

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN SELECTED
BASIC SCHOOLS IN THE CAPE COAST METROPOLIS OF GHANA

ETHEL BOAKYE-AKOMEAH

2015

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN SELECTED
BASIC SCHOOLS IN THE CAPE COAST METROPOLIS OF GHANA

BY

ETHEL BOAKYE-AKOMEAH

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration,
College of Education Studies, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for award of Master of Philosophy Degree in Educational
Administration

OCTOBER 2015

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature: Date.....

Name:

Supervisors' Declaration

We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature..... Date:.....

Name:

Co-supervisor's Signature:..... Date:.....

Name:

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted on the views of teachers of selected basic schools on inclusive education in Cape Coast Metropolis. The study adopted descriptive survey design to help find answers to the problem under investigation and a questionnaire was used to collect data for the study. Systematic random sampling technique was used to select 76 basic school teachers as the respondents for the study. The background information of the respondents was analysed by using frequency and percentage. Research questions one and two were analysed using mean and standard deviation while research questions three and four were analysed using frequency and percentage. The study revealed that almost all the respondents have knowledge and skills necessary to handle pupils with disabilities in inclusive settings. Another finding was that teachers implements the curriculum by adopting strategies to suit learners and were using alternative assessment strategies in assessing pupils in the classroom. The finding also points to the fact that teachers at the basic level were prepared to collaborate with other professionals to enhance inclusive education in the Metropolis. Based on the findings it is therefore, recommended that teachers at the basic schools should be given the necessary assistance from professionals in the field of inclusive education in handling the pupils. Provision of teaching and learning materials such as Braille machine, hearing aids, talking calculator and others should be provided by the stakeholders in education to enhance better delivery of education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. J. M. Dzinyela, my principal supervisor, and Dr. Dora Baaba Aidoo, my co-supervisor for their support, encouragement and constructive criticisms and suggestions in the course of undertaking this research. My appreciation goes to my husband Rev. Danny Flint Yeboah for his support and encouragement. I would like to also express my appreciation to all individuals and institutions that contributed in diverse ways to bring this work to a successful completion. My special thanks go to Mr. Cosmos Nutakor who toiled night and day in assisting me to come this far. I finally thank the headmasters and mistresses who helped me to carry out the research successfully, especially the headmistress of Ghana National Basic School.

DEDICATION

To my mother Meek Linda Akoete

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| DECLARATION | ii |
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iv |
| DEDICATION | v |
| LIST OF TABLES | x |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xi |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Background to the Study | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | 6 |
| Purpose of the Study | 7 |
| Research Questions | 7 |
| Hypotheses | 8 |
| Significance of the Study | 8 |
| Delimitation of the Study | 9 |
| Limitation of the Study | 9 |
| Organisation of the Study | 11 |
| CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE | 12 |
| Theoretical Framework | 12 |
| The Concept of Inclusive Education | 13 |
| Best Practice in the United States and Canada in Inclusion Education | 26 |
| Best Practice in Europe and other Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Countries | 27 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Inclusive Education at Work: Students with Disabilities in Mainstream Schools | 28 |
| Special Needs Education in Europe | 28 |
| Genesis of Inclusive Education in Ghana | 31 |
| Adaptation of Inclusive Education by Ministry of Education and GES | 32 |
| Strategies in Creating Awareness in Inclusive Education | 32 |
| Practice: Training of Trainers | 33 |
| Expertise Teachers Need to Handle Inclusive Classrooms | 34 |
| Students and Teachers' Attitude towards Inclusive Education | 39 |
| Adaptations in Inclusive Classrooms | 43 |
| Alternative Assessment | 46 |
| Nature of Performance Assessments Developed to Increase Access to Inclusive Education | 55 |
| Knowledge and Skills of Teachers to Function in Inclusive Education | 56 |
| Implementation of Curriculum to Benefit Special Needs Pupils | 64 |
| Collaboration of Teachers with Professionals in Inclusive Education | 71 |
| Effective Applications of Collaboration in Inclusive Schools | 74 |
| Shared Problem Solving | 74 |
| Co-teaching | 75 |
| Station Teaching | 77 |
| Parallel Teaching | 77 |
| Alternative Teaching | 77 |
| Team Teaching | 78 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Co-teaching Pragmatics | 78 |
| Teaming | 78 |
| Consultation | 79 |
| Summary of Reviewed Literature | 80 |
| CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS | 83 |
| Introduction | 83 |
| Research Design | 83 |
| Population | 85 |
| Sample and Sampling Procedure | 86 |
| Research Instrument | 87 |
| Pilot - Testing | 88 |
| Reliability and Validity | 89 |
| Data Collection Procedure | 89 |
| Data Analysis | 90 |
| Ethical Issues | 91 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 92 |
| Introduction | 92 |
| Demographic Information about the Respondents | 92 |
| Perceived Teachers' Knowledge and Skills in Inclusive Education | 95 |
| How Teachers Implement the Curriculum to Benefit Pupils in Inclusive School | 99 |
| Preparedness of Teachers to use Alternative Assessment in Inclusive Education | 102 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Assessing the Extent to which Teachers are Prepared to Collaborate with Professionals in Inclusive Education | 104 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 107 |
| Overview of the Study | 107 |
| Summary of the Main Findings | 107 |
| Conclusions | 108 |
| Recommendations | 109 |
| Suggestion for Further Research | 110 |
| REFERENCES | 111 |
| APPENDICES | 144 |
| A Questionnaire for Teachers | 145 |
| B Introductory Letter | 150 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | Staff Population in Selected Public Basic Schools | 85 |
| 2 | Demographic Data of Respondents | 92 |
| 3 | Subject Areas of the Respondents | 93 |
| 4 | Response on Inclusive Education Training | 94 |
| 5 | Relevance of the Teaching Curriculum in Inclusive Education | 95 |
| 6 | One-Sample t-test on how Teachers Implement Teaching Curriculum of pupils | 99 |
| 7 | Descriptive Statistics of Response on Preparedness to Use Alternative Assessment | 102 |
| 8 | ANOVA of Preparedness to use Alternative Assessment | 102 |
| 9 | Chi-Square Tests of Teachers' Preparedness to Collaborate with Professionals in Inclusive Education | 105 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---------------|---|
| AEP | Accelerated Educational Plan |
| CAST | Centre for Applied Special Technology |
| CFS | Child Friendly Schools |
| EA | Equitable Access |
| GES | Ghana Education Service |
| GSGDA | Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda |
| I E | Inclusive Education |
| I E | Integrated Education |
| IDEA | Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act |
| IEP | Individualized Education Plan |
| MOESS | Ministry of Education, Science and Sports |
| NGOs | Non-Governmental Organisations |
| NCLB | No Child Left Behind |
| OECD | Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PWD | Persons with Disability |
| SAP | Special Attention Project |
| TIE | Tanzania Institute of Education |
| UDL | Universal Design for Learning |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation |
| VSO | Voluntary Services Overseas |

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Education is one of the tools humanity uses to help in developing society through man. Since society needs the contributions of everyone in developing it, a lot of efforts are being made through research and others to educate almost everybody in society in contributing to it. The mind of the individual has to be trained to a level that it would be beneficial to each member of the society.

In creating a better society, we could not depend on one person in carrying out the desired development else society or community would lag behind in so many things. Hence every person whether with any form of disability or not has to be developed to his/her full potential. Inclusive education has been internationally recognized as a philosophy for attaining equity, justice and quality education for all children, especially those who have been traditionally excluded from mainstream education for reasons of disability, ethnicity, gender or other characteristics (Nguyet & Ha, 2010).

Inclusive education has been widely defined as a process intended to respond to students' diversity by increasing their participation and reducing exclusion within and from education (Nguyet & Ha, 2010). This definition considers inclusive education beyond disability issues and includes quality teaching, the attendance, involvement and achievement of all students, especially

those who, for different reasons, are excluded or at risk of being marginalized (UNESCO, 2009).

The Salamanca Statement on Principles, Policy and Practice in Special Needs Education (Salamanca Declaration) from 1994 is the cornerstone of understanding the practice of inclusive education. Inclusive education happens when children with and without disabilities participate and learn together in the same classes. Research showed that when a child with disability attends classes alongside with his/her peers who were not having any disability, it benefits the child with disability (UNESCO, 2009).

For a long time, children with disabilities were educated in separate classes or in separate schools. This has made most people to be used to the idea that special education meant separate education. Educating the public on this issue has made it such that it is now known that when children are educated together, positive academic and social outcomes occur for all the children involved. It is also known that simply placing children with and without disabilities together does not produce positive outcomes. Inclusive education occurs when there is on-going advocacy, planning, support and commitment.

The fundamental principle of the inclusive school is that all children should learn together, wherever possible, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have. Inclusive schools must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of their students, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning and ensuring quality education to all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnerships

with their communities. There should be a continuum of support and services to match the continuum of special needs encountered in every school (Salamanca Framework for Action, 1994).

Gardner and Kelly (2008) postulate that educators must “foster learning environments that are integrally attentive to issues of meaning-making, critical reflection, social justice, diversity, care, collaboration, and community” (p. 1). Therefore teachers who promote inclusive education are caring. They consider a school as a community, value good personal and interpersonal relationships and create optimum learning opportunities for all students (Lindsay, 2003; Sweetland, 2008).

Inclusive education requires something more than the binary divide between teachers as the givers of knowledge and the students as receivers (Freire, 1973). Freire (1998) posits that,

our relationship with the learners demands that we respect them and demands equally that we be aware of the concrete conditions of their world, the conditions that shape them. To try to know the reality that our students live is a task that educational practice imposes on us: Without this, we have no access to the way they think, soon with great difficulty can we perceive what and how they know (p. 58).

Freire (1998) confirmed that positive attitudes from the whole school community and changes to the concept of pedagogy, structure and policy are prerequisites for successful inclusion (Elkins & Grimes, 2009; Hooker, 2008; Loreman, 2007; Peterson, 2004; Sweetland, 2008).

According to UNICEF (2000) inclusive education is an approach to educating students with special educational needs. Under the inclusion model, students with special education need have to spend most or all of their time with non-disabled students. Implementation of these practices varies. Schools most frequently use them for selected students with mild to severe special needs.

Inclusive education differs from previously held notions of integration and mainstreaming, which tended to be concerned principally with disability and 'special educational needs' and implied learners changing or become 'ready for' or deserving of accommodation by the mainstream. By contrast, inclusion is about the child's right to participate and the school's duty to accept the child. Inclusion rejects the use of special schools or classrooms to separate students with disabilities from students without disabilities.

A premium is placed upon full participation by students with disabilities and upon respect for their social, civil, and educational rights. Inclusion gives students with disabilities skills they can use in and out of the classroom. Fully inclusive schools, which are rare, no longer distinguish between "general education" and "special education" programmes; instead, the school is restructured so that all students learn together.

Generally, the teacher's task where learners with special educational needs are concerned has changed dramatically over the past few years. Whereas formerly teachers were only expected to identify exceptional learners as soon as possible with a view to rating them to accommodate the special education, they now have ordinary classes, in conformity with the principles of normalization, mainstreaming and inclusion (Lefrancois, 1997).

In the United States of America, the individuals with disabilities in education Act (IDEA) continue to challenge colleges of teacher education in the methods by which they prepare special education and general education teachers (Council for exceptional children, 2004; U.S Department of Education, 2005). The amendment of the Education Act has placed much emphasis on children with disabilities to meet the same content standards as other students do.

Special education teachers must know how to align curriculum, instruction, and assessment in ways similar to general education teachers. Similarly, general education teachers must become more conversant with special curriculum and how to implement it. Teacher education for general educators must present and assess knowledge and examples of differentiated instruction, then promote the necessary individual adaptation methods and practice opportunities in these skills (Stewart, 2001).

In Ghana, most teachers' preparation is primarily the responsibilities of the thirty nine (39) colleges of education. They are being trained to handle special needs children in the formal certain. From the early 1990s the colleges of education introduced a course called 'Special Education' into the curriculum to

provide teacher trainees' knowledge about special needs in classrooms (Ghana Education Service, 2005). Indeed, studies have shown that there are many children with mild disabilities and other difficulties in the regular classrooms across the country (Hayford, 2007). In order to have effective teacher preparation programme towards inclusive education, the programmes must be geared towards the understanding and appreciation of diversity of learning needs by the individuals in the classroom (Schumann & Vaughn, 1995).

One of the requirements for effective implementation of inclusive education is that teachers must be adequately prepared (Moore & Gilbreath, 1998). This can be accomplished by providing experiences which could provide prospective teachers the ability to develop creative ways and skills in solving problems. Teachers are to view situations from different perspectives since they are key to educational change and school improvement and that teachers do not merely deliver the curriculum, they develop, define and interpret it too (Ainscow, 1997). It is what teachers think, believe and do in the classroom that ultimately shape the kind of learning that their students get.

Statement of the Problem

Although teachers in the general education classrooms have positive attitudes towards including students with disabilities in the regular school classrooms, they have limited knowledge of inclusive practices (Hayford, 2007). Most teachers do not provide the individual support to students with disabilities to offer assistance to enable them to overcome their problems and participate in learning successfully (Hayford, 2007). Most general education classroom teachers

in Ghana have limited knowledge in identifying special need children. Regular classroom teachers usually express concerns about inclusive education (Hayford, 2007). One of the concerns is that they lack the specialized training required to teach academic, social or adaptive behaviours to students with disabilities (Hayford, 2007).

Information gathered from resource teachers revealed that teachers in the general classroom have difficulties in adapting the general curriculum to suite the learning needs of special need children. Regular class teachers turn to see assessment practices that alienate special need children. As a result of these practices in the general education, some of the special need children feel uncomfortable and thus, turn to be truant and finally, drop out of school. It is against this and other background that it is necessary to explore the views of teachers of selected basic schools on inclusive education in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

Purpose of the Study

The aim of the study was to explore the views of teachers of some selected basic schools towards inclusive education in the Cape Coast Metropolis. To guide this study are four research questions.

Research Questions

The study is being guided with the following research questions:

1. What is the perceived knowledge and skills teachers in inclusive education have to enable them function effectively?

Hypotheses

1. H_0 : There is no significant difference in how teachers use inclusive curriculum to the benefit of special need pupils in Cape Coast Metropolis.
 H_1 : There is significant difference in how teachers use inclusive curriculum to the benefit of special need pupils in Cape Coast Metropolis.
2. H_0 : There is no significant difference of how teachers use alternative assessment in inclusive education.
 H_1 : There is significant difference of how teachers use alternative assessment in inclusive education.
3. H_0 : There is no significant difference in how teachers collaborate with other professionals in inclusive education Cape Coast Metropolis.
 H_1 : There is significant difference in how teachers collaborate with other professionals in inclusive education Cape Coast Metropolis.

Significance of the Study

It is anticipated that the findings from the study would reveal teachers' views about the adequacy of special education in preparing teachers towards inclusive education. This would enable curriculum planners for Colleges of Education to know whether or not the current curriculum used in the Colleges of Education is appropriate to prepare teachers for inclusive education in Ghana. The findings would enhance inclusive education so that children with special needs would benefit from quality education. The result of the study would again reveal to the Government of Ghana what has to be done to equip colleges of education in Ghana to make the teaching of special needs children better.

Delimitation of the Study

This survey was restricted to selected basic education school teachers in the Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region of Ghana. The study covered teachers in the classroom, except the head of the various institutions and teachers in Kindergarten. Teachers in Primary One to Junior High School Three help in the implementation of the inclusive education and they do have the practical feel of what goes on in the class. Delivery of lesson to the entire pupils rely on the teachers as well manage the pupils who do not have any known special needs in the class at the same time. The teachers have been interacting with the special needs pupils from morning till school is closed for day. Also, all the teachers in basic schools in the Metropolis were not used for the study since the focus of the study was not to cover the entire teachers in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

Limitations of the Study

One major problem faced initially was the difficulty in having access to the class teachers in responding to the instrument since they were busy always with their pupils. The distance between the schools was far, so a lot of travelling was done in collecting data, so the instrument was not responded to at the same time. At times the intended teachers who were to respond to the instrument do not come to school and they have to be chased severally. This had extended the time projected for the completion of the study.

Some weaknesses of descriptive design are worth noting. Confidentiality is a big disadvantage of descriptive research. Subjects that researchers are questioning may not always be truthful and instead, will give answers that they

feel that the researcher wants to hear. In interviews, participants may also refuse to answer any questions that they feel are too personal or difficult. Descriptive research also carries with it an observer's paradox. If a participant knows that someone is observing them, they may change the way they act. Subjectivity and error also play a disadvantageous role in descriptive research. Questions presented by a researcher are predetermined and prescriptive, while studies can contain errors. A researcher may choose what information to use and ignore data that does not conform to their hypothesis.

Despite some of the weaknesses noted above, the researcher is of the view that it is the best design that can be used in finding the necessary answers to the problem. The demand of the problem, collection of data from predetermined sample size and the variables involved in the problem can be well addressed using this design. Also, the researcher studied the phenomena as they existed by collecting data to answer the research question and test the formulated hypotheses.

Another challenge was the unwillingness of the targeted respondents to receive the questionnaire with the excuses of not having time to attend to the instrument and the fear of disclosing their personal information to a stranger and the public. Numerous contacts were made to convince the target group that it was an academic exercise and the ethics of anonymity would be complied with, before they accepted to be participants. Due to the absence of some of the teachers, 19 questionnaires were not retrieved and 8 of the questionnaires were also not completed hence they were excluded from the data analysis.

The final challenge was the availability of time on my part to go to several schools, perhaps three times, before administering the instrument since no teacher was willing to receive on behalf of their colleagues. The challenges outlined above unduly delayed the completion of the study. Nevertheless, it could not have any significant effect on the data collected for the study.

Organization of the Study

The thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter One covers the background to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study, delimitation and limitations of the study, Chapter Two reviews the relevant related literature as well as the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study, Chapter Three covers the research methodology whilst Chapter Four deals with analysis and discussion of the data gathered. Finally, Chapter Five covers overview of the study, summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides the review of related literature on teacher preparation toward inclusive education from different countries. The literature is reviewed under the following sub-headings: Theoretical framework, the concept of inclusive education, expertise teachers need to handle inclusive classrooms, student and teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education, adaptations in inclusive classrooms, alternative assessment, empirical studies and summary of the relevant literature of the study.

Theoretical Framework

The Theoretical framework adopted for this study was Vygotsky's social development theory which stressed the fundamental role of social interaction in the development (Vygotsky, 1978). Pupils are to receive adapted education hence, it is obviously important to understand how children learn and develop. Given the significant role that the social environment plays in children's development, it was a natural choice for me to use Vygotsky and his successors as our theoretical framework in order to understand the complex world of the classroom. This tradition, often referred to as the sociocultural approach. This therefore, emphasizes how social and cultural factors influence children's learning and development. Higher mental functions and social skills are learned through participation in social interactions from early infancy and throughout life.

Vygotsky was especially interested in language as an instrument for the development of higher mental functions. Vygotsky (1978) and Bakhtin (1986)

were concerned with the relationship between language and human development, and both agreed in many of their fundamental views. Bakhtin's theories indeed provide an insightful supplement to Vygotsky's theory. This theoretical framework is reviewed and described in the presentation of this study.

