *inclusive education*. Davies and Green (1998:99) mention that educators' attitudes are influenced by the nature of the disability. In this study it was determined that educators accept learners with minor disabilities, while rejecting those with severe disabilities.

5.1.2 FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO AIM NUMBER TWO

The results show that factors such as age, gender, qualification, phase/grade taught and class size have an influence on educators' attitudes towards *inclusive education*. The findings of this study support Avramidis and Norwich

(2002:137), Avramidis et al., (2000:199), and Luseno (2001:3) when they say that these variables affect educators' attitude to a great extent.

The study supports Green (1991:85) who is of the opinion that educators are unable to individualise their teaching in overcrowded classrooms. The results show that most educators teach more than thirty-six learners in one classroom, which is not in line with the educator-learner ratio which is 1:36, and all educators displayed negative attitude towards inclusive education.

5.1.3 FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO AIM NUMBER THREE

The results on the variable of contact with special education personnel in this study supports Charema and Peresuh (1996:77), and Davies and Green (1998:97) who contend that educators who get support from specialists have positive attitudes towards inclusive education. The study revealed that most educators do not have contact with special education personnel, and as a result they hold negative attitudes towards inclusive education. A minority group of educators who have contact with special education personnel hold positive attitudes towards inclusive education.

5.2 IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

The research findings indicate that most educators hold negative attitudes towards inclusive education. It is believed that workshops should be held to motivate educators to be more positive about inclusive education. Such workshops should explain the meaning of inclusion because some educators are not acquainted with the term. Educators need training to cope with the diverse needs of learners who are integrated in one classroom. Educators also need certain incentives, such as certificates and other kinds of recognition, including salary increases for handling such learners.

The age of an educator should be taken into consideration since the results show that there is a relationship between educators' attitudes and age. Aging educators are not used to new methods of teaching, therefore it would be wise not to include them in the system.

Gender also should be considered. The results show that a relationship exists between educators' attitudes and gender. There are certain kinds of disabilities that cannot be handled by certain genders, and these have to be considered, for example, foundation phase learners who cry often and relieve themselves in class need the attention of a female educator.

Qualifications play a very important role. The research findings reveal that qualifications affect educators' attitudes. Therefore educators who handle such learners should have a relevant qualification in order for learners to benefit from his/her teaching. Appropriate qualifications also assists an educator to achieve the aims that are set.

The numbers of learners in classrooms should be reduced, since the results show that some educators handle overcrowded classes. The number of learners should be in accordance with the educator-learner ratio which is 1:36 to enable an educator to handle such a class and to apply suitable methods such as individualisation.

Some educators feel relaxed if they are teaching foundation or intermediate phase learners, while others prefer senior phase learners. A preference should be made since the results show a relationship between the variable of grade/phase taught and educators' attitudes.

Exposure is also important. An educator who is familiar with a certain kind of disability will be at an advantage that the one who has no experience pertaining to the kind of disability.

The number of special education personnel should be increased. Different kinds of specialists should be available since there are many kinds of disabilities in schools. These specialists should be stationed in local districts in order to ascertain their availability in all schools

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the study succeeded in achieving its objectives, in hindsight, the following improvements could have been made to enhance success.

- (a) Personal administration of the questionnaire is considered to be a better method than posting questionnaires, since it leads to the return of a *number of incomplete or careless completed questionnaires*. Sometimes questionnaires are not returned by respondents.
- (b) Personal administration of the questionnaire is recommended because the respondents have an opportunity to ask questions and it also allows a researcher to explain the terms used and to give full details of the questionnaire.
- (c) A questionnaire which is designed to suit all educators whether teaching in special, regular, inclusive or remedial schools.

5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although this study has achieved its objectives, several limitations exist with regard to the sample, instrument, field of study and terminology used.

- (a) There were limitations emanating from the sample. Only one inclusive school exists in the province, while other schools which were targeted as inclusive schools are not yet implementing inclusive education. Therefore the researcher was compelled to use one inclusive school.

- (b) Special school educators did not complete the questionnaire. They mentioned that it was not designed for them. It was considered suitable for educators who are teaching in mainstream and inclusive settings only. Therefore attitudes of special school educators were not investigated.
- (c) Some educators did not return questionnaires while others returned them *incompleted*. Therefore not all educators responded to the questionnaire.
- (d) Problems in understanding the term special education personnel resulted in misconceptions. The researcher did not encounter such problems in as far as the pilot study was concerned, but the problem revealed itself with a few of the respondents who did not understand the term in the final study.

5.5 AVENUES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The study has succeeded in achieving its objectives and has opened the following areas for future research.

- (a) The study investigated educators' attitudes towards inclusive education. Only one school (which is a pilot school for inclusive education) was used because it was the only one available. There is therefore a need to investigate attitudes of educators in other schools targeted as pilot schools.
- (b) There is a need to investigate attitudes of educators teaching in special schools since they were not used in this study. The sample comprised of inclusive and regular school educators only.
- (c) A comparative study of inclusive, ordinary and special school educators' attitudes towards inclusive education is a necessity, in order to establish which group favours inclusive education the most among them.
- (d) It is also necessary to study students' attitudes towards inclusive education in KwaZulu-Natal in order to know their stand concerning inclusive education.

- (e) Equipment or physical resources are of crucial importance in teaching an inclusive class, therefore there is a need to investigate the resources available in schools.
- (f) Skills play a major role in educating a class of learners with diverse needs, it is therefore necessary to investigate the skills that educators possess.

5.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the findings of the study and established that the aims of the research study were achieved. Recommendations for future studies were made and the limitations of the study were listed.