The Concept of Inclusive Education

Globally, there has been a decisive move towards inclusive practice in education and any acceptable agreement on the key principles which was encompassed in the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994). Since 1994, the principles agreed on in Salamanca have been reinforced by many conventions. The declarations and recommendations in Europe which covers United Nation's Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) had made it an explicit reference to the importance of ensuring inclusive systems of education. It was obvious that the Rights of Persons with Disabilities has gone beyond the narrow idea of inclusion as a means of understanding and overcoming a deficit in understanding the issue on inclusive education. It is now widely accepted that concerns on the issues of gender, ethnicity, class, social conditions, health and human rights encompassed universal involvement, access, participation and achievement (Ouane, 2008).

The UNESCO International Conference in Geneva in 2008 raised the importance of inclusive education as a means of addressing increasing inequality, spatial segmentation and cultural fragmentation. Garcia-Huidobro (2005) has also pointed out that equity must be at the centre of general policy decisions and not limited to peripheral policies oriented to correct the effects of general policies that

are not in tune with logic of justice or prevention. Education for all and remove barriers to participation and learning are essential links which made the reform of education system and other policies such as poverty alleviation, improved maternal and child health, promote gender equality and ensure environmental sustainability and global partnership.

A declaration following the ninth meeting of the High-Level Group on Education for all (EFA) held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in February 2010, confirmed the key role played by education in building equitable and peaceful societies and in sustainable social and economic development (United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2010). The recommendations from the meeting were evidence-based, inclusive education policies are indispensable for reaching the marginalized and meeting the educational needs of all children, youth and adults, regardless of age, nationality, race, gender, ethnicity, disability, religion, low social status and other markers of disadvantage. The recommendations from the meeting also highlighted the importance of documenting and disseminating best practices in addressing key elements of quality education. For instance, adequately-qualified teachers, appropriate pedagogy, relevant curricula and materials, language of instruction, promotion of tolerance and peace, appropriate use of technologies and open education resources were proposed.

Rouse (2010) has indicated the fact that problems with quality and availability of educational opportunities are not confined to the developing world. Traces of such issues are also evident in the developed nations. According to

Rouse (2010), 'well-schooled' countries where compulsory education has a long history, such concerns may seem irrelevant, however, not all children have positive experiences of education, nor do many have much to show for their time in school when they leave.

Inclusive education can, therefore, be understood as the presence (access to education and school attendance), participation (quality of the learning experience from the students' perspective) and achievement (learning processes and outcomes across the curriculum) of all learners. UNESCO (2008) definition of inclusive education states that 'an ongoing process aimed at offering quality education for all while respecting diversity and the different needs and abilities, characteristics and learning expectations of the students and communities, eliminating all forms of discrimination'(p. 3).

Operti Brady and Duncombe (2009) discussed some of the challenges associated with the broad definition of inclusive education by UNESCO (2008) as:

- a. achieving a balance between universal and targeted social policies.
- b. positively discriminate towards certain social groups; such targeted policies may be seen as 'second class' or may increase fragmentation and segregation;
- c. supporting childhood care and education as the foundation for positive outcomes;
- d. the expansion of basic education to a minimum of nine or ten years, with a smooth transition between primary and lower secondary education;

- e. promoting a comprehensive and integrated life-long education system (instead of a vertical and static divided system of formal, non-formal and informal education);
- f. ensuring relevant curricular frameworks and learning tools to meet learners' diverse needs and achieve learning outcomes.

The ideology of inclusive education, as outlined above, is implemented in different ways across different contexts and varies with national policies and priorities which are in turn influenced by a whole range of social, cultural, historical and political issues. Definitions and understandings of what is meant by inclusion and inclusive education vary greatly within countries (D'Alessio, 2007) and there is no agreed interpretation of terms such as handicap, special need or disability. Such differences are linked to administrative, financial and procedural regulations rather than reflecting variations in the incidence and the types of special educational needs in countries (Meijer, 2003). When considering policy and practice for inclusive education across countries, therefore, it is important to keep in mind that policy makers and practitioners are not always talking about the same thing (Watkins & D'Alessio, 2009).

There appears to be a number of reasons for this: firstly, the education systems (policies and practice) in countries have evolved over time, within very specific contexts and are, therefore, highly individual (Meijer, 1999, 2003). Despite this, there are similarities in approaches and aims for inclusive education within all countries, as well as between countries (Ainscow & Booth, 1998).

Secondly, systems for inclusive education are embedded in both the general and special education frameworks of provision that exist in individual countries (Watkins, 2007). There is a need to examine issues impacting upon inclusive education within both general and special education legislation and policy to fully understand teaching and learning in inclusive settings.

Finally, inclusive education in all countries is not a static phenomenon – it has been developing in different ways and continues to develop (Barton & Armstrong, 2007). Conceptions of policies for and practice in inclusive education are constantly undergoing changes and any examination of inclusive education and ‘current’ practice in any country needs to be considered within the context of wider educational reforms occurring in that country.

UNESCO (2005) monitoring report on quality in education highlighted the need to respect ‘indigenous’ views of quality. Mitchell (2005) states:

Since there is no one model of inclusive education that suites every country’s circumstances, caution must be exercised in exporting and importing a particular model. While countries can learn from others’ experiences, it is important that they give due consideration to their own social economic-political-cultural-historical singularities’ (p. 19).

Despite these varying contexts, fundamental principles can be agreed to overcome barriers which may arise from ‘entrenched professional attitudes, class, sexist or racial prejudice, or from cultural misunderstandings’ (Rambla, Ferrer, Tarabini & Verger 2008). Opertti et al. (2009) have suggested that Skidmore’s (2004) examples of discourses around deviance as compared to inclusive education can be helpful in identifying and overcoming barriers to learning.

According to Schumm and Vaughn (1995), the most effective teaching strategies used in preparing teachers towards inclusive education is embedded in inclusive teacher preparation model. To them this preparation model is in two major dimensions. One deals with the outcomes of the model and the other focuses on the specific programme components (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995).

The most prevalent education conceptualisations are those that define inclusion based on certain key features and characteristics such as age-appropriate placement and students being able to attend their local school. Berlach and Chambers (2011) provided a philosophical framework for inclusive education along with school-based and classroom-based examples. Their philosophical underpinnings included: availability of opportunity; acceptance of disability and / or disadvantage; superior ability and diversity; and an absence of bias, prejudice, and inequality. Hall (1996), cited in Florian (2005) noted that inclusion means “Full membership of an age-appropriate class in your local school doing the same lessons as other pupils and it mattering if you are not there. Plus you have friends who spend time with you outside of school” (p. 31). Other definitions refer to the presence of community (Forest & Pearpoint, 1992), ‘ordinary’ schools expanding

what they do (Clark et al., 1995), problem solving (Rouse & Florian, 1996), and responsiveness to student needs via curriculum organisation and provision (Ballard, 1995). Loreman (2002) provided a synthesis of the features of inclusive education evident in a variety of sources situated firmly in this key features category. These features include:

1. All children attend their neighbourhood school.
2. Schools and districts have a 'zero-rejection' policy when it comes to registering and teaching children in their region. All children are welcomed and valued.
3. All children learn in regular, heterogeneous classrooms with same-age peers.
4. All children follow substantively similar programmes of study, with curriculum that can be adapted and modified if needed. Modes of instruction are varied and responsive to the needs of all.
5. All children contribute to regular school and classroom learning activities and events.
6. All children are supported to make friends and to be socially successful with their peers.
7. Adequate resources and staff training are provided within the school and district to support inclusion (Loreman, 2002, p. 43).

Attempts to define inclusive education by what it is, however, are problematic because such definitions can be impacted by shifts in educational practice, context, culture, and circumstance that can quickly render these features

irrelevant and out-dated. Such definitions tend to assume that educational practice is subject to a set of commonalities that are static across time and place, but this is not the case. For example, in many rural areas of the world where the 'one room schoolhouse' still exists, the criteria of children being educated with their same-age peers might not factor into a definition of inclusion.

As far back as 1924 the League of Nations adopted the declaration of human rights and the rights of the children. Discrimination is an acts of aggression perpetuated against some children all over the world (Urika, 1996 cited in Avoke, 2005). The current body, the United Nations formulated new and more elaborate convention on human rights in 1959. These declaration directed member states to protect the rights of citizens, particularly vulnerable groups such as women, children and those with disabilities and the disadvantaged in society. Despite these conventions, people with disabilities are still being subjected to human maltreatment and are denied access to relevant services in many parts of the world, including Ghana (Acije et al., 1948).

The Salamanca statement (1994) and the United Nations (1993) standard rules on the equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities are compelling institutions to open their doors for students having special needs to be educated together in the same class with their non-disabled counterparts. Delegates to the world conference on Special Needs Education held in Salamanca, Spain in 1994 recognized the urgency and the importance of providing education for individuals with special needs within the proclamation among others. Those with special needs education must have access to regular schools which should

accommodate them within a child-centred pedagogy capable of meeting these needs. Regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all (UNESCO, 1994)

Most conceptual literature on inclusive education were of European and North American in origin, taking a ‘whole-school’ approach to institutional change (Peters, 2004), and influenced by the social model of disability. Children in special schools were seen as geographically and socially segregated from their peers, and the initial movement of location to integrate these students in mainstream schools (‘integration’) shifted to one where the whole school was encouraged to become more adaptable and inclusive in its day-to-day educational practices for all students (‘inclusive education’). Pedagogy in particular was highlighted as the key to meeting all students’ educational needs by making the curriculum flexible, and so more accessible. Teaching methods can make curriculum accessible to children with disabilities and also make learning more accessible to all students in a way of improving the overall quality of their school (Ainscow, 2005; Ainscow, 1991).

Inclusion should, however not be seen as an issue solely about students with disability. Finley Snyder (1999, in Shaddock, MacDonald, Hook, Giorcelli, and Arthur-Kelly, 2009), observed that the “inclusion movement has primarily been a special education movement” (p. 174), and as such, it is easy to fall into thinking that it is only about children with disability.

The impetus for inclusion has, indeed, come from outside of the mainstream; from those who have been traditionally excluded. According to Shaddock and colleagues (2009), inclusion implies that if participation becomes an issue for any student, whether arising from disability, gender, behaviour, poverty, culture, refugee status or any other reason, the desirable approach is not to establish special programs for the newly identified individual or group need, but to expand mainstream thinking, structures, and practices so that all students are accommodated. When inclusion is seen as a disability issue and not as a whole-of-school issue, inclusive education becomes a code for ‘special education’ and as such can work against inclusive practice, with certain individuals and groups of children becoming pathologised in the eyes of educators. An expanded view of inclusive education allows it to be seen as a human rights issue, with marginalised and excluded groups being discriminated against and denied what is readily available to others in the mainstream. Inclusion, thus, requires “... a focus on all policies and processes within an education system, and indeed, all pupils who may experience exclusionary pressures” (Ainscow, Farrell & Tweddle, 2000, p. 228). Ainscow, Booth and Dyson (2006, p. 15), in advocating a broader understanding of inclusion, wrote

We question the usefulness of an approach to inclusion that, in attempting to increase the participation of students, focuses on the ‘disabled’ or ‘special needs’ part of them and ignores all the other ways in which

participation for any student may be impeded or enhanced (italics added).

It may, therefore, be that neither of the two categories above in isolation is adequate in providing a good conceptual definition of inclusive education. Attempts to define what inclusive education is are problematic, because they may fail to take into account a variety of context-dependent features. Attempts to conceptualise inclusion as the removal of that which excludes and marginalises are problematic because barriers may vary enormously between jurisdictions, cultures, and contexts and this description fails to adequately describe what an inclusive setting might actually be. Consequently, it is not surprising that there is difficulty, picturing what inclusion looks like in practice.

Considering international agreements are fundamental drivers and definers of inclusive education for most regions, the definition of inclusion adopted for this review would be from UNESCO. This is proposed as the most defensible definition on which this report is grounded, as it is consistent with conceptualisations in the literature and has broad international agreement. Education is not simply about making schools available for those who are already able to access them. It is about being proactive in identifying the barriers and obstacles learners encounter in attempting to access opportunities for quality education, as well as in removing those barriers and obstacles that lead to exclusion (UNESCO, 2012). This definition purports an education-for-all approach in which inclusive practice is generally seen as having a broader focus than just disability (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson, 2004). The terms of reference for

this report, however, relate to students with disability, thus the focus for much of the remainder of the report is on this specific group of students.

The UNESCO (2008) stated that inclusive education is: an outgoing process aimed at offering quality education for all while respecting diversity and the different needs and abilities, characteristics and learning expectations of the students and communities, eliminating all forms of discrimination (p. 3). The current thinking has moved beyond the narrow idea of inclusion as a means of understanding and overcoming a deficit. Inclusion is now widely accepted as concerning issues of gender, ethnicity, class social conditions, health and human rights encompassing universal involvement, access, participation and achievement (Ouane, 2008). Inclusive education describes the process as individuals, by reconsidering and restructuring its curricular organization and by providing and allocating resources to enhance equality of education (Hyann, 2004).

According to Giangreco et al. (1993), inclusive education has fine components and all of these should occur in an ongoing basis. They argued that inclusive education is in place only when all the fine features occur regularly. The fine features are:

- i. Heterogeneous grouping: All students including those with special needs are educated together in groups and the number of students with and without disabilities approximates natural or normal proportions.
- ii. A sense of belonging to a group. All students including those with disabilities are considered active members of the class. Students who have disability feel welcomed as those without disabilities.

- iii. Shared activities with individualized outcomes. Students share educational experiences, for example lesson laboratories, fieldwork, group learning at the same time. The learning objectives for the students are individualized to meet each student's learning needs.
- iv. Use of environment frequented by individuals without disabilities. The learning experiences take place in general education classrooms and community worksites.
- v. A balanced educational experience. Inclusive education seeks an individualist's balance between the academic/functional and social-personal aspects of schooling (p. 51).

Regarding teacher education, Ballard (2003) said that inclusive education is concerned with issues of social justice, which means that graduates entering the teaching profession should:

Understand how they might create classroom and schools that address issues of respect, fairness and equity. As part of this endeavour, they will need to understand the historical, socio-cultural and ideological contexts that create discrimination of disabled students. Others include gender discrimination, poverty and racism (p. 59).

Inclusion should not be viewed as an add-on to a conventional school. It must be viewed as intrinsic to the mission, philosophy, values, practices and activities of the school. Full inclusion must be embedded deeply in the very

foundation of the school, in its missions, its belief system, and its daily activities, rather than an appendage that is added on to a conventional school (Levin, 1997).

Best Practice in the United States and Canada in Inclusion Education

In Canada, more than two decades of inclusive education practice have significantly impacted countries of the North. At the centre of this inclusive vision is a belief in children and their capacities. This belief is manifested in several widely adopted best practices that began in Ontario schools: Person Centred Planning, Making Action Plans (MAPS), Circles of Friends, and PATH (Planning Alternative Tomorrow's with Hope) (Stainback & Stainback, 1996). Educational programmes are powerful tools for building connections between schools, parents and communities, and for solving complex individual, family, and systems issues that may act as barriers to inclusive education. The Centre for Integrated Education and Community in Toronto, Canada initiates and supports path-breaking activities to advance inclusion in education and communities (Stainback & Stainback, 1996).

In addition to Ontario, a noteworthy system-wide approach to Individual Education (IE) exists in the province of New Brunswick, Canada. Individual Education became official policy in New Brunswick as early as 1968, and reinforced in 1985 by the Act to Amend the Schools Act. Known as Bill 85, every school in the province is required to provide IE. Italy is the only other OECD member that matches this level of official Inclusive Education law/policy. In New Brunswick, as in Italy, virtually all students are educated in ordinary classrooms,

with specialized support as needed, based on a student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP).

In the United States, IE programmes have grown exponentially since the passage of PL94-142 in 1975. Between 1994 -1995 the number of school districts reporting IE programmes in the US tripled (Lipsky & Gardner, 1997). A 1994 report of National Centre on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion (NCERI) documented inclusion programs in every state, at all grade levels, involving students across the entire range of disabilities. Also in 1994, a Working Forum on Inclusive Schools identified the following best practice characteristics for Inclusive Education (Lipsky & Gardner, 1997).

Best Practice in Europe and other Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Countries

In getting more disabled children to school has called for integration of Disabled Children into Mainstream Education. A survey carried out in Paris in 1994 of twenty-three member countries was to identify common areas of success and difficulty experienced in integrating disabled pupils into ordinary schools. Findings of the study focused on: (1) placement decisions, (2) parental choice issues, (3) equality of access and integration, (4) forms and models of integration, and (5) teacher training and staff support.

Inclusive Education at Work: Students with Disabilities in Mainstream Schools

Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] (1999) carried out a study on 'Students with Disabilities in Mainstream School' between 1995 and 1998 in eight countries from three regions (North America, Europe and the Pacific). The major finding of this study was "From organizational,

curriculum and pedagogical perspectives, given certain safeguards, there is no reason to maintain generally segregated provision for disabled students in public education systems.” In fact, changes in pedagogy and curriculum development were found to benefit all students. The extensive research analysed provided a “substantial if not overwhelming case to support the full integration of disabled children into mainstream schools” (OECD, 1999 p. 22). Also, evidence suggested that IE improves performance of non-SEN students, in part because the increased attention to pedagogy and curriculum adaptation generalizes teaching skills to all students (p. 29).

Special Needs Education in Europe

European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education and EURYDICE in 2003 among some 30-countries focused on five areas of inclusive education: (i) IE policies and practice; (ii) funding of SNE; (iii) teachers and SNE; (iv) information and communication technology in SNE and (v) early intervention. In terms of inclusive education practices, the findings from EURYDICE (2003) have reinforced the findings of earlier study done by OECD in some areas. Specifically, a policy towards IE is a general trend. However, special schools still enrol between 1-6% of all pupils in segregated schools and classes.

(i) Transforming special schools into resource centres is a common trend (OECD, 2003). These centres typically:

1. Provide training and courses for teachers and other professionals
2. Develop and disseminate materials and methods

3. Support mainstream schools and parents
4. Provide short-term or part-time help for individual students
5. Support students in entering the labour market

(ii) Individualized Education Plans play a major role in determining the degree and type of adaptations needed in evaluating students' progress.

In Ghana, more efforts are being made in implementing inclusive education. According to the Ministry of Education (2003) the education strategic plan 2003-2015 document mandated that special education should include move in-depth knowledge of special needs children particularly in the light of policy on inclusive education and that all teachers in the country should be trained in special education training packs which provides basic approaches to helping children with special needs (UNESCO, 1993). According to UNESCO (1993), it suggested that a more comprehensive special needs education module should be developed for colleges of education in Ghana (Ministry of Education, 2003) as cited in Avoke (2005). Currently, 379 pilot inclusive schools have been established in 70 districts within 7 regions in Ghana (Ministry of Education, 2010).

The Ghanaian Persons with Disability (PWD) Act 2006 reinforced the rights of (PWD) and gave the impetus for their inclusiveness in education and all aspects of social life in Ghana. A study in educational policy becomes obvious as though the government has very good policy for education but its implementation is not the best (Avoke & Avoke, 2004; Kuyini & Desai, 2006, 2009; Ocloo & Subbey, 2008). Whereas the education policies advocate for inclusive teaching, the observation made about the curriculum and assessment requirements are

essentially prescriptive and rigid, leaving little room for teachers to modify it to meet individual student's needs (Agbenyega & Deku, 2011).