REFERENCES

1. Alban-Metcalf, J (1996). Assessing pupils with special needs in mainstream school: *The European Electronic Journal on Inclusive Education in Europe*, 1:1-8.
2. Anáiz, P (1996). Beginning Inclusive Education in Schools: An experience in Muga. *The European electronic Journal on Inclusive Education in Europe*, 1:1-3.
3. Avramidis, E, & Burden, R (2000). A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 20 (2):191-215.
4. Avramidis, E & Norwich, B (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: a review of the literature. *European Journal of special needs education*, 17(2):129 - 147.
5. Bayliss, P (1996). Segregation, Integration, Exclusion, Inclusion: The frameworks and Rationales: *The European Electronic Journal on Inclusive Education in Europe*, 1:1-12.
6. Bothma, M, Gravett, S & Swart, E (2000). Attitudes of primary school teachers toward inclusive education. *South African Journal of Education*, 20(3): 2000-2004.
7. Brodsky, M (2001). Interview: Special Education and Training becomes standard. Western Oregon State University College of Education.
8. Brucker, P (1996). Advantages of inclusion for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29 (6):581-606.

9. Carro, L (1997). School integration in Spain, A step toward inclusion in a democratic society. *The European Journal on inclusive Education in Europe*, 2:1-10.
10. Charema, J, Peresuh, M (1996). Support services for special educational needs: Proposed models for countries south of the Sahara. *Journal of special needs education*, 1(2):76-83.
11. Community Television Producers Association Report (CTPA) (1998). *Alternative Education, The Road to a Democratic Future*:UWC, Bellville .
12. Daane, C J, Beirne-Smith, M & Dianne, L (2000). Administrators' and teachers' perceptions of the collaborative efforts of inclusion in the elementary grades. *Journal of education*, 121 (2):1-9.
13. Davies, J & Green, L (1998). Mainstream teachers' attitudes to the mainstreaming of learners with special educational needs in primary classroom: A Western Cape study. *South African Journal of Education*, 18 (2):97-102.
14. Department of National Education (DNE) (1996). *White Paper on Education and Training*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
15. Department of National Education (DNE) (1997). *Quality Education for all. A report of the National Commission on special needs in education and training (NCSNET) and National Committee for Education Support Services (NCESS)* Pretoria. Government Printers.
16. Department of National Education (DNE) (2001). *White Paper on Education and Training*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

17. Engelbrecht, P & Forlin, C (1998). Pre-service teachers' acceptance of and social interactions with persons with disabilities: The African scene. *African Journal of Special Needs Education*, 3 (1):1-10.
18. Engelbrecht, P, Green, L, Naicker, S & Engelbrecht, L (1999). *Inclusive Education in Action in South Africa*, van Schaik Publishers, Western Cape.
19. Gold, J A (1984). *Principles of Psychological Research*. The Dorsey Press, Homewood.
20. Green, L (1991). Mainstreaming: The challenge for teachers in South Africa. *Support for learning disabilities*, 6(12):84-87.
21. Hintz, A (1996). Inclusive Education in Germany: The Example of Hamburg. *The European electronic Journal on Inclusive Education in Europe*, 1:1-10.
22. Hoover, J (1984). Effects of special education classroom experience of pre-service elementary teachers on attitudes towards mainstreaming as measured before and after student teaching. *Journal of research and development in Education*, 18 (1): 33-39.
23. Human Resource Development Workshop (HRDW) (2003). A sub-regional workshop central and Eastern Europe in support of inclusive education. Europe.
24. Hunt, P, Hirose-Hatae, A, Doering, K, Karasoff, P & Goetz, L (2000). "Community" is what I think everyone is talking about. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21(5):305-317.
25. Kulinna, P H & Silverman, S (2000). Teachers attitudes towards teaching physical activity and fitness. *American alliance for health, physical education, recreation and dance*, 71 (1): 80-84.

26. Luseno, F K (2001). An assessment of the perceptions of secondary special education teachers working in inclusive settings in Virginia. Published DED Thesis, University of Virginia.
27. Marshall, J Ralph, S & Palmer S (2002). 'I wasn't trained to work with them': Mainstream teachers' attitudes to children with speech and language difficulty. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 6 (3): 199-215.
28. McLaughling, M J (1995). Defining special education: A response to Zigmond and Baker. *Journal of Special Education*, 29(2):200-209.
29. McMillan, J H & Schumacher, S (1993). Research in Education: A conceptual Introduction. Harper Collins Publishers, New York.
30. Mushoriwa, T (2001). A study of the attitudes of primary school teachers in Harare towards the inclusion of blind children in regular classes. *British Journal of special education*, 28 (3): 142-147.
31. Nene, L M (1969). *The attitude of Bantu College students towards university education/ Unpublished Ded Thesis, University of Zululand.*
32. Ngidi D P (1998). Towards a Model for determinants of Occupational Stress among Teachers in KwaZulu-Natal. Unpublished DED Thesis, University of Zululand.
33. Peresuh, M Adenigba, S A & Ogonda, G (1997). Perspectives on Special Needs of Education in Nigeria, Kenya and Zimbabwe. *African Journal of Special Needs Education*, 2(1):9-15.

34. Price, L (2000). Inclusive education in Gauteng Schools: An Evaluative Study of Implementation procedures. Unpublished MED Dissertation, University of Zululand.
35. Ryndak, D Jackson, L & Billingsley, F (2001). Students with moderate to severe disabilities: What do experts say? *Exceptionality* 8 (2):101-116.
36. Sadek, F M & Sadek, R C (2000). Attitudes towards inclusive education in Egypt and implications for teachers preparation and training. International Special Education Congress 2000: Including the excluded, University of Manchester.
37. Simpson, R L Whelan, R J & Zabel, R H (1993). Special Education Personnel: Preparation in the 21st Century. *Remedial and Special Education*, 14 (2):7-22.
38. Skuy, P & Patington, H (1990) Special Education in South Africa. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 37 (2):149-157.
39. Slee, R (2001). Inclusion in Practice: Does practice make perfect? *Education Review* 53, (2):113-123
40. Van Hove, G & Van Hofstraete, T (1996). Some Obstacles in the Flemish Speaking Part of Belgium Concerning Inclusion Education for Children with Mental Retardation. *The European Electronic Journal On Inclusive Education In Europe*, 1:1-7.
41. Vaughn, S Elbaum, B E & Schumm, J S (1996). The effects of inclusion on the social functioning of students with learning disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29 (6):598-608.
42. Vaughn, S. & Schumm J S (1995). Responsible Inclusion for Students with Learning Disabilities: *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 28(5):264-270.

ANNEXURE A

ORIGINAL LIST OF ITEMS USED IN A PILOT STUDY

SECTION A

PERSONAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTION

Please indicate your answer by placing a cross (X) in the appropriate space.

1. GENDER

FEMALE	<input type="checkbox"/>
MALE	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. AGE IN YEARS

20 and below	<input type="checkbox"/>
21 - 30	<input type="checkbox"/>
31 - 40	<input type="checkbox"/>
41 - 50	<input type="checkbox"/>
51 and above	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. QUALIFICATION

MAKE A CROSS (X) NEXT TO THE CODE WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO YOU

OLD CODE	NEW CODE REQV	
Without matric and no training		
A2 (matric, no training)	10	
A1 (Std 6,7,8,9 + 2 yrs training)	11	
B (matric + 1 or 2 yrs training)	12	
C1 (matric + 3 yrs BA, BSc. etc)	13	
C2 (matric + 3 yrs educator training)	13	
D: (matric + 4 yrs training)	14	
E: (matric + 5 yrs training)	15	
F: (matric + 6 yrs training)	16	
G: (matric + 7 yrs training)	17	

4. TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN YEARS

0 - 10 yrs

11 - 20 yrs

21 - 30 yrs

31 yrs +

5. INDICATE THE PHASE/LEVEL IN WHICH YOU TEACH

FOUNDATION (GRADE R-3)

INTERMEDIATE (GRADE 4 - 6)

SENIOR (GRADE 7 - 9)

4. **CLASS SIZE**

INDICATE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN YOUR CLASS

- 0 - 30
- 31 - 60
- 61+

5. **CONTACT WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL**

Do you have contact with special education personnel?

YES	NO

SECTION B

INSTRUCTIONS

THIS IS A QUESTIONNAIRE ON YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Please indicate your degree of agreement by placing a cross (X) in the box next to each statement.

- KEY:** SA - **STRONGLY AGREE**
 A - **AGREE**
 U - **UNDECIDED**
 DA - **DISAGREE**
 SD - **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

ITEMS	SA	A	U	DA	SD
1. Inclusion of learners who are blind in my classroom would be a worthwhile undertaking					
2. Having slow learners in my classroom would empower me with different teaching methods.					
3. Inclusion of learners who are mentally ill in my classroom would be a good initiative					
4. Disobedient learners in my classroom would not hinder me to treat learners equally.					
5. Inclusion of learners who are deaf in my classroom would be acceptable to me					
6. If learners who are highly gifted are included in my classroom I would enjoy teaching them.					
7. I would not be adverse to having learners with epilepsy in my classroom.					
8. Inclusion of learners who are disobedient in my classroom would engender ambivalent feelings in me.					
9. Inclusion of weak-minded (idiots) among those learners with minor difficulties in one classroom would not worry me.					
10. Inclusion of learners who are blind in my classroom would not be worthwhile undertaking.					
11. Inclusion of learners who are highly gifted in my classroom would not encourage me to commit myself to my class fully.					

ITEM	SA	A	U	DA	SD
12. It will not upset me to have a learner with one eye in my classroom.					
13. Inclusion of learners who relieve themselves in class (do not ask to go to the toilet) would annoy me.					
14. Inclusion of learners who are mentally ill in my classroom would not be a good initiative.					
15. Inclusion of learners who are lame in my classroom would waste my time of teaching.					
16. Inclusion of learners who have no hands in my classroom would frustrate me.					
17. Inclusion of learners with no legs in my classroom would give me a better understanding of other people's differences.					
18. I would enjoy teaching delinquent learners.					
19. If learners who are blind are included in my classroom I would feel embarrassed to teach a class of learners who are fully dependent on an educator					
20. Inclusion of learners who are deaf in my classroom would not be acceptable to me.					
21. If learners who do not listen to instructions are included in my classroom I would not bother.					
22. If learners who are overactive are included in my classroom I would enjoy their company.					
23. Having stammering learners in my class would not hinder my teaching.					
24. If learners with short attention span are mixed with normal learners in one classroom I would feel embarrassed to teach them.					
25. I would encounter a problem if learners who bully other children are included in my classroom.					
26. If learners who cry often are included in my classroom I would be well prepared to teach them.					
27. If learners who are inattentive and easily distracted are included in my classroom I would highly appreciate them.					
28. I would love to have learners with malnutrition problems included in my classroom.					
29. I would not accept learners who do not listen to instruction in my classroom.					