According to Agbenyega and Deku (2011) the main concern for teachers was to finish the curriculum as stipulated by policy. Agbenyega and Deku (2011) maintained that post-colonial theory provides a framework which helps to address questions of why so many curriculum practices appear still so far away from reaching or even recognising the goals of individual differences. The inclusive elements of the education policy thus remain on paper without its real meaning being experienced in schools. A post-colonial view of the policy-practice divide as it currently exists would see it as an out-dated dysfunctional colonial institution in many ways, including the way in which it promotes inclusive policy on one hand and a curriculum steeped in the traditional assumption that the highly structured examination driven and teacher-centred approach is the best. It is argued that the traditional school almost inevitably promotes and reinforces socio-economic inequity (Hickling-Hudson, 2002; Ladwig, 2000) because they are unsuitable for meeting the learning needs of diverse student populations but rather drill the bodies of students into a regimented and stultified approach to learning through regimented approach in teaching.

Genesis of Inclusive Education in Ghana

Inclusive education in Ghana, as illustrated by Gadagbui (2008), had begun since 1951–Accelerated Educational Plan and the 1961 Educational Act for free education which resulted in increases in basic enrolment. Then the Jomtien World Conference in Education of Education (1990) for all set the goal of

Education for all. UNESCO alongside with other UN Agencies and NGOs worked towards the achievement of this goal together with the efforts made at the country level. For example, the 1992 Constitution had emphasized the Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (FCUBE - 1995) which also increased access to basic schools. It has been observed that though FCUBE had provided access to a lot of children to attend school, this did not provide what it takes to run an effective inclusive education. Rather, access to special schools was possible for some and those integrated had no equal opportunity. Society or educational systems had not changed, the child was rather expected to change – to have hearing aid; the teacher or peer are not expected to learn to sign; the child has to pass the standardized test in class to be promoted or if he fails to he repeats or drops out.

Contributions of UNESCO Teacher Education Resource Pack of 1995/96 started with Education of Teacher of Training Colleges as Trainer of Trainers at Saltpond. Series of workshops were held in many parts of the country to impact quality teaching for all children of diverse abilities in regular schools.

Adaptation of Inclusive Education by Ministry of Education and GES

In the light of these global development since Ghana was a participant at the Salamanca and Dakar Conferences, the Ministry of Education pursued those rights hence the Ghana Education Service in its Education Strategic Plan of 2003–2015 adapted Inclusive Education.

Strategies in Creating Awareness in Inclusive Education

The Report of Global Campaign for Education (2015) has identified seven different strategies which could be used to create awareness about inclusive education. These strategies were:

Strategy 1 - Create appropriate legislative frameworks, and set out ambitious national plans for inclusion.

Strategy 2 - Provide the capacity, resources and leadership to implement ambitious national plans on inclusion.

Strategy 3 - Improve data on disability and education, and build accountability for action.

Strategy 4 - Make schools and classrooms accessible and relevant for all.

Strategy 5 - Ensure there are enough appropriately trained teachers for all.

Strategy 6 - Challenge attitudes which reinforce and sustain discrimination; and

Strategy 7- Create an enabling environment to support inclusive education, including thorough cross-sectoral policies and strategies that reduce exclusion.

A policy document of Ministry of Education (2003) has outlined some strategic plan for inclusive education from 2003-2015 of how best to create access for children in Ghana to have their education without any difficulty. Under Policy Goal 1: Increase access, participation in education and training and the related policy objective (Equitable Access). To achieve this target, the strategies identified were to:

- i. Provide training for all teachers in Special Education.

- ii. Re-design school infrastructure to facilitate the accommodation of pupil/students with special needs.
- iii. Organize sensitization workshop for parents and children with special needs.
- iv. Incorporate training in special education into all teacher training College courses.
- v. Establish special education assessment centres in all districts.

Practice: Training of Trainers

The inclusion of mild to moderate children with disability into the mainstream started as a pilot project from 2003/04 with three regions: Central Region, Eastern Region, Greater Accra Region with Ten (10) Districts but now Northern Region and Volta Region are added to create an increase of 4 districts to the 10 regions initially created. Initially, Special Education Division and the Health Sector were part of the pilot implementation of the project again in collaboration with Voluntary Services Overseas(VSO) initially but the VSO withdrew very early after 11/12years in 2005 due to lack of funds (Gadagbui, 2008).

The Inclusive Education Policy is the result of series of consultations and workshops among key stakeholders in the delivery of education in Ghana. The Policy document takes its source from national legal documents including the 1992 Constitution of the republic of Ghana; the Ghana shared Growth and Development Agenda (GSGDA), the Education Strategic Plan (2010-2020), the disability Act, the Education Act Among others.

The document on education strategic plan was founded on the premise that every child has the right and can learn. Hence, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) model is the super structure upon which the policy is expected to deliver quality equitable education to all. The UDL is complemented by the Child Friendly Schools (CFS) model.

Under the UDL and the CFS model, the strategic focus of the policy has the overarching goal to redefine the delivery and management of education services to respond to the diverse needs of all pupils/students within the framework of Universal design for learning. The strategic focus includes improving equitable access to quality education for all children of diverse educational needs; provision of requisite teaching and learning materials; capacity development for professional and specialised teachers and managers as well as improvements in education service delivery (Opoku-Agyemang, 2013).

Expertise Teachers Need to Handle Inclusive Classrooms

In relation to inclusive practice, student achievement can be compromised unless teacher training programmes to embrace a new wave of pedagogical practice that value all learners (Carrington, Deppeler & Moss, 2010). Learning to teach in an inclusive setting is a highly complex and dynamic activity, and much to do with context that uses a ‘whole school approach.’ A whole school approach to inclusive education involves using multiple strategies that have a unifying purpose and reflect a common set of values. It requires that policymakers, teacher educators, teachers, parents, students, and the community working together to create education environment that promotes equal opportunity for learning and

well-being on social and emotional levels (Avramidis, 2005; Ekins & Grimes, 2009; Fullan, 2007; Peterson, 2004). While we cannot claim a definitive form of inclusive pedagogy, an attempt can be made to stir up a rich and diverse knowledge base that informs the preparation of teachers for inclusive education.

Professional development is important in the creation of successful inclusive environments. Many teachers are apprehensive about teaching special education students because they feel that they lacked training necessary to meet student needs, and that they had not learned appropriate skills in their career or at professional development workshops (Lohrmann & Bambara, 2006; Desimone & Parmar, 2006b).

In Idol's (2006) study, teachers wanted professional development in the areas of instructional and curriculum modifications, methods of supporting teachers in inclusive classrooms, professional development for instructional assistants, visiting schools practicing inclusion, disciplinary practices, and using reading tutor programs. The roles of general and special education teachers have been redefined to meet the requirements of inclusion (Carpenter & Dyal, 2007).

Traditionally, special education teachers have been extensively trained to meet the needs of students with disabilities and provided instruction for content courses. Special education teachers are no longer qualified to teach core academic areas in which they have not proven competency due to the passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 in United States (Doe, nd). Teachers who had training outside of school were more confident in

meeting Individualized Education Plan requirements more than teachers with school based training or no training at all (Avramidis, Bayless & Burden, 2000).

According to Avramidis et al. (2000), professional development increased teachers' positive attitudes towards inclusion. When 81 primary and secondary teachers were questioned about inclusion, it was revealed that teachers with first-hand experience in inclusion were more positive than teachers who had little experience with inclusion. Teachers who had the proper training were confident in their ability felt they could meet the needs of students with disabilities. Teachers are overwhelmed when they are faced with challenges they do not feel they are equipped to handle. Monahan and Marino (1996) stated that many general education teachers do not have the instructional skills or background to teach special education students (1996).

According to Hay (2003), educators' knowledge, skills and competencies have direct impact on their preparedness to implement inclusive education effectively. Studies on teacher formation have identified teaching as a complex process of socialization (Carrington, Deppeler, & Moss, 2010; Murrell, 2001; Proweller & Mitchener, 2004; Wenger, 1998). With this complexity is the tension between philosophy of teaching underpinned by the teacher's values, beliefs, behaviours, which influences what is taught, the policy and curriculum, and the structural constraints of school ethos (Goodson, 1992; Helms, 1998). Teacher training, development and change is shaped by the interrelationship between personal and experience, and professional knowledge linked to the teaching environment, students, curriculum and culture of the school (Proweller &

Mitchener, 2004). According to Proweller and Mitchener (2004), “early functionalist frameworks dominating research on teacher socialization provided linear models of teacher training, development and change” (p. 1045). Fullan (1993) argued,

the way that teachers are trained, the way that schools are organized, the way that the educational hierarchy operates, and the way that education is treated by political decision makers which result in a system that is more likely to retain the status quo than to change (p. 3).

Lortie (1975) posited that the school as a society shapes and alters the teacher, reconstructs teacher socialization more in terms of structural accommodation than individual agency. Agency here implies giving opportunity to learners to produce themselves in the world of their learning, to socially interact and reflect back through the independent behaviours of their interaction and knowledge they have produced. Without agency teacher development practices remain traditional, and “legitimize and institutionalize dominant beliefs and values; a process that both undermines critical thinking as a democratic educational and social practice” (Armstrong, 2006, p. 8). However, new theoretical insights into strong and effective teacher profession has identified the relevance of inclusive education to highlight the importance of multidimensional framings within interrelationships and community (Britzman, 1991; Munby & Russell, 1994) and professional knowledge linked to the teaching environment, students, curriculum, policy and ethos of the school (Hargreaves, 1994).

Teachers, school managers and mentors are the single most important components in the process of making an education system more inclusive. They have sometimes overwhelming task of translating framework, policies and directives into practice while safeguarding the best interests of the child (Hargreaves, 1994). The initial and continuous training and support of teachers are key strategies for the realization of an inclusive and right-based education system. Teachers are both duty bearers and rights holders within the framework for the right to education, and their empowerment to be able to assist the process of promotion and protection of the right to quality education for all is therefore very important. According to Hargreaves (1994) an inclusive education system is not only child-friendly in its nature but must also be teacher friendly.

Even if education is accessible, it doesn't mean that the education is relevant or acceptable to help children to attain the required quality. Based on the principles of equality and participation, all learning materials need to be accessible to all learners and the content made relevant to their situation. Education materials must be free of barriers to learning for all children which means that materials must be adapted to the individual needs of each learner. Some learners might need material in Braille while others need mother-tongue materials in order for them to be able to participate. In order to avoid exclusion from learning within the education system and remove discriminatory barriers, applying a rights-based approach to material development and design is fundamental in the process of creating an inclusive education system (Hargreaves, 1994).

Above all, the realization of an inclusive education system requires a paradigm shift towards more learner-centred and inclusive methodologies and pedagogies based on human rights principles of non-discrimination, equality and the best interests of the child. Teachers as the key change agents in the process towards inclusion and non-discrimination must be empowered to be able to actively remove barriers to and within learning.

A rights-based school, which reflects and helps children realize their rights, is essentially a child-friendly school - one which is not only academically effective but also inclusive of all children, healthy and protective of children, gender-responsive, and encouraging of the participation of the learners themselves, their families, and their communities (Lortie, 1975). This requires, of course, solid support from the teachers and principals, but also the communities which surround the school. All must be able and willing to ensure the inclusion in the classroom and in learning not only their own children; not only the “average” child but also other children with very diverse characteristics arising from sex and social economic status, ability/disability, language and ethnicity, etc.

Student and Teachers’ Attitudes towards Inclusive Education

Several studies showed that teachers’ and student-teachers’ attitudes contribute to the success of inclusion and that positive attitudes are linked to a range of factors including training in special/ inclusive education and experience working with students with disabilities. An international study of four countries has identified factors such as close contact with a person with a disability, teaching experience, knowledge of policy and law, and confidence levels had

significant impact on student teachers' attitudes (Loreman, Forlin & Sharma, 2007). Attitude of society continues to create significant barriers to inclusion (Forlin, Loreman, Sharma, & Earle, 2009; Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman; 2011, Sharma, Forlin & Loreman, 2008). Australia is a nation of diverse cultures and ethnic groups with diverse understandings of disability that may inform attitudes towards inclusion. So far, inclusion has been presented through a disability lens.

Many other studies (Bones & Lambe, 2007; Forlin, Loreman, Sharma, & Earle, 2009; Kuyini, 2004; Leatherman & Niemeyer, 2005) have reported that training in special/inclusive education and experience teaching or relating to students with disabilities have positive impact on attitudes. In addition, such positive attitudes support the potential for more successful inclusive programmes or experiences for students (Kuyini & Desai, 2008; Subban & Sharma, 2006). In light of the above, the special/inclusive education training initiatives in Ghana and Botswana were essential, given that apart from local contextual factors, both student teachers and regular classroom teachers have been found to have less positive attitudes towards inclusive education (Alghazo, Dodeen & Algaryouti, 2003; Avramidis, Baylis, & Burden, 2000a, 2000b; Kuyini, 2004) and they also have serious concerns about inclusive education (Alexander, 2001; Forlin, et al., 2009; Sharma & Desai, 2002; Sharma, Forlin & Loreman, 2007). Such less positive attitudes and strong concerns can impact upon the quality of teacher-student interaction and instructional provisions for students with special needs in inclusive classrooms (Avramidis, et al., 2000a, 2000b; Cook, 2001; Kuyini; 2004; Kuyini & Desai, 2008).

Over a decade ago Gary (1997) argued on the basis of a literature reviewed that many regular education teachers who feel unprepared and fearful to teach students with disabilities in regular classes displayed frustration, anger and negative attitude toward inclusive education. In the last decade, research in several countries show that many school teachers have limited skills to teach in inclusive classrooms and this coupled with the lack of resources (Alexander, 2001; Avramidis, et al., 2000a, 2000b) often translate into serious concerns on the part of teachers to be engaged in inclusive education settings.

For example, Kuyini and Desai (2007) found in Ghana that teachers' lack of knowledge and less positive attitudes accounted for limited use of effective instructional practices. David (2007) also found in a study of schools in Tamil Nadu, India that attitudes accounted for poor social inclusion of students. In addition, Mukhopadhyay (2009) and Chhabra, Strivasta and Strivasta (2010) concluded that teacher attitudes and concerns such as lack of training and limited resources in special education act as barriers to successful inclusive education in Botswana.

Arrah and Swain (2014) carried a study on teachers' perceptions of students with special education needs in Cameroon secondary schools. The study had revealed that teachers' perceptions of students with special education needs were favourable. However, specific areas of concern were noted that included insufficient resources for special education, lack of training to work with students with special education needs, additional stress and anxiety when teaching students with special education needs, and preventing the learning of other students. The

difficulty in assessing some of the needed equipment may prevent the teachers in doing their best to solve the challenges that affect people and could bring their morale down as the years draw by.

Majority of studies that have investigated educators' concerns and attitude to inclusive education have focused on teachers in the field (Agbenyega, 2006; Alexander, 2001; Gaad & Khan, 2007; Kuyini, 2004; Mangope, 2002) rather than on student teachers. In fact, very few studies on student teachers' attitudes and concerns have been undertaken generally across Africa, or more specifically in Ghana and Botswana. Given that less positive teacher attitudes and high concerns about inclusive education impact upon instructional quality, having an understanding of teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education is important if implementation is to be successful in these countries. Further, in the situation where teacher attrition is very high in Ghana (Cobbold, 2006) and elsewhere – due to poor service conditions – the drive to implement inclusive education may yet be another influential factor in whether or not student teachers feel comfortable to stay in the profession and whether they provide instruction that supports all students in regular classrooms. In this regard, examining student teachers' concerns and attitude toward inclusive education in Ghana and Botswana is essential in order to ensure that the many training programmes that are being rolled out in both countries by donor nations and NGOs address some of these concerns at both the training and policy levels.

Adaptations in Inclusive Classrooms

In recent years, a number of stated intentions and written policies towards the achievement of inclusive education have been enacted across a range of contexts (Ainscow & Booth, 1998). The clear implication of the inclusive education movement is that mainstream schools seek to restructure so as to provide for an increasing diversity of educational needs and eliminate the problem of students who fail to fulfil their learning potential (Avramidis et al., 2000). However, despite the widespread advocacy of inclusion in educational discourse and policy guidance, the question of how children's divergent needs are best met within educational systems still remains a highly debatable and controversial issue (Dyson & Gallannaugh, 2007; Florian, 2005).

To put the above controversy into perspective, a considerable number of authors (Ainscow, 2007; Dyson & Millward, 2000; Low, 2007) have argued that much of that debate pertains to the poor implementation of inclusive programmes, rather than the opposition towards the concept of inclusion per se. While, for example, it is generally agreed that teachers need to have an increasingly large repertoire of instructional strategies to meet students' divergent needs, little descriptive information is available regarding the types of instructional adaptations that are necessary in implementing an inclusive school programme (deBettencourt, 1999; Salend & Duhaney, 1999; Schumm et al., 1995).

There is limited information concerning the kinds and effectiveness of instructional adaptations in teachers' everyday practice within the mainstream classrooms, which aimed at responding to students' diversity (McLeskey &

Waldron, 2002; McIntosh, Vaughn, Schumm, Haager & Lee, 1993). The overall picture emerging from the vast majority of relevant studies suggests that regular education teachers do not usually differentiate instruction to meet students' diversity in regular classrooms. In addition, few instructional adaptations are provided for those with identified SENs and difficulties in learning (deBettencourt, 1999; McIntosh, et al.,1993; Schumm, et al.,1995; Vaughn, et al.,1994).

Mainstream teachers seem to be concerned about finding ways for responding to students' without disabilities increasing diversity in terms of academic background, level of mastery skills and interests. More importantly they mostly feel under-resourced and ill-equipped to master this task. The amount of difficulty they already face in the teaching process increases considerably, when students with disabilities are included in their mainstream classes (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002).

Baker and Zigmond (1990) found, for example, that the teachers in the mainstream primary schools they studied taught in single, large groups and seldom differentiated instruction or made adaptations based on students' needs. Besides, on a survey addressing adaptive instruction (Ysseldyke et al., 1990), regular education teachers did not specify classroom adaptations for students with disabilities.

Although students with disabilities appear to be accepted by their teachers, they could be characterized as 'passive learners' who are rarely engaged in the learning process, either by themselves or due to the teachers' initiation (McIntosh,

et al., 1993). These findings have been endorsed, somewhat, in a subsequent study by Vaughn and Schumm (1994), who suggested that instruction in mainstream classes was not differentiated to meet the needs of students with learning disabilities and that few instructional adaptations were provided. In such instances, teachers' adaptations tended to be largely incidental, inconsistent, idiosyncratic and not part of the overall plan for an individual student in the classroom or at the school level (Schumm et al., 1994).

Consequently, even though if mainstreamed students are going to learn successfully in the general education classroom, then they would have to meet the expectations set by the teachers for all students in the classroom (Vaughn & Schumm, 1994). Within the context of inclusion, teacher acceptability of various adaptations is a critical issue in understanding why accommodations are made or not made for students facing difficulties (Subban & Sharma, 2006).

There are some issues that teachers in the classroom are confronted with which are important when it comes to the implementation of certain adaptations in the classroom. This problem is difficult and demanding process is involved which are mainly due to: a) the complexity underpinning teachers' decisions over instructional practices, b) the multifaceted aspects of teaching, and c) the impact that the unique contextual and educational characteristics of different national systems exert on teachers' decision-making processes (Kohler, Manhart & Lafferty, 2008).