ITEM	SA	A	U	DA	SD
30. If learners without hands and arms are mixed in my classroom it would make my teaching cumbersome.					
31. Having lame learners in my classroom would not affect my teaching.					
32. Should learners who are blind be included in my classroom it would make the situation difficult for me to teach.					
33. I would not accommodate learners who are aggressive in my classroom.					
34. Should learners who are deaf be included in my classroom, teaching would go as normal.					
35. Should learners who walk with crutches be included in my classroom, I would ignore them.					
36. It is not a disgrace to teach learners who are forgetful.					
37. Having nervous learners in my classroom is a problem.					
38. I would appreciate it to have learner who are deaf and dumb in my classroom.					
39. Should learners who are lame be included in my classroom, I would be happy to have them.					
40. It is a disgrace to teach learners who are forgetful.					
41. I would give necessary support to insane learners should they be included in my classroom.					
42. It would be bothersome much to have delinquent learners in my classroom.					
43. I hate to have children who are talkative in my classroom.					
44. Learners who are nervous are not a problem in my classroom.					
45. Having learners who are idiots in my classroom will not disturb my teaching.					
46. I have no fear of teaching learners who are highly gifted.					
47. Should learners who are disobedient be included in my classroom, I would tolerate them.					
48. Should learners who involuntarily pass water (urinate) in class be included in my classroom I would accommodate them.					
49. I would appreciate it to have learners who are aggressive in my classroom.					
50. Limping (a walking problem) learners do not give me a problem in my teaching.					

ITEM	SA	A	U	DA	SD
51. I would tolerate learners who do not concentrate when I teach.					
52. I have no fear for teaching learners who are highly gifted.					

**ANNEXURE B
REQUESTS OF PERMISSION TO DO RESEARCH**

**PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE**

Telephone: 035 - 9011 300
Fax 035 - 792 6059

Corner: Maxwell Street and Hancon Avenue
EMPANGENI
3880
Private Bag X20104
EMPANGENI
3880

G M SIDAKI

21 August 2003

MISS J N MASHIYA

REQUEST TO CONDUCT A RESEARCH STUDY

1. The above matter has reference.
2. It is my pleasure to inform you that your request to conduct research study in the five nominated schools in the Empangeni District has been approved.
3. The Regional Senior Manager, Mr W Dorkin has approved on one condition: that the research may not in any way interfere with the normal school programmes.
4. Wishing you all the best.

**G M SIDAKI
DISTRICT DIRECTOR**

**PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE**

Corner Queen and Keate Street
LADYSMITH
3370

Private Bag X9980
LADYSMITH
3370

DR W S MPOFANA

27 August 2003

MISS J N MASHIYA

**REQUEST TO CONDUCT A RESEARCH STUDY ON EDUCATORS'
ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION**

1. Receipt of your letter dated 11 August 2003 is hereby acknowledged.
2. Permission has been granted to conduct a research study in the school (anonymity ensured) in the Othukela District. The District Director, the Chief Education Specialists for PGSES and the principal of the school have been informed about the proposed research. Kindly make prior arrangements with principal before visiting the school so that proper arrangements can be made.

**DRW S MPOFANA
REGIONAL CHIEF DIRECTOR
UKHAHLAMBA REGION**

**P O Box 2030
EMPANGENI
3880**

The Principal

Dear Sir/Madam

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO DO RESEARCH

I am currently engaged in research project concerning the inclusion of learners with special educational needs in ordinary schools as part of my dissertation in Educational Psychology and Special Education.

My basic concern is to examine the educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of learners with special educational needs in mainstream settings. This research will add to the existing body of knowledge on inclusive education.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance by allowing me to conduct a research study in your school.

Enclosed in this letter is the permission from the Department of Education.

Your assistance in this regard will be highly appreciated.

Yours sincerely

**J N MASHIYA (MISS)
UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND**

SUPERVISED BY

**Prof P T Sibaya MA (Natal) PhD (Stell)
HOD: EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION**

ANNEXURE C

ITEMS USED IN A FINAL STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

PERSONAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTION

Please indicate your answer by placing a cross (X) in the appropriate space.

1. GENDER

FEMALE	<input type="checkbox"/>
MALE	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. AGE IN YEARS

20 and below	<input type="checkbox"/>
21 - 30	<input type="checkbox"/>
31 - 40	<input type="checkbox"/>
41 - 50	<input type="checkbox"/>
51 and above	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. **QUALIFICATION**

MAKE A CROSS (X) NEXT TO THE CODE WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO YOU

OLD CODE	NEW CODE REQV	
Without matric and no training		
A2 (matric, no training)	10	
A1 (Std 6,7,8,9 + 2 yrs training)	11	
B (matric + 1 or 2 yrs training)	12	
C1 (matric + 3 yrs BA, BSc. etc)	13	
C2 (matric + 3 yrs educator training)	13	
D: (matric + 4 yrs training)	14	
E: (matric + 5 yrs training)	15	
F: (matric + 6 yrs training)	16	
G: (matric + 7 yrs training)	17	

4. **TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN YEARS**

- 0 - 10 yrs
- 11 - 20 yrs
- 21 - 30 yrs
- 31 yrs +

5. **INDICATE THE PHASE/LEVEL IN WHICH YOU TEACH**

- FOUNDATION (GRADE R-3)
- INTERMEDIATE (GRADE 4 - 6)
- SENIOR (GRADE 7 - 9)

4. **CLASS SIZE**

INDICATE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN YOUR CLASS

0 - 30

31 - 60

61+

5. **CONTACT WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL**

Do you have contact with special education personnel?

YES	NO

SECTION B

INSTRUCTIONS

THIS IS A QUESTIONNAIRE ON YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Please indicate your degree of agreement by placing a cross (X) in the box next to each statement.