Despite the complexities surrounding the implementation of inclusive education; analysing teachers' acceptability of routine adaptations is a key

variable for understanding their compromise in teaching diverse students in inclusive classrooms and for learning to the extent to which they are ready to adapt and differentiate instruction. Moreover, studying how teachers approach adaptations may contribute not only to identify teacher preference, but also the various barriers and impediments to implementing them (Cardona, 2009; Scott et al., 1998).

Alternative Assessment

According to Dietel, Herman, and Knuth (1991) define assessment as “any method used to better understand the current knowledge that a student possesses”. Assistive Technology (AT) has been around for hundreds of years and is used to describe both the products and the services for people with special needs. Casely-Hayford and Lynch (2003b) considered the most commonly quoted definition to be derived from American Legislation. Assistive Technology Act (1998) and the IDEA (Amended 1997) defined an Assistive Technology (AT) device as any item, piece of equipment, or product system (whether acquired off the shelf, modified, or customized) that is used to increase, maintain or improve the functional capability of an individual with disability. AT devices may be categorized as no technology, low technology, or high technology (Casely-Hayford & Lynch, 2003b).

While Assistive Technology can help overcome some of the functional barriers created by disability, it can also create new barriers if not matched carefully with individual needs. In an inclusive education context the effective integration of AT devices to enable learning would require an assessment process

with two objectives: (1) to assess the needs of the learner and (2) to access resources in order to meet those needs (Winter, Fletcher - Cambell, Connolly & Lynch, 2006).

The Act on 'No Child Left Behind' and 'Individuals with Disabilities Education' Act of 2004 presented a paradigm shift in instructing and assessing students with significant cognitive disabilities. According to a study, these Acts have moved special education from "a culture of compliance to a culture of accountability for results" (Manasevit & Maginnis, 2005, p. 51). However, technical and logistical challenges have confronted states with far greater resources than those created by assessments designed for general education students. Issues of bias, validity, and reliability as well as approaches to training and monitoring are complicated by the heterogeneity and varying degrees of disability in the targeted population.

Implementation of Alternative Assessment in Inclusive Education

Assessing a learner is to help the educator to know how well he/she is coping with learning. Without the assessment of a learner, there is no feedback to find out how the learning is being assimilated. Overall, Assessment for learning is concerned with collecting evidence about learning that is used to adapt teaching and plan next educational steps. Evidence about learning is crucial as it indicates if there has been a shift (or not) in the process of learning of a pupil. On the basis of such evidence, teachers can formulate targets/goals and are able to provide pupils with feedback about their learning (Hattie & Timperly, 2007). Clearly this is an indication to give pupils not just what they need to learn, but also giving

them information on how best they can learn it, therefore contributing to pupils' reflection on their own learning. All children can learn but this statement represents a shift in thinking about schools and schooling in the United States (Quenemoen, Thompson, Thurlow & Lehr, 2001). For the past decade, schools in USA have been refocused on efforts to set high standards for the learning of all children, and to develop assessment and accountability systems that will ensure that all children do in fact learn, and learn to very high levels (Quenemoen, Thompson, Thurlow & Lehr, 2001). Quenemoen et al., have noted a remarkable progress in assessing students with disabilities and have found that most states in the US had 10% or fewer of their students with disabilities in state assessments in the early 1990s.

Quenemoen, Thompson, Thurlow and Lehr (2001) found that participation and accommodation policies were either non-existent or limiting. According to Quenemoen, Thompson, Thurlow and Lehr (2001), only one state had developed an inclusive assessment system in the early 1990s with both a general and alternate assessment that were fully implemented. Negative consequences of excluding students with disabilities emerged: increased rates of referral to special education, exclusion from the curriculum, and no information on the educational results of students with disabilities.

The Education Summit of 1989 set an agenda for education reform that called for higher expectations, rigorous educational standards, and assessments of progress for all students. Participation rates in US assessments have increased steadily during the 1990s; in 1998 most states had over 50% of students with

disabilities in their assessments. Participation and accommodation policies have been established in every state. Access to the curriculum emerged as a critical part of improving the performance of students with disabilities on state assessments. All but a few states had developed alternate assessments by 2000 for those students unable to participate in the general state assessment even with accommodations (Quenemoen et al, 2001).

Most students with disabilities in the US participated in state and district assessments by taking existing assessments with testing accommodations (Thurlow & Case, 2004). But a small percentage of students have disabilities that make their participation in general state and district tests impractical, if not impossible. Such participation is likely to yield inaccurate measures of academic achievement. Alternate assessments are intended for students who were not able to participate in state and district assessment systems, even with accommodations issues (Thompson, Johnstone, Thurlow & Altman, 2005; Thurlow & Case, 2004). On December 9, 2003, the U.S. Department of Education issued regulations that allowed states to use for accountability purposes. Alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was the first federal act to require including all students in state and district accountability systems. In 2003, the U.S. Department of Education issued regulations allowing states to develop alternate assessment standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities - and to include some results from these assessments in annual school,

district, and state accountability formulas as long as the number of such inclusions did not exceed 1 percent of the combined population of students taking general and alternate assessments state-wide (U.S. Department of Education, 2003b). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 and U.S. Department of Education (2006b) regulations issued in August 2006 further clarified the requirements for assessing students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

A survey and interviews conducted by Rabinowitz, Sato, Case, Benitez, & Jordan (2008) suggested that the Southwest Region states in the US have been tracking changes in their curricular and assessment focus from functional to academic content. State representatives believe that changes in policies and practices have improved each state's approach and emphasis, though they admit a need for more rigorous analysis of these relationships.

When the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 was passed, states moved quickly to develop alternate assessments. At that time Louisiana and New Mexico used checklists to assess students. Texas used locally selected alternate assessments and also produced the State-Developed Alternate Achievement I, a multiple-choice assessment. Arkansas and Oklahoma were using a body of evidence (portfolio) alternate assessment. Policy makers and researchers increasingly agree that alternate assessments are intended to function as one component in a larger accountability system and to measure progress toward general education expectations. A state's general education academic standards should form the foundation for alternate assessment, and evidence of this link should routinely be available (U.S. Department of Education, 2003b,

2006b; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary & Secondary Education, 2004).

States in the US are now struggling to identify outcomes on which to base alternate content standards and to find curriculum models that meet students' needs in addressing the standard set from curriculum models. In addition, United State is struggling to link the alternate standards to their grade-level counter-parts in accordance with expectations set by the No Child Left Behind Act. Test developers and policy makers struggle over the content and focus of state alternate assessments. The question then is, should alternate assessments focus on "the content standards (or core learning outcomes) identified for all students" or on "a separate, more 'functional' set of learner outcomes" (Kleinert & Kearns, 1999, p. 101)? The functional-skills curriculum model for students with significant cognitive disabilities was intended to promote community inclusiveness. It was a paradigm shift from previous developmental models based largely on infant and early childhood curricula. Developmental models hinged on the belief that many students with significant cognitive disabilities would not continue to develop intellectually as their typically developing peers would (Browder et al., 2004).

Early functional curriculum models, by contrast, focused primarily on skills for independent living in the United State, such as cooking, shopping, managing money, using public transportation and living in the community (National Centre on Learning Disabilities, 2007). Functional curricula vary from district to district in US, and often from classroom to classroom, depending on

student needs or the mandates of an individualized education programme. One of such functional curriculum includes personal-care skills (grooming, health, dressing, attending to medical needs), domestic skills (shopping, cleaning, cooking, budgeting, planning), recreation skills (making social connections, using the library, swimming, biking), and employment skills (prevocational, vocational, on-the-job training, community-based job experiences; Provincial Out-reach Programme for Autism, 2007).

A functional-skills curriculum is child-centred, not curriculum centred. It is fluid, changing with the needs of the student, and is teacher-selected and teacher directed to emphasize academic tasks that the student will use daily and can apply in real life. The shift from a functional-skill assessment approach to one based more on academic skills has advanced the trend toward alternate assessments across US. The states, however, had to decide how to relate academic content standards to the alternate assessments. Thurlow (2004) has these questions ‘Would policy makers keep standards identical with general education standards, revise or amend the general education standards, or develop separate alternate assessment standards? These questions were asked based on the new trends that are emerging in how best to assess students with some kind of disabilities or challenges in learning.

The traditional paper-and-pencil tests are inappropriate for students with significant cognitive disabilities; hence, various states in the US have had to consider alternative approaches and to build more valid instruments. Significantly cognitively disabled students tend to have limited communication skills, some

being non-verbal and extremely low academic achievement levels. They need highly specialized instruction and support, such as augmented communication systems (Almond & Bechard, 2005). These needs are often complicated by English language learner or low socioeconomic status. The broad heterogeneity of this population requires a broad and flexible assessment approach. Although researchers have made progress determining the technical requirements of alternate assessments their adequacy continues to lag behind that of their general education counterparts - primarily assessments with multiple-choice and short and extended constructed response questions. Given the range of student needs, one size of alternate assessment will not fit all (Rabinowitz & Sato, 2005).

In 2010, Education of Persons with special needs children was passed by Bridge of Hope an NGO and the RA Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) jointly to introduce a pilot project, which was implemented in Tavush region. The goal of the project was to create conditions in all mainstream schools of Tavush for educating children with special needs children. It is assumed that some children are in constant need of special support, which has to be provided by teacher's assistants. The number of teacher's assistant is equal to 10% of the average annual number of non-SEN students. In Tavush, 62 out of 77 schools in do not have students classified by Medical, Psychological and Pedagogical Assessment Centre (MPPAC) as children with SEN.

According to the Centre for Educational Researches and Consulting [CERC] (2013), schools have engaged untrained teachers to assist professional teachers in the classroom. However, these teachers do not have special education

background to support the school staff in meeting the needs of special needs pupils in the classroom. From the study, only 15 schools from Tavush were included in the list of ISs and host children classified by MPPAC as children with SEN. These schools employ both teacher's assistants and special educators. Special educators receive state funding through the experimental model, with no additional financing (Centre for Educational Researches and Consulting, 2013). The use of different means to assess students call for different modes of instruction. The Centre for Applied Special Technology (CAST) (2009) explained universal design for learning (UDL) as a way of organizing instructional support and pedagogy based on ways that match individual students' learning styles and differences. According to UDL, to help students learn, teachers must:

1. use multiple ways to present information,
2. provide multiple pathways for students' action and expression, and
3. provide multiple ways to engage students, including collaborative and interactive structures (Cited in The Universal Education Grant of the Florida Developmental Disabilities Council, 2011).

A study in Ethiopia on challenges and opportunities to implement Inclusive Education by Mitiku, Alemu and Mengsitu (2014) showed that even though there are some opportunities that support inclusive education it cannot be taken as a guarantee due to lack of awareness, commitment, and collaboration. And there are real challenges that hinder the full implementation of inclusive education. The study revealed how the challenges outweigh the opportunity on the full implementation of inclusive education.

Nature of Performance Assessments Developed to Increase Access to Inclusive Education

Alternative assessment attempts to capture the learner's total array of skills and abilities (Tierney, Carter & Desai, 1991). Through alternative assessment procedures, it is possible to measure language proficiency in the context of specific subject matter (Hill & Ruptic, 1994; Short, 1993; Turner 1992). Thus, for school age learners, questions can be answered regarding students' ability to process in English, information in areas of science or social studies; in the case of adult learners, one might assess how well a person can hold a conversation in a business setting. Alternative assessment procedures are also based on the idea that various aspects of a learner's life, both academic or professional and personal, are integral to the development of language proficiency and cannot be ignored (Baskwill & Whitman, 1988).

Alternative assessment also allows for the integration of various dimensions of learning as they relate to the development of language proficiency. These dimensions include not only processes such as acquiring and integrating knowledge, extending and refining knowledge, and using knowledge meaningfully, but also issues such as varying students' attitude towards learning (Davies, Cameron, Polotano & Gregory, 1992; Marzano, 1994).

Knowledge and Skills of Teachers to Function in Inclusive Education

A review of literature by Avramidis and Norwich (2002) has indicated that although most teachers have positive attitudes toward inclusion, teachers did not feel prepared for teaching students with exceptional needs, especially in the case of students with severe learning difficulties and behavioural/emotional disorders.

Oliver and Reschly (2010) have provided information on teacher organization and preparation in the classroom. The article pointed out how inadequate special education teachers are as compared to general education teachers to manage students with behaviour disorders in the classroom.

Students with Emotional and Behavioural Disorders (EBD) or Severely Emotional Disorders (SED) have behaviours that inhibit special needs children academically as well as socially. The EBD student oftentimes cannot or does not know how to control these “acting out” behaviours (Oliver & Reschly, 2010). Moreover, they are frequently too disruptive in the general education classroom and must be separated from their peers. The convention now is students with disabilities must be educated in the same classrooms as their non-disabled peers. The underlying key to teacher success is preparation. Learning in the classroom with the least disruptions possible is essential. Therefore, to impede negative behaviour as much as possible, teachers must be prepared to manage these behaviours.

Oliver and Reshly (2010) argued that, excesses exhibited by students with EBD, teacher skills in classroom organization and behaviour management are necessary to address these challenging behaviours, attenuate academic deficits, and support successful inclusion efforts. Teachers must make sure that classrooms are structured and conducive to learning with minimal disruptions. Teachers must have concise rules for the classroom and ensure that students know and understand the rules that are set. The results from the study of Oliver and Reschly

(2010) found that special education teachers may not be adequately prepared to meet the behavioural needs of diverse learners.

Akalin, Sazak-Pinar and Sucuogluo (2010) gave information on teachers and classroom management in inclusive classrooms. The inclusive classrooms in the study have at least one or more student diagnosed with a learning disability. The authors explained how the law in Turkey is mandating that children with disabilities should be placed in general classroom and mainstreaming has been expanding throughout Turkey since 1983. However, teachers were not trained to provide accommodations or modifications to adhere to this mandate. Students were mainstreamed, even though few teachers were adequately trained in an academic setting to provide for the needs of students with disabilities. Moreover, equally important was a study conducted by Fallon, Zhang, Kim (2011), which focused on training teachers to manage the behaviours of students with disabilities in the inclusive classroom. Many general education teachers lack the skills and knowledge necessary to effectively manage these challenging behaviours. The study focused on novice teachers that are certified in the general curriculum who want additional certification in special education. Each participant in the study was a volunteer in a graduate class in managing and accessing behaviours of students with disabilities using functional behaviour assessments as well as behaviour intervention plans. The need to train teachers to manage students with behaviour disorders is imperative since these students are now educated in the same classrooms as their non-disabled peers. Educating, training, and cultural

diversity should be considered when recruiting teachers to teach students with behavioural and emotional disorders.

It is essential that teachers are trained in the skills and strategies to support behaviour management in the classroom as well as the ability to differentiate instruction for students with special needs. Frequent classroom distractions take something away from the learning experience of all students. The teacher is the manager of the classroom and he or she must have rules in place to impede negative behaviours as much as possible. Akalin, Sazak-Pinar and Sucuoglu (2010) concluded that “The results of research focused on classroom management revealed that effective classroom management increased academic achievement and decreased problem behaviours of students” (p. 64).

Akalin, Sazak-Pinar, and Sucuoglu (2010) stated the behaviour of the student has a direct correlation to student achievement. Final results of the research found that

classroom management should be considered as a powerful cluster of techniques and strategies in terms of creating meaningful learning experiences for all students including students with disabilities, because in Turkey, there are a limited numbers of experts working in special education collaborating with the general education teachers for meeting the needs of students with disabilities (p. 72).

General educators believed that they are not trained to effectively manage the challenging behaviours of EBD students, therefore making them apprehensive about having these students in their classes (Wagoner, Friend, Bursuck, Kutash, Duchnowski, Sumi & Epstein, 2006). Furthermore, Sawka and colleagues' research has found that there continue to be high turnover rates for teachers of EBD students; therefore leaving the students with EBD at greater risk of poor academic outcomes and constantly having to adjust to new teachers.

General education teachers do have concerns about teaching students with learning impairments including lack of training, planning time, and resources, so research is essential to demonstrate how the inclusion model can have a positive impact on academic achievement as well as social interaction among students with disabilities. However, the literature indicates with proper training and resources, inclusion can be a practical and effective learning environment (Lamport, Graves & Ward, 2012). In Latin America, today, inclusive education often does not respond to the needs of children and young people, and teachers often finish their professional training without acquiring the skills they need to work with children and young people living in difficult circumstances.

Teachers also need incentives to work in remote or difficult geographical areas, and they benefit from national efforts to improve their status, including awards for innovative work. Much remains to be done, but the training of teachers for a more inclusive education system is gradually being incorporated as part of the educational policy agenda in Latin America (UNESCO IBE, 2011). In Latin America, large proportions of primary school teachers, up to one third in some

countries, lack the necessary training to adequately fulfil their teaching responsibilities (Da Silva, 2010). For example, in Guatemala and Peru, only 64% of primary school teachers are adequately trained for their positions. The typical primary school teacher tends to be female, urban, non-indigenous, and minimally trained (Hunt, 2008). The demographic makeup of the teaching force in Latin America poses several challenges to school access and quality education for all children.

The policy of including pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools and classes is now firmly established in many jurisdictions worldwide. However, to make this policy fruitful it largely depends on teachers who are prepared and have the requisite knowledge, skills and competencies. This may create some sort of challenges to both novice and experienced teachers (Eileen, 1999). Notwithstanding the challenges which may face teacher preparation and training, it is important as it provides quality education for all students in inclusive settings. In order to counteract the challenges associated with the implementation of the inclusive education, greater efforts are being made in various countries to train and develop teachers who are to carry out the strenuous task (Whitworth, 2001).

Savolainen (2009) noted how teachers play essential role in quality education and quoted McKinsey and Company who said: 'the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers' (p. 16). Studies suggested that the quality of the teacher contributes more to learner achievement

than any other factor, including class size, class composition, or background (Sanders & Horn, 1998; Bailleul, Bataille, Langlois, Lanoe & Mazereau, 2008).

The need for 'high quality' teachers equipped to meet the needs of all learners become evident to provide not only equal opportunities for all, but also education for an inclusive society. Reynolds (2001) has identified knowledge, beliefs and values of the teacher which brought to bear in creating an effective learning environment for pupils, making the teacher a critical influence in education for inclusion and the development of the inclusive school.

Cardona (2009) noted that concentration on initial teacher education '... would seem to provide the best means to create a new generation of teachers who will ensure the successful implementation of inclusive policies and practices' (p. 35). The road towards inclusion continues to be a major challenge for most schools across many parts of the world. One reason is that the current classroom teachers were trained to either work in general education classroom or in special educational settings. Few general education teachers have had any course work in special education and few special educators have had any training in teaching in large group settings or have expertise in content areas normally taught by general educators (Bursetein & Sears, 1998).

Teacher training programmes in colleges and universities are not offering enough course work to train new teachers to work in inclusive classrooms, so new teachers are unprepared to function in inclusive settings (Pugach & Johnson, 2002). In order to prepare teachers effectively to teach in inclusive settings, the inclusive needs of all students entail different model of teacher preparation and

training (Whitworth, 2001). Although knowledge is very important in inclusive education, competency and skill cannot be down played when it comes to inclusive education. The teacher has to be ready for the ‘normal’ pupils and the ‘special needs’ pupils as well. Teacher preparation and training has attracted considerable attention due to the fact that it is considered an important factor in improving teacher attitudes towards the implementation of an inclusive policy (Gyimah, Sugden & Pearson, 2009).