- KEY:** SA - **STRONGLY AGREE**
 A - **AGREE**
 U - **UNDECIDED**
 DA - **DISAGREE**
 SD - **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

ITEMS	SA	A	U	DA	SD
1. Inclusion of learners who are blind in my classroom would be a worthwhile undertaking					
2. Having slow learners in my classroom would empower me with different teaching methods.					
3. Inclusion of learners who are mentally ill in my classroom would be a good initiative					
4. Disobedient learners in my classroom would not hinder me to treat learners equally.					
5. Inclusion of learners who are deaf in my classroom would be acceptable to me					
6. If learners who are highly gifted are included in my classroom I would enjoy teaching them.					
7. Inclusion of weak-minded (idiots) among those learners with minor difficulties in one classroom would not worry me.					
8. It will not upset me to have a learner with one eye in my classroom.					
9. Inclusion of learners who relieve themselves in class (do not ask to go to the toilet) would annoy me.					

ITEM	SA	A	U	DA	SD
10. Inclusion of learners who are mentally ill in my classroom would not be a good initiative.					
11. Inclusion of learners who are lame in my classroom would waste my time of teaching.					
12. Inclusion of learners who have no hands in my classroom would frustrate me.					
13. Should learners who are deaf be included in my classroom, teaching would go as normal.					
14. Inclusion of learners with no legs in my classroom would give me a better understanding of other people's differences.					
15. I would enjoy teaching delinquent learners.					
16. If learners who are blind are included in my classroom I would feel embarrassed to teach a class of learners who are fully dependent on an educator					
17. Inclusion of learners who are deaf in my classroom would not be acceptable to me.					
18. If learners who do not listen to instructions are included in my classroom I would not bother.					
19. If learners who are overactive are included in my classroom I would enjoy their company.					
20. Having stammering learners in my class would not hinder my teaching.					
21. If learners with short attention span are mixed with normal learners in one classroom I would feel embarrassed to teach them.					
22. If learners who cry often are included in my classroom I would be well prepared to teach them.					
23. If learners who are inattentive and easily distracted are included in my classroom I would highly appreciate them.					
24. I would not accept learners who do not listen to instruction in my classroom.					
25. Having lame learners in my classroom would not affect my teaching.					
26. Should learners who are blind be included in my classroom it would make the situation difficult for me to teach.					

ITEM	SA	A	U	DA	SD
27. I would appreciate it to have learners who are deaf and dumb in my classroom.					
28. Should learners who are lame be included in my classroom, I would be happy to have them.					
29. It is a disgrace to teach learners who are forgetful.					
30. I would give necessary support to insane learners should they be included in my classroom.					
31. Learners who are nervous are not a problem in my class.					
32. Having learners who are weak-minded (idiots) in my classroom will not disturb my teaching.					
33. Should learners who are disobedient be included in my classroom, I would tolerate them.					
34. Should learners who involuntarily pass water (urinate) in class be included in my classroom I would accommodate them.					
35. I would appreciate it to have learners who are aggressive in my classroom.					
36. Limping (a walking problem) learners do not give me a problem in my teaching					
37. I would tolerate learners who do not concentrate when I teach.					
38. I have no fear of teaching learners who are highly gifted.					

**ANNEXURE D
SECTION A
PARTICULARS OF RESPONDENTS**

Respondent Number	Gender F=Female M=Male	Age in years	Qualification M=Matric+training in years	Teaching Experience	Phase (Grade) Taught	Class Size	contact with SE Personnel	Sample	Total Score	ATTITUDE P=POSITIVE N=NEGATIVE
1	F	51+	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	31+	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	109	N
2	F	51+	M+2 yrs (REQV12)	31+	R-3	0-30	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	115	P
3	F	51+	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	31+	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	101	N
4	F	51+	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	31+	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	101	N
5	F	31-40	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	128	P
6	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	107	N
7	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	R-3	31-60	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	121	P
8	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	105	N
9	F	41-50	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	110	P
10	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	107	P
11	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	131	P
12	F	51+	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	31+	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	114	N
13	F	51+	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	119	N
14	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	R.3	0-30	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	106	N
15	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	96	P
16	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	107	P
17	F	31-40	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	130	P
18	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	115	N
19	M	21-30	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	98	P
20	F	51+	M+2 yrs (REQV12)	31+	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	116	N
21	M	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	101	P
22	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	107	N
23	M	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	96	N
24	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	111	N
25	F	21-30	M+2 yrs (REQV12)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	91	P
26	M	51+	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	31+	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	124	N
27	M	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	104	N
28	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	104	N
29	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	107	N

30	M	51+	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	109	N
31	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	7-9I	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	104	N
32	F	31-40	M+2 yrs (REQV12)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	101	N
33	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	146	P
34	F	21-30	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	125	P
35	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	113	P
36	F	21-30	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	96	N
37	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	130	P
38	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	125	P
39	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	125	P
40	F	51+	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	31+	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	112	P
41	F	51+	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-7	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	103	N
42	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-7	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	112	P
43	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	119	P
44	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	0-30	N	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	132	P
45	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	119	P
46	F	31-40	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	128	P
47	F	51+	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	31+	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	122	P
48	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	141	P
49	M	51+	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	110	P
50	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	130	P
51	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	95	N
52	F	0-20	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	111	P
53	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	99	N
54	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-URBAN SCHOOL	105	N
55	M	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	99	N
56	M	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	77	N
57	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	86	N
58	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	87	N
59	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	R-6	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	89	N
60	M	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	91	N
61	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	100	N
62	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	91	N
63	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	186	P
64	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	102	N
65	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	131	P
66	F	51+	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	123	P