According to Mukhopadhyay, Molosiwa and Moswela (2009) special education student-teachers in Botswana were not prepared to meet the learning needs of diverse categories of learners with disabilities in inclusive settings. Based on the findings of this study, a teacher preparation model was proposed for successful implementation of inclusive basic education in Botswana. In Tanzania, a similar study revealed that trainee teachers are not adequately prepared for teaching students with special needs included in regular classrooms, as the present teacher education curriculum does not cover a lot of courses in special education and inclusive education in general. It was further revealed that trainee teachers were not equipped with relevant special education needs knowledge. However, it was noted that trainee teachers had positive attitudes towards students with special needs and attitudes towards inclusive education (Kapinga, 2014).

A Disability Survey Report of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania conducted by the National Bureau of Statistics in 2008 found disability prevalence to be 7.8% (about 2.4 million people) (URT, 2008). The survey also reported that, the illiteracy rate for persons with disability in Tanzania was 47.6%

compared to 25.3% of the persons without disability. That means almost half of the persons with disability are not educated. The survey also revealed that 15.5% of children with disabilities aged between 3-14 years were refused entry to schools because of their disabilities (Kapinga, 2014). The finding is a pointer to the fact that teachers were not ready for these children because they do not have the requisite knowledge and skill to handle the children with disabilities.

A survey in Ghana to evaluate inclusive education practice revealed that 94.0% of the teachers were adequately prepared for inclusive schools and most teachers held positive perception about inclusive education (Danso, 2009). Research pointed to the direction that the Ghanaian learning spaces (from preschool to the university level) depicted a hegemonic colonial rationalist way of organizing educational practice (Agbenyega, 2006; Deppeler, Moss & Agbenyega, 2008).

Researchers of inclusive education practices in Ghana consistently found that despite the majority of teachers' support for inclusive education, they had limited knowledge of inclusive practices and their approaches to pedagogy remain punitive (Agbenyega, 2006; Deppeler, Moss, & Agbenyega, 2008; Kuyini & Desai, 2007, 2009). The teachers and other stakeholders seemed not to see the need for inclusive education let alone the parents whose wards needed attention, so reading literature to know new trend of development in inclusive education seemed not be there.

In a related study, Ocloo and Dogbe (2005) noted that Special Education Services in Ghana are largely provided in urban areas and district capitals whereas

the greater number of persons who need these services are found in the rural areas. Service providers are mainly professionals who teach in the special segregated schools with only a few in mainstream regular classrooms. This revelation shows that children in the deprived areas would be denied of their right to education and the stigma of having disability would continue to last for a long time.

Special Attention Project (SAP) explored the situation of children with learning difficulties in public basic schools in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. Findings were that teachers and other stakeholders do identify children who have specific learning difficulties, but knowledge levels on Specific Learning Disabilities and relevant legislation and policies is low (Special Attention Project, 2011). This calls for a lot more attention to this effect to update the knowledge of the teachers as a whole.

Implementation of Curriculum to Benefit Special Needs Pupils

The curriculum is a way of organizing and sequencing learning experiences with the aim of achieving specified learning outcomes. It guides what will be learned, and why, and how, this learning is facilitated. The curriculum reflects connections between society, politics and schools/teachers, so the development of inclusive curricula reflects a desire to develop an equitable, non-discriminatory society (Braslavsky, 1999 cited in UNESCO, 2008).

The advocacy guide on curriculum was discussed in relation to inclusive teacher education in relation to the curriculum. According to Braslavsky (1999), curriculum advocacy look at:

1. Inclusive curriculum – ensuring that the content and methods used in teacher education courses convey clear messages about inclusive education, use inclusive learner-centred approaches, and are flexible and responsive to learners’ needs and experiences.
2. Inclusive approaches to curriculum development – ensuring that the process of developing teacher education curricula is inclusive and participatory and takes account of diverse stakeholder perspectives (e.g. teachers, students, teacher educators, parents and carers who are male and female, with and without disabilities, from majority and minority language groups, from rural and urban locations, and so on).

The curriculum used in teacher education; especially during pre-service programmes – shapes teachers’ attitudes, knowledge and competencies, and influences their subsequent work with their own students (UNESCO, 2013). In many countries, investments are made in in-service teacher education programmes to ‘upgrade’ teachers’ competencies and knowledge, and influence their attitudes towards inclusive education (UNESCO, 2013). Such ongoing professional development will always be needed, both to support teachers who have not accessed inclusive pre-service teacher education, and to facilitate commitment to continuous improvement towards inclusive education among all teachers. However, there needs to be a balance between pre-service and in-service teacher education, so that there is an effective mix of initial learning via a core teacher education curriculum, and further learning through supplementary (in-service) curricula. Advocating for inclusive education to be incorporated into the

pre-service teacher education curriculum in your country or teacher education institution is, therefore, an essential part of moving forward with inclusive education.

A special needs curriculum design can never be universal in content, process and ends as it deals with varied ranges of disabilities as well as extents of each of those disabilities and disability situations and needs. A special needs curriculum therefore is not a universal document but more of a strategic approach to meeting special educational needs. The various kinds of disabilities handled as suggested by the Warnock Report (1978) included primarily the following general learning disabilities: emotional and behavioural disturbance, language and communication difficulties and disorders, physical and sensory disabilities. The areas of focus in the curriculum also differs with the different institutional approaches to the provision of special needs education and these include inclusion approach, integrative approach, mainstreaming, exclusion as well as institutionalisation.

Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) analysed 28 studies conducted from 1958 to 1995 and found that, overwhelmingly, teachers endorse the general concept of providing support to students with disabilities. In spite of that, only one third of the teachers felt that they had the time, preparation, resources and skills needed. More recently, similar findings have been reported by Forlin (2001), Loreman (2002), Jobling and Moni (2004), Sharma and Desai (2003). Shippen et al. (2005) and Lambe and Bones (2006a). The OECD TALIS survey (2009) also found that

teachers do not feel fully prepared to cope with the challenges of students with special educational needs.

Ballhysa and Flagler (2011) in their research found that teachers believed in the message of inclusive education and have embraced it. The challenges identified are related to (a) lack of adequate professional preparation to work with students with special needs in general and in inclusive settings, in particular; (b) lack of administrative support such as reduced class size and teaching load; (c) lack of support by other professionals and special education teachers; and (d) lack of any supportive resources such as special equipment and modified didactic materials. The willingness to embrace inclusive education not backing it with practise amount to virtually nothing in the sense that children with disability in various communities are in ignorance and looking up to someone to ‘deliver’ them from such a situation (Ballhysa & Flagler, 2011). Authorities behind inclusive education ought to be on their toes to pull teachers who are willing and ready to practise inclusive education.

Reporting the data of their qualitative study with 136 Canadian educators, Bunch and Finnegan (2005) noted that although the educators were enthusiastic about inclusive education as a model of social inclusion beneficial for both students with special needs and their peers, they had some concerns related to its implementation. The concerns were related to teacher preparation to respond to the learning challenges of students with special needs, heavier workload, and lack of sufficient support, especially from the administration. The authors of another mixed design study conducted in Canada with 22 teachers reported that the

regular education staff surveyed agreed that students with special needs belong fully in the regular classroom, since “teachers are there to teach children, not subjects, and teachers tended to look at what is best for each child in their class” (Horne & Timmons, 2009, p. 281). Among the needs expressed were further training, as well support from students, parents and departments. Their main concern was lack of adequate time.

The need for specific training of the teachers teaching in inclusive setting becomes more apparent when one takes into account the multitudes of pedagogical strategies needed for effective inclusion. In their systemic review of the literature on the pedagogy of inclusion in the classroom used by teachers, British authors Nind and Wearmouth (2006) found that some of the successful pedagogical approaches reported in literature were adaptation of instruction, materials, assessment, classroom environment as well as behavioural and programmatic interventions, computer-based pedagogy, peer tutoring, peer group interactive and team teaching.

UNESCO (1994) has identified and proposed that basic training curriculum for teachers might include advice about how to:

1. Translate relevant research findings (including brain research) into effective teaching practices;
2. Assess the progress of all students through the curriculum, including how to assess learners whose attainments are low and whose progress is slow;

3. Use assessments as a planning tool for the class as a whole, as well as in drawing up individual plans for students;
4. Observe students in learning situations, including the use of simple checklists and observation schedules;
5. Relate the behaviour of particular learners to normal patterns of development
(particularly important for teachers of young children);
6. Involve parents and pupils in the assessment process;
7. Work with other professionals and know when to call on their specialised advice and how to use their assessments for educational purposes.

The implementation of these guidelines in the various countries could be very good to serve as a catalyst to development of inclusive education worldwide. A study seeking to find the views of teachers on how best to implement inclusive education curriculum in Zambia has revealed that teachers have a clear idea of how they want to work in making the curriculum beneficial to the target groups. However, few resources to implement a meaningful curriculum are lacking. Teachers consider gaining independence as the most important aim for their pupils, while simultaneously many teachers are concerned with further educational opportunities of their pupils as well as their placement in society (Ojala, 2004). Teaching of practical skills is considered important but schools are equipped with few resources for it. Apart from the curriculum and resources

needed positive attitudes towards disability at schools and in the communities seem to be essential for providing meaningful special education in Zambia.

The Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE) was given the responsibility of developing curriculum for primary school, secondary school and teacher training education. In principle, Tanzania has national curriculum which has to be followed by every learner including those with disabilities. Tanzania recognises that the quality of education is strengthened by availability of relevant curricula guidelines and quality of teaching and learning materials (United Republic of Tanzania, 2006 p. 19). In order to meet the needs of all learners, the ministry has planned to review the existing curriculum to meet current and future needs and orient the teachers on the same and to strengthen the production and provision of relevant teaching and learning materials (United Republic of Tanzania, 2006 p. 19).

Danso (2009) has found in a study how the use of curriculum in inclusive education in schools being flexible and how it is adapted to suite a child. Adaption of curriculum may largely depend on the child and the environment which the child is located. In adapting curriculum in schools calls for creativity of the teacher under whom the child is entrusted for tuition. In observing 21 pre-teachers teach for a total of 42 hours in Ghana, Agbenyega and Deku (2011) found that current pedagogical practices are prescriptive, mechanistic, and do not value student diversity and different learning styles. The teachers would do what they think is prescribed by the general curriculum meant for the children who are

perceived to be 'normal' hence would not be ready to implement the curriculum to the benefit of the children.

Collaboration of Teachers with Professionals in Inclusive Education

Collaboration is a style of interaction professionals use to undertake shared responsibilities. Collaboration refers to how professionals interact. One of the earliest definitions for collaboration according to Cook and Friend (2010) is "Collaboration is a style for direct interaction between at least two parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision-making as they work toward a common goal." The term inclusion is often associated with collaboration.

Inclusion is a philosophy or set of beliefs based on the idea that "everyone belongs, is accepted, supports, and is supported by his or her peers and other members of the school community in the course of having their educational needs met" (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). Both NCLB and IDEA make it imperative that students with disabilities, no matter what their level of functioning, access the general curriculum to the maximum extent possible. Inclusion is driven by the needs of the student while collaboration is driven by the needs of the teachers.

In the past, teachers tended to work alone and there was little or no collaboration among teachers. This type of isolated work style is changing and more educators are sharing ideas, develop plans together, and implement plans and evaluate outcomes with their colleagues (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). Collaboration is a style that professionals choose to use in order to accomplish a goal they share. Any activity that teachers work with someone else requires collaboration (Friend & Bursuck, 1996). Collaboration is demonstrated only on by

the teams where all members feel their contributions are valued and the goal is clear, where they share decision making, and where they sense they are respected (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Collaborative co-teaching requires the learning support teacher and the general education teacher to partner in all aspects of instruction. The outcome of collaborative co-teaching includes effective instruction, a cohesive, accepting class community, positive learner development and the professional and personal growth of the learning support teacher and the general education teacher (Krüger & Yorke, 2010). Inclusion is founded on collaboration among all players in education: teachers, teacher specialists, parents, supporting disciplines, and even the students. The view is that education and learning will proceed more powerfully if all involved understand what is happening, and if they all have a part to play.

In Canada, collaboration traditionally has been more of a theoretical concept than one practised in schools. Parents, to a large extent, have been seen as interlopers in schools. Supports from other discipline were to be delivered outside of school hours or in special education settings. Specialist teachers were seen as possessing special knowledge about special things and loathe giving up their power (Bunch, 2005). A collaborative attitude is not yet common amongst Canadian educators, though rhetoric abounds. Collaboration is not perfect. Students, in particular, often are left out of the mix. Some players must learn to play harder when it comes to collaboration. But collaboration has proven to be key to successful inclusion in Canada (Bunch, 2005).

A study has revealed that most educators in the States (USA) have the feeling of being positive about working collaboratively and being able to provide administrative support to make inclusive education programme a success (Idol, 2006). The technicalities involved in inclusion education necessarily calls for collaboration of experts from diverse background to making the programme a success. In the study of Bouillet (2013) to find about the level of collaboration among teachers and other professionals inclusive education in Croatian schools has shown that only a relatively small number of various professionals who could support teachers and students in inclusive processes work in schools.

Furthermore, it is established that schools do not compensate for this problem with stronger collaboration between schools and professionals in local communities. Teachers would like to receive more specific advice, as well as more concrete assistance in the education of students with disabilities. A similar study has affirmed that the class integration process appears to work well when special education teachers work side by side with regular teachers (Korkmaz, 2011).

When working with students who have mild to moderate disabilities in inclusion classrooms for science education, special education teachers and science teachers may work together, or collaborate, to teach students with and without disabilities. Friend and Cook (2007) provided the following definition for collaboration: Interpersonal collaboration is a style for direct interaction between at least two co-equal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal (p. 7).

Collaboration in inclusion classrooms is an equitable process where teachers value the importance of sharing educational responsibilities for students with and without educational disabilities. Friend (2005) related that effective collaboration is dependent on a foundation of trust, respect, and shared responsibility for all students' educational achievement. Teachers' approaches to collaboration continually evolve as they learn more about working together. The educators involved in collaborative teaching must perceive each other as equal professionals and understand that they can learn from each other. They cooperate to plan the entire teaching process including preparing class lessons, sharing materials and resources, co-teaching the lessons while managing the inclusion classroom, and making decisions about assessment of common goals for teaching and for student learning.

Effective Applications of Collaboration in Inclusive Schools

Effective application of collaboration in inclusive school has four approaches and each approach has its way of going about it. The approaches include shared problem solving, co-teaching, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, team teaching, co-teaching pragmatics, teaming and consultation (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Shared Problem Solving

It is the basis for collaborative activities in many contexts of school settings. This is a challenging task since it involves a group of professionals whose needs, expectations, and ideas should be blended into shared understanding and mutually-agreed upon solutions.

Co-teaching

In many instances, co-teaching is the inclusion of students with special learning needs in the classroom is supported through co-teaching arrangements. Co-teaching can be defined as “the partnering of a general education teacher and a special education teacher or another specialist for the purpose of jointly delivering instruction to a diverse group of students, including those with disabilities or other special needs, in a general education setting and in a way that flexibly and deliberately meets their learning needs” (Cook & Friend, 2010, p. 11).

Through co-teaching arrangements, the requirements of both NCLB and IDEA can be met while still providing students with disabilities the specially designed instruction and supports to which they are entitled (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010). Research has found that targeted and ongoing professional development is critical in supporting and maintaining co-teaching in schools (Pugach & Winn, 2011). Indubitably, teachers must be adequately trained on effective co-teaching practices in order for inclusion to be successful and for students to receive the best education possible.

According to a study by Daane, Beirne-Smith, and Latham (2000), teachers who lacked the training and skills necessary for co-teaching reported significant difficulties implementing the co-teaching model. Teachers who work in inclusive settings need substantial training in the knowledge and skills required to collaborate effectively. Friend et al. (2010) not only recommended enhanced professional development opportunities to support teachers entering collaborative

relationships, but they also posited that these teachers should attend the professional development sessions together for optimal benefit.

Co-teaching is a result when two or more teachers share the instruction for a single group of students, typically in a single classroom setting (Bauwens & Hourcade, 1995). Co-teaching is one way of meeting the needs of students in inclusive schools but not a solution for every inclusive situation. This approach is done in way that when '*One teaches*' the other person '*supports*': one teacher leads the lesson and the other takes an assisting role.

The co-teaching partnership benefits students when there are good interpersonal skills between the partners in addition to sound curriculum instruction and effective, research-proven strategies (Cramer & Nevin, 2006; Mastropieri et al., 2005). Implementing co-teaching involves more than just directing two teachers to work together. The process of forming the union requires considering the individuals joined with regard to the attributes they contribute and their perspectives on what their purpose is within the relationship.

Isherwood and Barger-Anderson (2007) noted that, up until now, the tradition in teaching has been teachers working independently. Cooperative and responsive co-teaching partnerships go against that long-standing and deeply engrained tradition. Any value or benefit gained from a co-teaching partnership depends on the partners being compatible (Scruggs, Mastropieri & McDuffie, 2007). Finding in a study conducted has determined that assignment of special education teachers to multiple co-teaching partners was a predominate feature which complicated the implementation of co-teaching practices, and hindered the

ability to establish effective co-teaching relationships (McCarty, n.d.). More on target, Howard and Potts (2009) elaborated, saying that the “nature of the relationship” is in a sense, a “professional marriage” (p.2). This professional union relies on two individuals with different avenues of training and skill sets that, when blended together have the potential to create a learning environment that supports all students under their charge.

Station Teaching

The curricular content is divided into two parts. One teacher teaches half of the content to half of the students while the other teaches the other part to the rest. The group then switch and each teacher teaches his/her part of the lesson (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Parallel Teaching

Two teachers divide a heterogeneous class group in half and have each teacher instruct half of the class separately. This strategy is to help control the class for effective teaching and learning. It could help the learners have divergent views and ideas from more than one source (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Alternative Teaching

Alternative teaching is how a class is divided into two or more where one of the classes would be large and one small group. The small group is for remediation for children who have not grasp a particular concept well enough to progress to another with more difficult task (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Team Teaching

Teachers share leadership in the classroom; both are equally engaged in the instructional activities. One teacher may begin a lesson by introducing vocabulary while the other provides examples to place the words in context (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Co-teaching Pragmatics

Students are heterogeneously grouped so students with disabilities are appropriately integrated with their peers without disabilities. Both teachers take on teaching and supportive roles. Which approach is best depends on student needs, the subject being taught, the teachers' experience, and practical considerations such as space and time for planning (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Teaming

Teams are formal work groups that have certain characteristics. They have clear goals, active and committed members, and leaders; they practice to achieve their results' and they do not let personal issues interfere with the accomplishment of their goals. Teaming is one of the most typical strategies to implement inclusive educational practice. For example, you may belong to a multidisciplinary team that determines students' eligibility for special education services and writes students' IEPs. Teaming itself will not guarantee a successful educational practice. The success of the team will depend on each team member's understanding of mutually shared goals and their collaborative effort for the goals (Cook & Friend, 2010).

Consultation

Teachers often find that they do not have direct support for a student in their classroom. They may find situations when they must seek support through consultation. Consultation is a specialized problem-solving process in which one professional who has particular expertise assists another professional who needs the benefit of others (Sheridan, Welch & Orme, 1996). The role of consultant in collaborative school consultation is to contribute specialized information toward an educational need.