67	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	126	P
68	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	98	N
69	M	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	121	P
70	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	103	N
71	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	102	N
72	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	129	P
73	M	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	108	N
74	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	117	P
75	F	31-40	M+6 yrs (REQV16)	11-20	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	136	P
76	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	110	P
77	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	81	N
78	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	108	P
79	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	89	N
80	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	90	N
81	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	82	N
82	F	41-50	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	113	P
83	F	41-50	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	124	P
84	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	116	P
85	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	132	P
86	F	21-30	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	93	N
87	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	105	N
88	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	107	N
89	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	75	N
90	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	88	N
91	M	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	105	N
92	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	97	N
93	F	31-40	M+5 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	87	N
94	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	87	N
95	M	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	83	N
96	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	95	N
97	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	94	N
98	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	109	N
99	M	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	115	P
100	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	97	N
101	F	41-50	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	21-30	4-6	0-30	Y	EMP-TOWNSHIP SCHOOL	153	P
102	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	168	P
103	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	142	P

104	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-7	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	147	P
105	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	152	P
106	M	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-7	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	148	P
107	F	31-40	M+5 yrs (REQV15)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	122	P
108	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	R-3	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	160	P
109	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	0-30	Y	ESTCOURT	157	P
110	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-6	31-60	N	ESTCOURT	96	N
111	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	91	N
112	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	101	N
113	M	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	98	N
114	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	91	N
115	M	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	94	N
116	F	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	11-20	4-7	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	93	N
117	M	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	100	N
118	F	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	96	N
119	F	41-50	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	21-30	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	102	N
120	M	31-40	M+4 yrs (REQV14)	0-10	4-6	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	109	N
121	M	31-40	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	7-9	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	109	N
122	F	21-30	M+3 yrs (REQV13)	11-20	R-3	31-60	N	EMP-RURAL SCHOOL	100	N

SECTION B

RESPONSE TO SECTION B OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (ITEMS 1-38)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38		
1	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	1	4	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	1	1	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
2	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	2	1	4	5	1	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
3	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	1	4	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	2	1	4	1	1	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
4	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	2	1	1	4	1	1	4	1	1	1	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	2	1	4	1	1	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
5	1	5	2	4	1	5	4	2	5	5	2	5	5	4	3	3	1	4	4	4	2	5	5	4	2	2	1	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	
6	2	4	2	2	1	5	3	1	1	4	3	4	1	4	3	2	5	3	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	5	
7	1	4	1	3	1	4	4	2	2	4	2	4	2	2	3	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	5	4	5	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	
8	1	2	1	4	1	5	2	1	4	1	1	5	4	5	1	4	4	4	2	5	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	4	4	2	4	4	1	2	2	5	2	5		
9	2	5	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	5	2	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	4	2	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	
10	1	5	1	2	1	4	4	1	2	4	1	1	2	4	2	4	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	1	2	4	5	1	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	
11	1	5	2	4	2	5	4	2	5	5	2	5	5	4	3	3	1	5	4	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	1	4	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	
12	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	1	4	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	5	1	4	4	2	2	2	1	4	5	1	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
13	1	1	1	3	2	5	2	1	5	4	3	4	5	5	3	4	4	4	5	3	2	4	3	1	3	2	2	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	2	5	
14	1	4	3	2	3	5	2	1	3	2	2	4	3	5	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	4	1	3	1	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	2	4	3	4	4	
15	1	4	1	1	1	3	2	1	3	5	1	3	4	4	1	1	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	2	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	1	4	3	4	4	
16	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	1	2	4	4	4	1	2	3	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	1	1	4	1	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	
17	1	5	2	4	2	5	4	2	5	5	4	5	4	3	3	3	1	4	4	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	1	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	
18	1	4	2	2	1	4	4	2	3	5	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	1	4	3	3	2	2	1	4	4	3	4	4	2	2	4	3	4	3	5		
19	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	2	3	1	3	4	4	2	3	2	4	2	4	3	1	4	3	4	3	1	1	3	4	4	1	5	1	1	5	2	3	4	4	
20	1	2	1	3	1	5	2	2	2	5	5	3	2	5	3	1	1	2	4	5	4	4	4	2	3	5	1	5	2	1	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	5		
21	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	4	5	4	4	4	2	1	1	1	2	2	4	5	4	2	5	2	4	1	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	4	2	5	2	5	
22	1	1	1	4	1	5	5	1	5	5	2	5	2	4	1	5	4	2	2	5	2	4	5	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	5	1	3	2	5	2	5	2	5
23	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	1	4	2	4	5	5	2	5	2	4	4	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	4	2	4	2	4	1	4	2	5	
24	1	5	1	2	2	4	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	5	2	5	4	4	5	1	1	2	4	2	5	2	2	4	5	5	5	5	5	
25	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	4	5	1	3	4	2	5	1	4	1	4	2	1	3	3	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	1	5	2	4	1	4	4	
26	2	5	2	2	2	4	5	4	4	5	1	2	2	3	1	2	5	2	5	1	1	5	3	4	1	2	2	2	4	5	1	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	
27	1	5	2	1	1	5	4	1	4	1	1	3	4	4	2	1	4	2	4	1	1	5	4	1	2	2	1	2	5	1	4	4	1	4	3	5	4	4		