The 'consultee' uses the information and expertise of consultants and other collaborators to provide direct service to the client. All who are involved, including consultants, consultee, and client are collaborators working together in a combined effort to address a particular need. For example, a learning-disabilities consultant (consultant) may serve a new student (client) who has a learning disability indirectly by collaborating with the classroom teacher (consultee) who provides direct service to the student (Dettmer, Dyck & Thurston, 1996, p. 6).

A study by Brew (2011) to find out how prepared pre-service teachers are after college to collaborate with other stakeholders show that majority of the teachers (60.7%) also thought that pre-service teachers are not being prepared to collaborate with parents and other professionals to educate pupils in inclusive schools. More also, 72.6% of the tutors believed that, contents of courses in Colleges of Education did not teach pre-service teachers the use of inclusive assessment. The results showed that 59.1 % of the tutors in the study felt that the current curriculum did not prepare pre-service teachers towards implementing

inclusive education. The educator in some colleges of education themselves acknowledge the fact that they were not preparing the students well enough to go to their fields and deliver. This finding is a pointer that more has to be done to change the situation for the better.

Summary of Reviewed Literature

Inclusive education is tailored to give the maximum assistance to special needs children in society so that they become useful to themselves and society. Education was designed for the 'normal' children in mind and as education and knowledge abounds, special schools were created for children with varied forms of disabilities. New development and research proved that inclusive education would be the best as compared to special schools. The Salamanca statement (1994) and the United Nations (1993) standard rules on the equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities were compelling institutions to open their doors for students having special needs to be educated together in the same class with their non-disabled counterparts.

Berlach and Chambers (2011) provided a philosophical framework for inclusive education along with school-based and classroom-based examples. Their philosophical underpinnings include: availability of opportunity; acceptance of disability and / or disadvantage; superior ability and diversity; and an absence of bias, prejudice, and inequality.

The account of Gadagbui (2008) revealed how inclusive education in Ghana has started after implementing special schools in selected parts of Ghana for a number of years ago. Strategies were employed in creating awareness of

inclusive education. Government and other stakeholders including NGOs were involved in making inclusive education a reality in Ghana. According to Hay (2003) educators' knowledge, skills and competencies have direct impact on their preparedness to implement inclusive education effectively.

Available literature all pointed to the fact that attitude of society continues to create significant barriers to inclusion. This notwithstanding a lot of education, awareness and research on inclusive education is ongoing to break the barrier of not making inclusive education possible in a short time to come (Forlin, Loreman, Sharma, & Earle, 2009; Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman, 2011). The clear implication of the inclusive education movement is that mainstream schools seek to restructure so as to provide for an increasing diversity of educational needs and eliminate the problem of students who fail to fulfil their learning potential (Avramidis, Bayliss & Burden, 2000). Adaptation of the classroom to absorb disable children calls for a turn-around in assessing the achievement of learners. Alternative assessment attempts to capture the learner's total array of skills and abilities (Tierney, Carter & Desai, 1991). Through alternative assessment procedures, it is possible to measure language proficiency in the context of specific subject matter (Hill & Ruptic, 1994, Short, 1993; Turner 1992).

In making inclusive education thrive, knowledge of teachers, implementation of the curriculum to benefit special needs pupils, implementation of alternative assessment in inclusive education and collaboration of teachers with other professionals to make the best out of inclusive education were the empirical literature that were reviewed. In all these literature reviewed, none of them has

focused on inclusion of special needs children in the basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. There is the possibility of the existence of literature on inclusive education in basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis I did not come across while reviewing literature for this study. This current study is to bridge this knowledge gap that has existed for quite some time.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The study aims at finding the perception of teachers on inclusive education in some selected basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. This chapter describes the research design, target population, sample and sampling procedure, the research instrument, pilot testing of instrument, validity and reliability of the study, data collection procedure, and data analysis procedure.

Research Design

The study used a descriptive survey design. Descriptive design is defined According to Burns and Grove (2003:201), descriptive research “is designed to provide a picture of a situation as it naturally happens”. It may be used to justify current practice and make judgment and also to develop theories.

Although there are many research designs, descriptive research was considered to be the most appropriate design to find the perception of teachers on inclusive education in selected basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana. Descriptive research design helps to identify the cause of something that is happening. Key (1997) observed that “descriptive research design is used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe ‘what exist’ with respect to variables or conditions in a situation, p. 2.

Also, Shuttle (2002) asserted that descriptive research design is a scientific method which involves observing and describing the behaviour of a subject without influencing it in anyway. Descriptive design outlined how scientific

research from the first to the last step, meaning it is a programme designed to guide the research in collecting, analysing, interpreting observed facts and specifies which of the various types of research approach to be adopted (MaCabe & Moore, 1989).

The purpose of descriptive research is just to describe and not to establish any relationships. One of the advantages of descriptive research is that it can provide a lot of information. It is useful in identifying further areas of research. Also, it is very useful in studying abstract ideas. “In descriptive research the subject being studied is observed in a completely natural and unchanged environment” (Shuttleworth, 2008, p.2). The study is often used as a pre-cursor to quantitative research designs, and the general overview gives some valuable pointers as to what variables are worth testing quantitatively.

Furthermore, descriptive research uses logical methods of inductive and deductive reasoning of samples in order to arrive at generalizations of samples. All the variables and procedures used in descriptive studies are described as completely and accurately as possible so as to permit future replication.

The main challenge involved in the descriptive survey is that the researcher cannot control events to isolate cause and effect. The investigator can just describe and report the observations. Despite this challenge, the descriptive survey design was considered appropriate because the purpose of the study was to describe challenges encountered by the teachers of the selected basic schools where inclusive education is practised.

Population

According to Oxford Advance English Learners Dictionary [online] (2015), population is generally defined as the entire pool from which a statistical sample is drawn. The target population of the study were head teachers, assistant head teachers and teachers in selected public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region of Ghana. The estimated target population for the selected schools was 168. The selected schools were used because it is accessible to most parents and it is likely that pupils with disability cases can be enrolled in those schools in the Metropolis. The criteria used to arrive at the selected schools were schools that have the full complement of the basic school (i.e. Classes one to JHS three) and under one detached head teacher. The target population of the selected schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: *Staff Population in Selected Public Basic School*

| Name of School | Male | Female | Total |
|------------------------------|------|--------|-------|
| St. Andrews Anglican | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| Kubease M. A. | 5 | 9 | 14 |
| Kakumdo M. A. | 5 | 9 | 14 |
| St. Nicholas Anglican | 9 | 14 | 23 |
| St. Monica's Anglican | 5 | 19 | 24 |
| Philip Quaque Girls Anglican | 8 | 10 | 18 |
| Philip Quaque Boys | 10 | 7 | 17 |
| Zion A & B | 12 | 13 | 25 |
| Jubilee Catholic | 8 | 9 | 17 |
| Total | 68 | 100 | 168 |

Source: Metro Education Office, 2014

Sample and Sampling Procedure

The head teachers were excluded from the sample size because they were not dealing directly with the pupils in the classrooms. In addition, Kindergarten teachers were also not used because some of the signs of disabilities among the pupils do not show early when this level of education to be managed. Hence, using teachers at the Kindergarten was considered not necessary in the study since purposive sampling technique was used to sample the respondents for the study. In all, a total of 9 head teachers and 18 Kindergarten teachers were excluded from the total target population of 168 for the study. The sample size for this study was determined, using Krejcie and Morgan's Table for sample size determination of a population of 141 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). The sample size of 103 teachers was arrived at using Krejcie and Morgan's Table for sample size determination from the selected public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Purposive sampling technique was used to sample class teachers at the primary school and subject teachers at the Junior High Schools excluding the head teachers and teachers at Kindergarten level. Purposive sampling technique was adopted for this study due to the fact that the focus of this study was targeting a category of teachers who were the respondents for the study. It was deemed that no other respondents could better provide the relevant information for this study apart from those in the classroom dealing with special needs children.

The Basic One through to the Junior High School Form 3 teachers were used because the pupils at this level can complain about their disability problems to their teachers for redress. Also, the teachers can identify any form of disability

signs and manage them. The case could be referred to other professionals if the need be.

Research Instrument

An important part of planning a research project is the choice of instrument by which data is collected. This required a precise form of questions to study and the nature of sampling frame. The use of several methods to provide a range of data for a piece of research work can enhance the validity of results (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003). The main instrument used in collecting data was a questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of closed-ended items. The instrument has 40 items. With five sections and each section dealt with a peculiar issue relating to the study. Section A dealt with background information about the respondents while sections B – E had items which sought information for the study on knowledge, skills and competencies; adaptation in inclusive class, collaboration and support in inclusive setting; and assessment in inclusive education respectively. The instrument is of four Likert-type scale with 40 items. The options; strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree were the scale used. The items on the questionnaire were closed ended type which implies that the respondents have options to select from (See Appendix A for details).

Pilot -Testing

The instrument was pilot-tested at Ghana National Basic School because it is a mixed type of school where pupils with and without special needs were in the same classroom. Also, it is one of the schools where inclusive education is practiced in the Cape Coast Metropolis. With regard to the designing of the

instrument, it was necessary to subject the instrument to tests so as to determine the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The pilot test was conducted to find out if the instructions in the instrument were understandable and adequate enough without ambiguities or any verbosity to enable respondents complete the instrument accurately.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2003) suggested that piloting does help to check for clarity of items, instructions and layout of the entire instrument. Getting feedback from the respondents was one of the major responses which could guide in constructing a good questionnaire. Additionally, piloting fosters the elimination of ambiguities or difficulties in wording. The pilot test was conducted to determine whether questionnaires would be understood by the sample to be surveyed. Piloting offers the researcher an idea of improving or modifying the instrument. After the pilot testing, the result was analysed and unclear statements and rewording of some the items were done. For instance, items 3 and 4 on the questionnaire were reframed to give clearer meaning because some of the respondents were asking for explanation on these items before giving their responses.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability refers to a measure being consistently reproducible and validity is whether the tool for data collection measures what it was set out to measure. According to Osuala (2005), content validity of an instrument demonstrates that the items of that instrument are representative and comprehensive enough to represent and measure a presumed objective and variable. In the case reliability,

Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) noted that it borders on the consistency of an instrument for each respondent, from one administration to another and from one set of items to another.

In order to ascertain reliability and validity of this particular questionnaire, it was first given to my supervisors for suggestion and correction. Face validity was then ensured before the final print for pilot testing was done. This was to determine the reliability and validity of the instrument before collecting the actual data from the field. The instrument was then pilot-tested which yielded Cronbach Alpha of 0.7 with respect to Sections B – E.

Data Collection Procedure

In collecting data for the study, I presented a letter of introduction from the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA) at the University of Cape Coast to seek permission from the head teachers of the basic schools to administer the instrument. The distribution and collection of the questionnaire was done by visiting the respondents in the schools they teach. I visited the schools which were involved in the study to administer the instrument to the various respondents concerned. The sorting of the respondents was done using purposive sampling that was described earlier.

The instrument was administered to all the sampled schools in one day and they were retrieved from the respondents two days later. In order to ensure that the instruments were well completed, enough time was given to the teachers so that they could have time to complete them well. The return rate for the instrument was 73.79% since 4 of the instruments could not be collected from the

teachers. Effort was made to retrieve them but it proved futile; hence, the 76 questionnaires were screened for data analysis.

Data Analysis

Data analysis has been explained by Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) as the process of simplifying data in order to make it comprehensible. To Pallant (2005), analysis may involve calculating the total score on a scale, adding up the scores obtained on each of the individual items or collapsing a continuous variable into a smaller number of discrete categories.

Completed instruments from respondents were serially numbered to make identification of the questionnaire easier when entering the data in the SPSS. The responses of the items were coded and entered into statistical software called ‘Statistical Package for Social Sciences’ (SPSS) to enhance easy and accurate analysis of the data collected. The data was analyzed taking into consideration the background information of the respondents and the four objectives guiding the study.

Frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation, one-sample t-test, ANOVA and Chi-square were the statistical tools used to analyse the data. The background information was analysed using frequency and percentage while mean, standard deviation and frequency distribution was used to analyse research question one. One-sample t-test, ANOVA and Chi-square were used to analysed hypotheses two, three and four respectively. The results are presented in Chapter Four for analysis and discussion.

Ethical Issues

Ethical issues are very important aspects in a research work and in this particular study, it was taken seriously. The respondents were assured of their anonymity though it was written on the questionnaire. No respondent was allowed to disclose his/her name or even the name of the school which they teach. The teachers would not like to be associated with any comment or remark on the issues of the special needs pupils in their care. Hence, the views of the respondents were handled with utmost care and confidentiality.

CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter presents results and discussion of the study. The background information of the respondents and their responses were presented in tables for analysis, while the results on the various research questions were also presented, discussed and conclusion drawn.

Demographic Information about the Respondents

The responses of the respondents on their demographics are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: *Demographic Data of Respondents*

| Characteristics | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 30 | 39.5 |
| Female | 46 | 60.5 |
| Educational level | | |
| Diploma | 38 | 50.0 |
| BED | 22 | 28.9 |
| MA/Med/MPhil | 15 | 19.7 |
| BECE | 1 | 1.3 |
| Number of years in teaching | | |
| 6-10yr | 21 | 27.6 |
| 11-15yrs | 33 | 43.4 |
| 16-20yrs | 22 | 28.9 |

Source: Field data, 2015

In Table 2, the responses showed that 30(39.5%) of the respondents were male and 46(60.5%) of the respondents were female, indicating that female teachers were the majority of the respondents. Teachers having diploma in education were the greatest number of 38(50%) and MA/Med/MPhil degree holders constitute 15(19.7%). Skill in teaching is one of the important elements of competency in the art of guiding and leading the children to learn at ease. Experience in any field does not come easily without working at it. Teaching experience does come if the teacher is practising the profession continually. Majority 33(43.4%) of the teachers have been teaching for 11 to 15years. Those with least teaching experience have been teaching for 6-10years representing 21(27.6%) of the total respondents.

Table 3 shows the various subjects that are taught by the respondents in the sampled schools.

Table 3: *Subject Areas of the Respondents*

| Subject taught | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| B.D.T | 2 | 2.6 |
| English Language | 10 | 13.2 |
| Fante | 3 | 3.9 |
| I.C.T | 3 | 3.9 |
| Mathematics | 20 | 26.3 |
| Primary Subjects | 6 | 7.9 |
| R.M.E | 6 | 7.9 |
| Science | 13 | 17.1 |
| Social | 2 | 2.6 |
| Social Studies | 10 | 13.2 |
| Technical Skills | 1 | 1.3 |

Source: Field data, 2015. B.D.T. – Basic Design and Technology; I.C.T. – Information and Communication Technology & R.M.E – Religious and Moral Education

According to the result in Table 3, teachers of Mathematics formed the highest respondents 20 (26.3%) followed by those teaching Social Studies and English language of 10 teachers representing 13.2 per cent each. Meanwhile, technical skills teachers had the least frequency 1(1.3%). In lieu of subject specialisation, teachers can have mastering of the subject matter in their chosen subjects. Teachers would therefore, be in a better position to help the pupils learn various subjects better.

Table 4 presents the result relating to inclusive education training for the respondents.

Table 4: *Response on Inclusive Education Training*

| Responses | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 69 | 90.8 |
| No | 7 | 9.2 |
| Total | 76 | 100 |

Source: Field data, 2015

Teachers who have training in inclusive education were higher, 69(90.8%) and those without training in inclusive education were the lesser, 7(9.2%). The result clearly points to the fact that the teachers in the selected basic schools have been prepared to practise inclusive education. Although few 7(9.2%) of the respondent teachers did not receive any form of inclusive education, it may not derail the preparedness of the former. The few teachers could be trained while on the job by those who have the training.

Perceived Teachers' Knowledge and Skills in Inclusive Education

In addressing the issue of perceived knowledge and skills teachers have so as to function effectively in inclusive education, the result has been tabulated in Table 5.

Table 5: *Relevance of the Teaching Curriculum in Inclusive Education*

| S/N | Item | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----|---|------|----------------|
| 1 | Relevance of the curriculum to enable teachers to know the procedure for screening and identification | 1.84 | 0.994 |
| 2 | Relevance of curriculum to exposes teachers on the knowledge of early identification. | 3.03 | 3.414 |
| 3 | The relevance of curriculum to teachers on the causes, behaviour and problems. | 2.42 | 1.123 |
| 4 | How teachers see the curriculum on informal method of information gathering. | 2.57 | 1.112 |
| 5 | Relevance of curriculum to teachers on instructional strategies for children in inclusive classrooms. | 2.09 | 1.048 |
| 6 | Teachers' perception on appropriate behavioural intervention in inclusive classroom. | 2.51 | 1.013 |
| 7 | Relevance of records to teachers in an inclusive classroom. | 2.38 | 1.070 |
| 8 | Perception of teachers on designing learning materials. | 2.49 | 1.149 |
| 9 | Relevance of diversity in learning among pupils in inclusive classroom. | 2.28 | 1.040 |
| 10 | Knowledge of teachers to teach children in inclusive classroom. | 2.46 | 1.089 |
| 11 | Perception of teachers in classroom management. | 2.50 | 1.000 |
| 12 | Ability of teachers to use resources and technology in inclusive set up. | 2.50 | 1.065 |
| | Total | 2.42 | 1.26 |

Source: Field data, 2015, N = 76

A cursory look at Table 5 indicated that the mean scores for the 12 items range from 2.09 to 3.03 with the exception of item 1. Item 1 (screening and identification of pupils with any impairment) had the lowest mean score of 1.84 and standard deviation of 0.99. The importance of teachers knowing about early identification of disabled child in any form also had the highest mean score of 3.03 and a standard deviation of 3.414. Meanwhile, another item which reads “The curriculum exposes teachers to informal method of gathering information” had a mean score of 2.57 with a standard deviation of 1.11. On how the curriculum could be used in strategizing to help disabled pupils in class, a mean score of 2.09 and standard deviation of 1.05 for item 5 was obtained.

Item 6 which is; “The curriculum enables teachers to use appropriate behavioural intervention skills in inclusive class” also had a mean score of 2.51 and standard deviation of 1.01. Items 7, 8 and 9 also have mean score of 2.38, 2.49 and 2.28 respectively. Also, two of the items (11 & 12); “The curriculum enables teachers to know how to use appropriate classroom management skills” and “The curriculum enables teachers to know how to use appropriate instructional resources and assistive technology for children with special needs” had mean scores of 2.50 and 2.50 and standard deviations of 1.00 and 1.07 respectively. The total computed mean and standard deviation score for the 12 items was 2.42 and 1.26 respectively.

Having analysed the result in Table 5, it can be concluded that the teachers have perceived knowledge and skills in handling children with disabilities. The finding has attested to literature on the acquisition of knowledge and skills of

teachers' involvement in inclusive education (Fallon, Zhang, Kim, 2011; Wagner, et al., 2006; Lamport, Graves & Ward, 2012; Da Silva, 2010; Gyimah, Sugden & Pearson, 2009). Knowledge and skills are very necessary to teachers to enable them practice not only as general education teacher but a specialised teacher. This is to help give children with special needs a tailored service to assist them in performing their daily chores. The teachers have alluded to the fact that they have training in inclusive education.