28	2	4	1	1	2	4	3	5	3	1	1	4	3	1	1	2	1	4	2	5	1	5	3	4	1	5	1	4	1	2	5	5	1	3	4	4	3	5		
29	1	1	1	3	3	4	4	2	4	2	3	4	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	3	1	2	1	1	4	4	4	5	3	4	5	5	4	4		
30	1	1	2	4	2	3	4	1	4	1	1	4	4	4	2	3	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	2	1	2	1	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4		
31	2	1	1	3	1	1	3	5	5	1	1	4	4	5	3	1	4	1	1	4	2	5	4	5	1	2	1	4	2	2	1	4	1	2	1	5	4	4		
32	2	5	2	2	4	5	4	5	4	3	5	1	2	5	4	1	5	2	3	5	5	5	4	5	2	5	3	5	5	5	5	2	4	4	3	5	5	5		
33	2	5	2	2	5	4	5	4	5	2	4	1	2	4	4	1	5	2	4	4	5	5	5	4	2	5	2	5	5	1	1	1	1	4	1	5	1	5		
34	2	4	2	2	2	5	2	2	4	1	1	4	4	2	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	5	4	2	2	4	2	2	5	4	1	2	4	4	4		
35	1	5	1	5	1	4	1	4	1	1	2	5	5	2	2	2	5	5	2	2	4	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	4	2	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	4		
36	3	4	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	2	4	4	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4		
37	2	5	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	2	4	2	2	4	4		
38	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	2	4	5	2	4	4	4	5	2	4	4	1	5	2	5		
39	1	5	1	1	1	5	1	5	5	1	5	4	1	4	1	1	1	5	1	5	5	5	1			5	2	4	5	1	5	1	2	2	1	4	4	5		
40	1	2	1	2	1	5	1	5	5	1	2	5	5	4	1	1	1	5	1	4	5	5	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	1	5	1	5		
41	4	3	2	2	4	4	1	4	1	2	5	2	5	4	5	2	4	2	4	4	5	4	2	2	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	1	4	2	4	
42	2	4	2	2	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	1	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	2	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	
43	3	4	3	5	5	3	3	4	2	3	4	2	4	4	4	3	2	5	4	4	2	4	4	5	4	2	2	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	1	4	4	3
44	2	1	2	2	1	5	1	4	2	2	4	1	4	3	4	1	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	2	2	4	1	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	4	4	5	
45	2	5	3	2	2	4	5	4	2	2	5	5	4	3	2	4	2	2	3	5	4	5	3	2	2	5	2	5	5	1	3	3	4	4	1	5	4	4		
46	1	4	1	5	1	5	1	1	1	5	5	1	5	5	1	1	5	2	4	4	4	4	1	5	1	5	1	1	5	1	4	5	1	1	1	4	4	4		
47	4	5	3	2	4	4	2	5	3	3	5	1	3	5	3	1	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	3	1	2	3	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	3	5	5	5		
48	1	4	1	5	1	5	1	1	2	5	1	5	5	1	1	5	1	5	2	1	4	2	1	4	4	4	1	1	4	2	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4		
49	2	4	1	5	4	5	1	4	1	5	4	3	5	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	1	4	5	4	1	2	4	4	5			
50	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	4	4	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	4	1	4	2	3	4	3	5		
51	1	3	2	2	4	2	3	3	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	2	2	4	2	2	5	3	1	2	2	2	4	
52	2	4	1	5	4	3	1	4	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	4	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	2	2	4	2	4	5		
53	2	5	1	1	4	3	4	1	1	1	4	5	1	4	2	4	4	1	2	4	2	4	3	5	5	1	4	2	3	1	1	1	4	3	1	2	4	5		
54	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	1	5	2	4	5	2	5	4	2	5	5	3	5	3	5	2	3	1	4	1	1	1	5		
55	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	4	2	4	5	5	5	1	1	2	1	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4		
56	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	4	1	1	2	4	2	2	5	2	1	4	4	1	2	4	1	4	2	2	1	2	2	2	5	1	2	1	1	1	2	4		
57	1	3	2	2	2	2	5	5	1	1	1	5	4	1	2	2	1	5	1	5	2	1	2	5	1	2	1	4	1	2	1	1	2	1	3	2	1	4		
58	1	2	1	1	3	4	2	5	2	3	1	2	3	1	4	2	1	5	1	4	1	4	2	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	2	3	1	4	1	1	1	4		
59	1	1	1	5	2	1	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	1	4	1	2	3	4	4	1	4	4	2	2	2	4	3	1	1	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	5		
60	1	2	1	4	3	2	2	4	2	4	2	5	2	4	2	1	1	4	4	2	2	5	4	2	1	1	5	4	2	1	1	1	2	4	2	2	2	4		
61	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	4	2	4	4	5	2	4	3	2	5	1	1	5	4	1	1	2	2	5	1	2	1	4	