As part of the training requirement in colleges of teacher education, teacher trainees learnt various theories related to child psychology and special education as some of the courses could position the teachers to meet the needs of children in schools. Hitherto, special needs children have dedicated schools to handle any difficulty in learning and schooling which was certain to have resulted from disabilities. These children are then segregated from the 'normal' child. This was found to be affecting children with special needs. Hence, the new concept of inclusive education which allows children with disabilities to sit in the same classroom so as to reduce, if not eliminate totally, any form of stigma that society or their colleagues may have tagged them with. In view of this, all teacher trainees who are currently in any tertiary institutions are made to study a course in special education having children of disability in mind. Those out of college before the inclusion of special needs children in the mainstream are being re-oriented and given further training to have the requisite knowledge and skill which can meet the demand of children with disabilities.

Literature reviewed has attested to the fact that not all teachers could teach children with special needs. Though all teachers were trained to lead children to study, but some category of teachers cannot teach children with special needs. Teachers in special schools were given further training by other professionals as to how to handle children with disabilities. The current practice is all teachers in whatever level of education are to have some sort of knowledge and skill to meet the needs of special need children.

How teachers implement the curriculum to benefit pupils in inclusive school

In addressing the issue on implementation of curriculum, Table 6 shows the result from the field as to how the curriculum could be implemented to the benefit of pupils having special needs.

Table 6: *One-Sample t-test on how teachers implement teaching curriculum of pupils*

| Test Value = 50 | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----|------|------|-------|------|--------|----------|--------|
| | | | Std. | Std. | | | Sig. (2- | Mean |
| | N | Mean | Dev. | Error | Mean | t | tailed) | Diff. |
| Compute | 76 | 2.58 | .59 | .068 | - | 75 | .000 | -47.42 |
| mean | | | | | | 692.89 | | |

Source: Field data, 2015

The curriculum is a way of organizing and sequencing learning experiences with the aim of achieving specified learning outcomes. The curriculum should be learner-centred approaches, flexible and responsive to learners' needs and experiences. The response from the teachers on how they use pupils' curriculum to benefit them is presented in Table 6.

The mean score of 2.58 of standard deviation of 0.59 with $df = 75$ Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.00 and $p = 0.00$ was less than alpha value of 0.05. The result has indicated that it is significant hence the null hypothesis is rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis that teachers use inclusive curriculum to the benefit of special need pupils in Cape Coast Metropolis.

The result as presented and analysed showed that teachers in the sampled schools do implement the pupils' curriculum to their benefit by adopting it to suite their environment and pupils of disabilities. The finding can be located in the literature; it agreed with the earlier findings of Ojala (2004) and Danso (2009) that curriculum of pupils in schools is being implemented in adaptive manner to suite the learners' needs for them to make much gain in society.

The importance of a teacher is to assist learners to learn with less difficulty. The teachers having this in their mind try to explore all available means to implement the curriculum they teach to be relevant to the pupils. In exploring how best to implement the curriculum, perhaps the teachers introduce varied means and approaches to make the pupils see the benefits of learning or studying.

The theoretical study which teachers underwent might have culminated into the finding that the teachers do implement the curriculum to benefit the pupils. The theories underpinning inclusive education is so convincing that inclusive education should be embraced by all to help the disadvantaged in society. It is not only the theory on inclusive education but the reality of the need to care and educate children who need attention so that they could care for themselves. One of the cardinal goals of educating children who were physically

challenged is to help them to live independent life as much as possible. Independent life of a person cannot be under-estimated hence, some sort of independent atmosphere have to be provided for children who are physically, mentally, emotionally or having learning disabilities among others so that they could provide for themselves to some extent. These realities are there for teachers to see; hence, they are teaching the curriculum with all seriousness to achieve the needed results.

Another reason why teachers implement the curriculum to the benefit of pupils could be attributed to the fact that majority of these teachers have a lot of further training on the relevance of inclusive education. Workshops apart from the professionals and academic training are supposedly a contributing factor to this finding. Workshop on inclusive education creates such a platform where various professionals who have connection with inclusive education come and contribute, share experiences and knowledge on the subject matter. A lot of things go on which help to update and broaden the horizon of the participants. The new update of knowledge on the subject matter is carried to the field for the benefit of the children and the entire community.

The finding that the curriculum is being implemented to the benefit of the children by the sampled teachers is not a coincidence. This so because, there are a lot of literature available why segregation of special needs children from the mainstream is not the best. The teachers are perhaps living with the reality hence they ought to implement the curriculum in such a way to have bearing on the needs of special children in the community. The teachers knew if the curriculum

is well implemented, parents and guardians who lock up their disabled children in room for the fear of stigmatization and being a laughing stock could be reduced to barest minimum. Education holds the key to liberation and development of the individuals and the society. The skills teachers need to implement the pupils' curriculum in a way that it becomes practical to the present needs and challenges are very necessary. This and other reasons may have called for the implementation of the curriculum in a way to benefit the children.

Preparedness of teachers to use alternative Assessment in inclusive education

The result from the field on the preparedness of teachers to use alternative assessment is presented in Tables 7 and 8 for detail explanation and the necessary conclusion drawn.

Table 7: *Descriptive statistics of response on Preparedness to Use Alternative Assessment*

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|--------|----|--------|----------------|------------|
| Male | 30 | 2.4259 | .38939 | |
| Female | 46 | 2.5531 | .38382 | |
| Total | 76 | 2.5029 | .38851 | .04456 |

Source: Field data, 2015

In Table 7, the result has indicated that 76 respondents have taken part in the study with mean and standard deviations scores of 2.4259 (Std. Dev. = 0.38939) and 2.5531 (Std. Dev. = 0.38382) for male and female respectively.

Table 8: ANOVA of Preparedness to use Alternative Assessment

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between | | | | | |
| Groups | .294 | 1 | .294 | 1.972 | .164 |
| Within | | | | | |
| Groups | 11.026 | 74 | .149 | | |
| Total | 11.320 | 75 | | | |

Source: Field data, 2015

From Table 8, the sum of squares between groups is 0.294 and within groups is 11.026 which is having $F = 1.972$, $\text{Sig.} = 0.164$ and $p = 0.164$. With regards to the alpha value of 0.05, the Sig. value of 0.164 was more than the alpha value. I therefore failed to reject the null hypothesis on the basis that the p-value of 0.164 is greater than the alpha value of 0.05 hence, the result is not significant.

It can therefore, be concluded that majority of the teachers are prepared to use alternative assessment strategies to assess their pupils. This conclusion attest to literature reviewed (Rabinowitz, Sato, Case, Benitez, & Jordan, 2008; Hattie & Timperly, 2007; Quenemoen, Thompson, Thurlow & Lehr, 2001). These researchers have found the strategies teachers have perceived to put in place to give immediate feedback and being accountable to their learners.

It is obvious to teachers that they are now teaching a mix grouping pupils with varied learning needs and capabilities. Earlier on the teachers have been doing general teaching and perhaps the only form of assessing their learners. Now that inclusive education has been accepted and being rolled out calls for

alternative assessment as well. The result showing that teachers are now prepared to use other assessment means other than what they knew to be best is in the right direction.

The motive of assessment is not to fail a person but rather to evaluate if learning has actually taken place for the set aim for education to be achieved. Therefore 'dropping' the earlier form of assessment is not a punishment to any of the parties involved (learner & teacher). However, the implementation to benefit the learners in particular should be of focus.

The 'normal child' should not feel being left out and the focus rather shifted to the 'special need child'. The culture of change to new things is known to be always resisted to because of the unforeseen situations which could arise. The teacher willing to adopt alternative assessment strategy is good.

The willingness of teachers to use alternative assessment in inclusive education may have arisen from the fact that they have a lot of exposure to education on the field of inclusive education. The teachers have alluded that most of them had training in the implementation of inclusive education aside what they studied while in colleges or universities.

The concerns of other stakeholders in the implementation of inclusive education could have cleared other lingering negative thought of the whole programme on inclusive education. Further education on inclusive education would therefore intervene in breaking the barrier of stigma and misconception on children with special needs in society.

Assessing the Extent to which Teachers' are Prepared to Collaborate with Professionals in Inclusive Education

The responses on assessment of the preparedness of teachers to collaborate with other professionals in inclusive education from the sampled teachers were computed and analysed using chi-square which have been presented in Table 9.

The result presented in Table 9 had indicated that the Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) = .316; $p = .316$. At the critical region $\alpha = 0.05$, I therefore failed to reject the null hypothesis on the basis that the p-value of 0.316 is greater than 0.05. It can therefore be concluded that the result is not significant. This means that there is an association of teachers to collaboration with other professional workers to advance the course of inclusive education in the selected schools where the study was down.

Table 9: *Chi-Square Tests of Teachers' preparedness to collaborate with Professionals in inclusive education*

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 18.143 ^a | 16 | .316 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 20.675 | 16 | .191 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.204 | 1 | .273 |
| N of Valid Cases | 76 | | |

Source: Field data, 2015; a. 31 cells (91.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .39.

The finding can be located in the reviewed literature that teachers were prepared to collaborate with other professionals to enhance inclusive education

(Bouillet, 2013; Korkmaz, 2011; Friend, 2005). According to the finding in this study, teachers were ready to collaborate with other professional is premised on the fact that the task of teaching in inclusive environment demands a lot from the teacher or teachers in the class. Aside this, children with disabilities any form has what its challenges in class control. Class control in the 'normal' class demands a lot from the teacher let alone in inclusive class.

The teachers knew how important and relieving it is for them to collaborate with other professionals in the discharge of their duties. Other professionals would handle other issues relating to children with learning, task performance, health issues among others which are not in the domain of a teacher can only be addressed by other professionals such as physicians, therapist among others. Assessment to determine a child with special needs is better done by other professionals in those disciplines. Wrong assessment of a disability problem could be detrimental to the child and even their parents or guardians. The child would be labelled wrongly and this would not be in the best interest of the child. Having studied about inclusive education and special education, the teachers are fully aware of this and that may be some of the issues that informed them to be ready to collaborate with other professionals.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations the study arrived at. It also gives suggestions for further studies.

Overview of the Study

The main purpose of the study is to determine perception of teachers on inclusive education in some Selected Basic Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The aim of the study was to explore the perception of teachers of selected basic schools towards inclusive education in the Cape Coast Metropolis and four research questions were used. The study aims at bringing out the relevance of inclusive education and especially the perception of basic school teachers in Cape Coast Metropolis.

Descriptive research design was adopted to guide the entire study and 76 basic school teachers in selected schools from the Cape Coast Metropolis constituted the sample size for the study. The participants were arrived at using Krejcie and Morgan's table of sample determination. The instrument used for the data collection was a closed-ended questionnaire. Pilot test on the instrument was conducted and Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed on the data collected and a reliability coefficient of 0.70 was attained.

Summary of the Main Findings

The study has revealed the following:

1. Teachers were perceived to have the required knowledge and skills in handling pupils with disabilities in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

2. Teachers in the sampled schools do implement the teaching curriculum by adopting strategies to suit the learners and their environments of study.
3. About 78% of the teachers are prepared to use alternative assessment strategies to assess their pupils.
4. Teachers were perceived to collaborate with other professionals to enhance inclusive education in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

Conclusions

The perceived knowledge and skill of teachers with regard to inclusive education is good at the basic level in the Metropolis. Teachers do implement the curriculum to benefit all pupils irrespective of the category of the learners in the classroom. This was done by adopting a flexible approach to teaching and learning. The result revealed the perceived willingness of teachers to adapt their assessment to suit the varied grouping of children in the classroom.

This study has brought to the fore the hidden perception of teachers relating to inclusive education in the Cape Coast Metropolis and how it could be explored to improve upon the adoption of inclusive education in the entire country. Teachers are also willing to work with other professionals to make inclusive education a success. Generally, this will serve as a motivation for parents who have denied their disabled children the right to education because of either stigmatization or lack of financial resources to send them to special schools that may be located in communities far from them.

The stigmatization associated with disability will be reduced since all the children are in the same school and class. The parents will be financially capable

of taking their wards to schools located in their communities as it will be less expensive. Since teachers will be collaborating with experts, parents would be reassured that their 'special' children would be properly taken care of.

Recommendations

The perception of teachers on inclusive education of selected basic schools in the Metropolis was studied. I therefore, urge the government and other stakeholders to do the following;

1. The Metropolitan Assembly has to tap into the rich environment of teachers' knowledge and skills of educating special needs children by encouraging parents in their jurisdiction to enrol their wards to be trained for their day to day living skills.
2. Teaching aids should to be made available by Ghana education Service and other stakeholders to teach the curriculum to meet the needs of all the category of children in the classrooms.
3. Materials needed for effective alternative assessment in inclusive education should be provided by stakeholders like 'Friends of the Disabled' and 'Curriculum and Research Development Division' in collaboration with Ghana Education Service.
4. Experts in special education are encouraged to visit schools especially where more cases of disabilities are profound to educate teachers and parents on disability issues.

Suggestion for Further Research

The findings showed that further studies can be done to bring to knowledge what must be known about inclusive education. Since it is a topical issue in Ghana, I suggest further research in the following areas;

1. A Comparative study of inclusive education among public and private schools in the Central Region of Ghana.
2. Challenges affecting inclusive education in the northern and southern part of Ghana.

REFERENCES

- Agbenyega, J., & Deku, P. (2011). Building new identities in teacher preparation for inclusive education in Ghana. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1), 47 - 58.
- Agbenyega, J. S. (2006). Punishment in the schools of Ghana: Does inclusive education suffer? *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 107-122.
- Ainscow, M. (1991). *Effective schools for all*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Ainscow, M. (1997). Towards inclusive schooling. *British Journal of Special Education*, 24(1), 3-6.
- Ainscow, M. (2005). *From special education to effective schools for all*. Keynote presentation at the Inclusive and supportive education congress 2005, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.
- Ainscow, M., & Booth, T. (1998). *From them to Us: An international study of inclusion in education*. London: Routledge.
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2004). Understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools: A collaborative action research network. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 8(2), 125-140.
- Ainscow, M., Farrell, P., & Tweddle, D. (2000). Developing policies for inclusive education: A study of the role of local education authorities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(3), 211-229.
- Akalin, S., Sazak-Pinar, E., & Sucuoglu, B. (2010). The effects of classroom management of the behaviors of students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms in Turkey. *The Journal of Emotional International Association of Special Education*, 9 (1), 64-74.

- Alexander, J. (2001). *Concerns of middle and high school teachers towards inclusion of students with exceptional educational education needs*. Unpublished master's thesis, Graduate College-University of Wisconsin-Stout Menomonie, Wisconsin.
- Alghazo, E. M., Dodeen, H., & Algaryouti, I. A. (2003). Attitudes of pre-service teachers persons with disabilities: Predictions for success of inclusion. *College Student Journal*, 37(4), 515 - 521.
- Almond, P., & Bechard, S. (2005). Alignment of two performance-based alternate assessments with combined content standards from eight states through expanded benchmarks. *Behavioral Disorders*, 35(3), 188–199.
- Armstrong, D. (2006). Dreaming our future: Developing democratic professional practice? *Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 1-11.
- Arnesen, A., Allen, J., & Simonsen, E. (2009). *Policies and practices for teaching socio-cultural diversity. Concept, principles and challenges in teacher education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Arrah, R. O., & Swain, K. D. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of students with special education needs in Cameroon secondary schools international *Journal of Special Education*, 29(3), 1-10.
- Ary, D., & Jacobs, L. C. (1976). *Introduction to statistic: Purpose and procedures*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Avoke, M. (2005). *Special education needs in Ghana: Policy practice and research*. Winneba: Department of Special Education.

- Avoke, M. K., & Avoke, S. K. (2004). *Inclusion, rehabilitation and transition services in special education*. Winneba: Department of Special Education.
- Avramidis, E. (2005, August). *Developing inclusive schools: Changing teachers' attitudes and practice through critical professional development*. Paper presented at the International Special Education Conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
- 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.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & 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. *Educational Psychology, 20*(2), 191-121.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000a). Student teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(3), 277-293.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000b). A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority. *Educational Psychology, 20*(2), 191-211.

- Bailleul, P., Bataille, A., Langlois, C., Lanoe, P., & Mazereau, P. (2008). *From disabled pupils' integration to inclusive schooling: current situation and new teacher training needs. Shedding light on the European situation*. Retrieved 22 March, 2010 from <http://www.unicaen.fr/recherche/>.
- Baker, J. M., & Zigmond, N. (1990). Are regular education classes equipped to accommodate students with learning disabilities? *Exceptional Children*, 56, 515-526.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ballard, K. (1995). Inclusion paradigms, power, and participation. In Clark, C., Dyson, A. & K. Ballard. *The analysis of context: Some thoughts on teacher education, culture, colonization and inequality*. In Booth T., Nes K., and Stromstad M. (eds.) *Developing inclusive teacher education*, London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Ballhysa, N., & Flagler, M. (2011). A teachers' perspective of inclusive education for students with special needs. *Academicus - International Scientific Journal*, 1, 121-132.
- Baskwill, J., & Whitman, P. (1988). *Evaluation: Whole language, whole child*. New York: Scholastic.
- Bauwens, J., & Hourcade, J. J. (1995). *Cooperative teaching: Rebuilding the schoolhouse for all students*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed. ED 383 130.
- Berlach, R. G., & Chambers, D. J. (2011). Inclusivity imperatives and the Australian national curriculum. *The Educational Forum*, 75, 52-65.

- Bones, R., & Lambe, J. (2007). The effect of school-based practice on student teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 33(1), 99 – 113.
- Bouillet, D. (2013). Some aspects of collaboration in inclusive education: Teachers' experiences. *CEPS Journal*, 3(2), 93 -117.
- Bradley, D. F., King-Sears, M. E., & Tessier-Switllck, D. M. (1997). *Teaching students in an inclusive setting: From theory to practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Braslavsky, C. (1999). *Interregional discussions around inclusive curriculum and teachers in light of the 48th International Conference on Education*. Geneva, UNESCO-IBE.
- Brew, B. (2011). *Views of tutors of colleges of education on pre-service teacher preparation towards inclusive education in Ghana*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Winneba, Winneba.
- Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Browder, D. M., Flowers, C., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Karvonen, M., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, B. (2004). The alignment of alternate assessment content with academic and functional curricula. *Journal of Special Education*, 37, 211 – 223.

- Bunch, G. (2005). *10 Keys to successful inclusion*. NY: Marsha Forest Centre.
- Bunch, G., & Finnegan, K. (2005). *Finding a way through the maze: Crucial terms used in education provision for Canadians with disabilities*. Retrieved 18th March, 2015 from <http://www2.gnb.ca/content/dam/gnb/Departments>.
- Burns, S. N., & Grove, S. K. (2003). *Understanding nursing research* (3rd edition) Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Burstein, N. D., & Sears, S. (1998). Preparing on-the job teachers for urban schools: Implications for teaching. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 21(1) 47-62.
- Campher, E. J. (2003). *Educational change: A support programme for educators in an inclusive school setting*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Cardona, C. M. (2009). Teacher education students' beliefs of inclusion and perceived competence to teach students with disabilities in Spain. *Journal of the International Association of Special Education*, 10(1), 33-41.
- Carpenter, L., & Dyal, A. (2007). Secondary inclusion: Strategies for implementing the consultative teacher model. *Education*, 127(3), 344 - 350.
- Carrington, S., Deppeler, J., & Moss, J. (2010). Cultivating teachers' beliefs, knowledge and skills for leading change in schools. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(1), 1-13.