62	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	5	4	2	5	4	1	2	2	1	5	5	2	4	1	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	2	2	5
63	2	3	2	1	4	4	1	1	5	1	5	2	1	4	2	1	2	2	4	4	2	2	5	3	2	2	2	5	1	1	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	2	5
64	1	5	3	2	5	5	1	5	4	5	2	5	5	4	1	1	1	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	1	5	1	3	5	4	1	3	3	4	1	5	4	5	
65	1	4	1	2	1	5	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	2	3	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	5	2	4	2	2	3	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	
66	2	4	2	4	2	5	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	4	5	2	4	4	4	2	4	2	4	
67	1	3	1	3	3	2	1	4	5	1	5	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	4	1	5	3	1	1	3	5	2	2	3	3	1	3	4	2	2	
68	5	5	1	1	1	5	4	4	3	1	3	1	1	4	3	3	4	1	5	5	2	5	5	4	4	2	2	2	5	1	5	1	5	2	1	5	5	5	
69	4	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	5	4	2	4	5	3	2	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	2	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	1	4	1	1	2	2	4	
70	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	2	4	2	4	1	2	2	2	4	2	3	2	2	4	2	3	3	4	4	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	
71	5	5	5	2	4	5	5	4	4	2	4	2	2	5	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	5	2	2	2	5	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	2	2	2	5	
72	1	2	1	5	5	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	1	5	1	4	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	
73	5	4	1	3	1	4	3	5	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	1	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	1	5	2	2	4	3	4	3	4	4	1	3	1	4	
74	1	1	3	4	3	5	4	5	3	1	3	5	3	5	3	1	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	1	3	5	3	3	5	4	5	3	3	4	2	4	3	5	
75	2	1	2	1	1	4	1	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	2	1	4	1	5	5	5	1	1	2	1	5	1	1	5	1	5	1	4	5	4	5	2	5	
76	1	2	1	1	1	5	1	5	5	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	
77	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	5	5	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	
78	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	5	5	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	
79	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	5	5	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	
80	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	5	
81	1	2	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	1	1	5	4	3	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	5	2	1	5	1	5	1	5	
82	2	2	2	1	1	4	2	2	3	5	5	1	5	1	1	5	4	5	1	1	4	2	2	5	2	1	2	2	5	3	5	2	1	5	1	5	1	5	
83	1	1	5	1	1	5	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	5	1	5	3	4	2	1	4	4	4	2	4	1	5	
84	5	5	3	2	5	1	3	5	4	5	2	4	4	1	2	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	2	4	5	1	1	4	5	5	1	3	4	4	2	4	1	5	
85	4	5	1	2	1	5	2	4	5	4	2	5	4	1	2	5	4	3	4	3	2	4	2	1	4	1	1	2	4	1	1	4	3	4	2	3	1	5	
86	2	4	1	4	2	2	1	4	4	1	1	1	4	2	3	4	3	4	2	5	1	1	1	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	3	4	5	1	1	4	4	5	
87	2	4	3	3	3	4	1	4	4	1	1	1	3	2	3	2	1	4	1	2	2	1	1	4	5	5	2	1	4	4	5	5	4	2	3	4	1	5	
88	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	4	4	1	1	1	5	5	1	2	2	5	1	4	1	4	1	1	1	1	5	
89	1	2	1	1	1	5	1	4	4	2	2	1	4	2	4	1	2	4	3	1	1	1	5	5	4	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	2	1	1	3	5	
90	2	2	3	4	1	4	2	1	4	4	1	4	5	2	3	4	2	5	4	1	1	1	1	4	4	2	1	1	5	1	1	1	3	4	2	4	1	5	
91	1	2	1	2	4	2	5	4	3	1	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	4	5	5	2	4	1	1	5	2	1	1	5	1	4	1	4	1	4	5	1	4	
92	1	2	1	5	5	1	1	2	3	1	2	4	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	1	2	5	1	4	2	2	1	4	4	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	5	
93	1	1	5	1	1	1	3	1	5	1	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	4	2	1	5	5	2	5	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	1	1	4	5	
94	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	5	4	2	4	3	2	1	1	1	2	2	4	2	2	1	3	4	2	1	1	1	4	4	2	1	5	1	1	1	5	
95	1	2	1	4	1	1	2	1	1	5	2	4	2	1	1	4	1	4	1	2	2	3	5	4	1	1	1	1	1	5	3	1	4	1	4	4	5	5	

96	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	4	4	1	3	1	2	4	2	3	4	5	4	2	1	3	1	2	1	4	4	4	2	4	1	1	5	4	5	
97	1	1	2	2	1	2	4	2	4	5	5	1	1	3	2	2	4	4	2	2	5	4	4	1	4	1	2	1	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	1	5	
98	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	5	3	3	5	5	2	5	1	2	1	5	4	4	4	4	1	2	5	2	2	2	4	4	5	4	2	2	1	5	2	5	
99	2	1	2	2	2	4	1	4	2	2	1	1	3	5	3	2	1	4	4	4	2	4	3	1	1	1	2	1	5	1	5	1	2	4	1	4	4	5	
100	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	2	5	2	5	4	5	4	5	4	2	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	2	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5
101	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	2	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	5	4	4	
102	3	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	5	4	5
103	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	5	2	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
104	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	1	2	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	5	5	5	5
105	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	5	4	5	2	4	5	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	2	2	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5
106	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	2	2	4	3	2	2	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	2	1	1	5	1	4	4	1	4	2	4	2	4	4
107	3	4	4	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	4	4	2	3	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4
108	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	3	5	4	5	5	2	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	5
109	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	1	5	5	1	4	1	1	1	4	5	5	5	4	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	1	1	5	4	5	
110	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	4	5	1	4	1	1	2	4	5	5	4	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	2	2	2	5	4	5	
111	1	1	2	1	1	4	1	4	1	2	4	4	1	4	2	1	1	2	5	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	2	2	1	5	4	5	
112	1	2	2	1	2	4	1	4	4	1	4	5	2	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	5	2	4	1	2	1	1	4	4	5	
113	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	4	5	1	4	1	1	1	5	4	5	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	1	1	4	4	5	
114	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	4	5	1	5	1	1	2	5	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	2	2	1	4	4	5	
115	1	2	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	2	3	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	3	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	4	2	1	2	1	4	4	5	
116	2	1	2	2	1	4	1	4	1	2	4	4	1	4	1	1	1	5	4	5	4	4	4	1	1	4	1	2	5	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	
117	1	1	1	1	1	5	2	5	1	1	4	5	1	4	2	1	1	4	4	5	4	4	4	1	2	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	2	2	2	2	4	5	
118	2	5	1	1	4	4	4	4	5	2	5	1	2	4	4	1	5	1	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	5	4	5		
119	2	4	3	2	4	4	1	4	1	1	4	1	2	4	5	2	5	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	4	2	1	2	1	4	1	4	1	4	4	
120	1	4	2	3	5	4	4	5	5	1	4	1	1	3	3	1	2	2	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	1	2	2	1	1	1	4	1	1	5	1	4		
121	1	4	2	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	4	4	1	5	2	4	4	5	5	5	5	1	4	1	4	4	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	5	
122	1	4	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	2	1	4	1	2	5	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	1	4	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	5	