- Casely-Hayford, L., & Lynch, P. (2003b). *ICT based solutions for special educational needs in Ghana, Imfundo Report - Phase 21*. Retrieved 16 July 2007 from <http://imfundo>.
- Cavana, M., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. (2000). Reply to commentators on scientific culture and educational research: *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 28-29.
- Center for Educational Researches and Consulting (2013). *An assessment of implementation of inclusive education in the Republic of Armenia*. Open Society Foundations-Armenia. Retrieved 15 April 2015 from www.e-research.am.digitalbrain.com/imfundo/web/papers/refpapers.
- Chhabra, S., Strivasta, R., & Strivasta, I. (2010). Inclusive education in Botswana: The perceptions of school teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 20(4), 219 -228.
- Clark, C., Dyson, A., & Millward, A. (1995). *Towards inclusive schools?* London: David Fulton.
- Cobbold, C. (2006). Attracting and retaining rural teachers in Ghana: The premise and promise of a district sponsorship scheme. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(4), 453 - 469.
- Cohen, L, Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2003). *Research methods in education* (5th ed). NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cook, B. G. (2001). A comparison of teachers' attitudes toward their included students with mild and severe disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, 34(4), 203-23.

- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (2010). The state of the art of collaboration on behalf of students with disabilities. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 1-8.
- Cramer, E., & Nevin, A. (2006). A mixed methodology analysis of co-teacher assessments. *Teacher Education & Special Education*, 29, 261-274.
- Da Silva, C. (2010). *Teacher recruitment: Guiding the educational policies in Latin America*. Santiago de Chile: GTD-PREAL.
- Daane, C. J., Beirne-Smith, M., & Latham, D. (2000). Administrators' and teachers' grades. *Education*, 121(2), 331-339.
- Danso, J. B. (2009). *Evaluation of inclusive education practice in Ghana: Survey of inclusive pilot schools*. Unpublished thesis, University of Cape Coast.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davies, A., Cameron, C., Politano, C., & Gregory, K. (1992). *Together is better: Collaborative assessment, evaluation, and reporting*. Winnipeg, MB: Portage and Main Press.
- Davis, G. (2005). Searching the literature on teaching strategies and approaches for pupils with special education needs: Knowledge production and synthesis. *Journal of Research In Special Education Needs*, 4(3), 142-147.
- deBettencourt, L. U. (1999). General educators' attitudes toward students with mild disabilities and their use of instructional strategies. Implications for training. *Remedial and Special Education*, 20(1), 27-35.

- Deppeler, J., Moss, J., & Agbenyega, J. S. (2008). The ethical dilemma of working the visual and digital across space. In J. Moss (Ed.), *Researching education visually, digitally and spatially* (pp.13-34). Amsterdam: Sense Publications.
- DeSimone, J. R., & Parmar, R. S. (2006b). Middle school mathematics teachers' beliefs about inclusion of students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 21*(2), 98–110.
- Dettmer, P., Thurston, L. P., & Dyck, N. (1993). *Consultation, collaboration and teamwork for students with special needs*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dietel, R. J., Herman, J. L., & Knuth, R. A. (1991). *What does research say about assessment?* Retrieved 20th April, 2015 from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/stw_esys/4assess.htm.docs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/7e/8e.pdf.
- Dyson, A., & Gallannaugh, F. (2007). National policy and the development of inclusive school practices: A case study. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 37*(4), 473-488.
- Eileen, C. W. (1999). *Preparing new teachers for inclusive schools and classrooms*. Retrieved July 20, 2009 from <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com>.
- Ekins, A., & Grimes, P. (2009). *Inclusion: Developing an effective whole school approach*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Elliot, J. (1996). *School effectiveness and its critics: Alternative visions of schooling*. Cambridge: University Press.

- Engelbrecht, P., & Green, L. (Eds.) (2001). *Promoting learner development*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Engelbrecht, P., Green, L., Naicker, S., & Engelbrecht, P. (1999). *Inclusive education in action in South Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Fallon, M. A., Zhang, J., & Kim, E. J. (2011). Using course assessments to train teachers in functional behaviour assessment and behavioural intervention plan techniques. *The Journal of International Association of Special Education*, 12(1), 50-58.
- Farrel, P. (2004). The imprint of research on development in inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(2), 153- 163.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Flavell, L. (2001). *Preparing to include special children in mainstream schools: A practical guide*. London: David Futon.
- Florian, L. (2005). Inclusion, special needs and the search for new understandings. *Support for Learning*, 20(2), 96-98.
- Forest, M., & Pearpoint, E. (1992). Putting all kids on the map. *Educational Leadership*, 50(2), 26-31.
- Forlin, C. (2001). Inclusion: Identifying potential stressors for regular class teachers. *Educational Research*, 43(3), 235-245.
- Forlin, C., Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Earle, C. (2009). Demographic differences in changing pre-service teachers' attitudes, sentiments and concerns about inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13(2), 195-209.

- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Boulder: West view Press.
- Friend, M. (2005). *Power of 2 (Video)*. Forum on education: Indiana University.
- Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (1996). *Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 9-27.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gaad, E., & Khan, L. (2007). Primary mainstream teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of students with special educational needs in the private sector: A perspective from Dubai. *International Journal of Special Education*, 22 (2), 95-108.
- Gadagbui, G. Y. (2008). *Inclusive education in Ghana: Practices, challenges and the future implications for all stakeholders*. Faculty of Educational Studies: University of Education, Winneba.

- Gall, D. Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Gardner, M., & Kelly, U. A. (2008). Introduction: Narrating transformative learning in education. In M. Gardner & U. A. Kelly (Ed.), *Narrating transformative learning in education* (pp. 105-201). New York: Macmillan.
- Gary, P. L. (1997). The effect of inclusion on non-disabled children: A review of the research. *Contemporary Education, Summer, 68*(4), 78 -91.
- Ghana Education Service (2010). *Special education division document*. Accra: Ministry of Education.
- Ghana Education Service. (2005). *Conference of heads of second cycle schools*. Adjumako: Author.
- Giangreco, M., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). I've counted Jon: Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. In J. McLeskey (Ed), *reflection on inclusion: classic articles that shaped our thinking* (pp. 323-336). Arlington, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Goodson, I. (1992). *Studying teachers' lives*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gyimah, E. K., Sugden, D., & Pearson, S. (2009). Inclusion of children with special educational needs in mainstream schools in Ghana: Influence of teachers' and children's characteristics. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 1-18.

- Hall, R., Campher, E., Smit, A. G., Oswald, M., & Engelbrecht, P., (1999). *Formal support in inclusion*. Pretoria: J. L. Van Schaik.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the post modern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hattie, J., & Timperly, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), p. 81-112.
- Hay, J. F. (2003). Implementation of the inclusive education paradigm shift in South African education support services. *South African Journal of Education*, 23(2), 135-138.
- Hayford, S. K. (2007). *Continuous assessment and lower attaining pupils in primary and junior secondary schools in Ghana*. PhD Thesis: University of Birmingham. Retrieved 21st June, 2014 from <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/128/1/Hayford08PhD.pdf>.
- Helms, J. (1998). Science and me: Subject matter and identity in secondary school science teachers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 35, 811–834.
- Hickling-Hudson, A. (2002). Re-visioning from the inside: Getting under the skin of the WorldBank's education sector strategy. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 5, 20 - 36.
- Hill, B. C., & Ruptic, C. (1994). *Practical aspects of authentic assessment: Putting the pieces together*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

- Hooker, M. (2008). *GeSCI and the inclusive education agenda in Ghana: A question of 'diversification' or 'leverage'?* Retrieved 12th June, 2014 from <http://www.gesci.org/old/files/docman/IEiGhana.Diversification>.
- Horne, P. E., & Timmons, V. (2009). Making it work: Teachers' perspectives on inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13, 273-286.
- Howard, L., & Potts, E. (2009). Using co-planning time: Strategies for a successful co-teaching marriage. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, 5, 2-12.
- Hunt, B. (2008). *Teacher effectiveness: A review of the international literature and its relevance for improving education in Latin America*. Series Document No. 43. Santiago de Chile: PREAL.
- Idol, L. (1997). Key questions related to building collaborative and inclusive schools. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30(4); 384-394.
- Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education. *A Program Evaluation of Eight Schools*, 27(2), 77- 94.
- Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education. *Remedial & Special Education*, 27(2), 77-94.
- Idol, L., & West, J. F. (1987). Consultation in special education, Part 11. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 20(8), 474 - 494.
- Isherwood, R. S., & Barger-Anderson, R. (2007). Factors affecting the adoption of co-teaching models in inclusive classrooms: One school's journey from mainstreaming to inclusion. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, 2, 121-128.

- Jobling, A., & Moni, K. B. (2004). I never imagined I'd have to teach these children: Providing authentic learning experiences for secondary pre-service teachers in teaching students with special needs. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(1), 5-22.
- Johnson, G., & Howell, A. (2009). Change in pre-service teacher attitudes towards contemporary issues in education. *International Journal of Special Education*, 24(2), 35-41.
- Kapinga, O. (2014). *Teacher trainees' knowledge and preparedness for inclusive education in Tanzania: The case of Mkwawa University College of Education*. A paper presented in 2014 conference, Tanzania.
- Kapp, J. A. (1994). *Children with problems: An orthopedagogical perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Kleinert, H. L., & Kearns, J. F. (1999). A validation study of the performance indicators and learner outcomes of Kentucky's alternate assessment for students with significant disabilities. *The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 24, 100-110.
- Kohler, P. K., Manhart, L. E., & Lafferty, W. E. (2008). Abstinence-only and comprehensive sex education and the initiation of sexual activity and teen pregnancy. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 42(4), 344-351.
- Korkmaz, I. (2011). Elementary teachers' perceptions about implementation of inclusive education. *US-China Education Reviews*, 177-183.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.

- Krüger, D., & Yorke, C. (2010). Collaborative co-teaching of numeracy and literacy as a key to inclusion in an independent school *South African, Journal of Education, 30*, 293 – 306.
- Kuyini A. B., & Desai, I. (2008). Providing instruction to students with special needs in inclusive classrooms in Ghana: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Whole schooling, 4*(1), 22-38.
- Kuyini, A. B. (2004). *Principals' and teachers' attitudes and knowledge of inclusive education as predictors of effective teaching practices in Ghana*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne, Australia.
- Kuyini, A. B., & Desai, I. (2007). Principal's and teachers' attitude and knowledge of inclusive education as predictors of effective teaching practices in Ghana. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 7*(2), 104–113.
- Kuyini, A. B., & Desai, I. (2009). Providing instruction to students with special needs in inclusive classrooms in Ghana: Issues and challenges *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 4*(1), 22-39.
- Kuyini, A. B., & Desai, I. (2006). Principals' and teachers' attitudes toward and knowledge of inclusive education in Ghana, IFE. *Psychologia, 14*(2), 225-244.
- Ladwig, J. (2000). World institutions, world dispositions: Curriculum in the world cultural institution of schooling. In R. Mahalingam & C. McCarthy, *Multicultural curriculum: New directions for social theory, practice and policy* (pp. 87 -90). New York: Routledge.

- Lambe, J., & Bones, R. (2006a). Student teachers attitudes to inclusion; Implications for Initial teacher education in Northern Ireland. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(6), 511-527.
- Lamport, A. M., Graves, L; & Ward, A. (2012). Special needs students in inclusive classrooms: The impact of social interaction on educational outcomes for learners with emotional and behavioural disabilities. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(5), 54-69.
- Leatherman, J. M., & Niemeyer, J. A. (2005). Teachers' attitudes toward inclusion: Factors influencing classroom practice. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 9(26), 23-36.
- Lefrancois, G. R. (1997). *Psychology for teaching* (9th ed.). NY: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Levin, H. (1997). Doing what comes naturally: Full inclusion in accelerated schools. In D. K. Lipsky & A. Gartner (Eds.). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms* (pp. 389-400). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Lindsay, J. (2003). Inclusive education: A critical perspective. *British Journal of Special Education*, 30(1), 3-12.
- Llpsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1996). Inclusion school restructuring and the remaking of American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(4), 762-794.
- Llpsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

- Lohrmann, S., & Bambara, L. (2006). Elementary education teachers' beliefs about essential supports needed to successfully include students with developmental disabilities who engage in challenging behaviours. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 31*(2), 157-173.
- Loreman, T. (2002). *Teacher education and inclusion*. Paper presented at the XIII World Congress of Inclusion International. Melbourne, Australia.
- Loreman, T. (2007). How we view young children with diverse abilities: What Canada can learn from Reggio Emilia. *Exceptionality Education Canada, 17*(1), 5-26.
- Loreman, T., Forlin, C., & Sharma, U. (2007). An international comparison of pre-service teacher attitudes towards inclusive education. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 27*(4), 20-31.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Manasevit, L. M., & Maginnis, A. M. (2005). *IDEA: New expectations for schools and students*. Washington, DC: Thompson Publishing Group.
- Mangope, B. (2002). *The attitudes of rural primary and secondary school teachers toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in their classrooms in Botswana*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Marzano, R. J. (1994). *Assessing student outcomes: Performance assessment using the dimensions of learning model*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Mastropieri, M., Scruggs, T., Graetz, J., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., & McDuffie, K. (2005). Case studies in co-teaching in the content areas: Successes, failures, and challenges. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 40*, 260-270.
- McCabe, G. P., & Moore, D. S. (1989). *Introduction to the practical of statistics*. New York: Freeman and Company.
- McCarty, A. E. (n. d.). *Co-teaching in the inclusion classroom: Teacher perspectives and practices*. Retrieved 18th July, 2015 from <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?newwindow>.
- Mcintosh, R., Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., Haager, D., & Lee, O. (1993). Observations of students with learning disabilities in general education classrooms. *Exceptional Children, 60*(3), 249-261.
- McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. (2002). School change and inclusive schools: Lessons learned from practice. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(1), 65-72.
- Mcmillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Meijer, C. (1999). *Financing of special needs education*. Middelfart, Denmark: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- Meijer, C. J. W. (Ed.) (2003). *Inclusive education and classroom practices. Summary report*. Middelfart: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- Millward, T. (2005). *Towards inclusive schools*. London: David Fulton.

- Mitchell, D. (2005). *Education that fits: Review of international trends in the education of students with special educational needs*. Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education.
- Mitiku, W., Alemu, Y., Mengsitu, S. (2014). Challenges and opportunities to implement inclusive education. *Asian Journal of Humanity, Art and Literature, 1*(2), 118 – 136.
- Molina, S. (2006). Teacher education students' and first year in-service teachers' perception about their initial education in relation to the special educational needs of Spanish Pupils. In Gash, H. (ed.) *Beginning teachers and diversity in school: A European study*. Institute Politécnico de Braganca Report of Research undertaken within Comenius, Project 94158-Cp-1-2001-Fr. Routledge.
- Moore, C., & Gilbreath, D. (1998). *Educating students with disabilities in general*. Retrieved from mrsh/files/Rapport.SEH_.pdf.
- Mukhopadhyay, S., Molosiwa, S. M., & Moswela, E. (2009). Teacher trainees' level of preparedness for inclusive education in Botswana Schools: Need for change. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education, 2*(2), 51-58.
- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. *Journal of Teacher Education, 45*, 86–95.
- Murrell, P. (2001). *The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Nell, M. (1996). The education of learners with special educational needs: Current debates and challenges to colleges of education training pre-primary and junior primary teachers. *The Pre-school Years, 15*, 25-40.
- Nguyet, D. T., & Ha, L. T. (2010). *How to guide series: Preparing teachers for inclusive education*. CRS Vietnam: Catholic Relief Services.
- Nind, M., & Wearmouth, J. (2006). Including children with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms: Implications for pedagogy from a systematic review. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 6*, 116-124.
- Obi-Banku, F. (2004). *An effective parenting of children with special needs. A guidebook for parents, special educators, counselors and related professional*. Ibadon: Hope Publications
- Ocloo, C., & Dogbe, T. (2005). Towards inclusive education in Ghana. Winneba: AFR 048.
- Ocloo, M. A., & Subbey, M. (2008). Perception of basic education school teachers towards inclusive education in the Hohoe District of Ghana. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 12*, 639-650.
- OECD (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS*. Retrieved 22nd March 2010 from <http://www.oecd>.
- Ojala, P. (2004). Aims of education and curriculum planning in special education units and schools in Lusaka, Zambia: A qualitative study of special education teachers' views and classroom practice. Unpublished thesis. University of Zambia.

- Oliver, R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2010). Special education teacher preparation in classroom management: Implications for students with emotional and behavioural disorders. *Behavioural Disorders*, 35, 188 – 199.
- Opertti, R., Brady, J., & Duncombe, L. (2009). Moving forward: Inclusive education as the core of education for all. *Prospects*, 39(3), 205–214.
- Opoku-Agyemang, J. N. (2013). *Draft inclusive education policy: Republic of Ghana*. Retrieved from org/dataoecd/17/51/43023606.pdf.
- Osuala, E. C. (2005). *Introduction to research methodology*. Onitsha: Africana-First Publishers Ltd.
- Ouane, A. (2008). *Creating education systems which offer opportunities for lifelong learning*. Paper presented at UNESCO International Conference on Education, inclusive education: The way of the future, 48th session, Geneva.
- Oxford Advance English Learner's Dictionary (2015). *English language dictionary*. London: Oxford Press.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS version 12* (2nd ed.). New York: Penn Plaza.
- Peters, S. (2004). *Inclusive education: An EFA Strategy for all children*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Peterson, M. (2004). Toward whole schooling: Building a movement for dialogue and action in the 21st century. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 1(1), 1-7.

- Phillips, V., & Mccullough, L. (1990). Consultation-based programming: Instituting the collaborative ethic in schools. *Exceptional children*, 56, 219-304.
- Plessis, J., Prouty, D., Schubert, J., Habib, M., & George, E. (2003). *Continuous assessment: A practical guide for teachers*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Proweller, A., & Mitchener, C. P. (2004). Building teacher identity with urban youth: voices of beginning middle school science teachers in an alternative certification program. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(10), 1044 – 1062.
- Pugach, M. C., & Winn, J. A. (2011). Research on co-teaching and teaming. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 24(1), 36 – 46.
- Quenemoen, R. F., Thompson, S. J., Thurlow, M. L., & Lehr, C. A. (2001). *A self-study guide to implementation of inclusive assessment and accountability systems: A best practice approach*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Rabinowitz, S., Sato, E., Case, B. J., Benitez, D., & Jordan K. (2008). Alternate assessments for special education students in the Southwest Region states. *Issues & Answers Report*, REL 44.
- Rambla, X, Ferrer, F., Tarabini, A., & Verger, A. (2008). Inclusive education and social inequality: An update of the question and some geographical considerations. *Prospects*, 145(1), 65–76.

- Report of Global Campaign for Education (2015). *Inclusive education for children with disabilities*. Retrieved 20th May, 2015 from www.campaignforeducation.org.
- Reynolds, M. (2001). Education for inclusion, teacher education and the teacher training agency standards. *Journal of In-Service training*, 27(3), 78 -85
- Richmond, T. (1993). Making learning flexible. *British Journal of Special Education*, 20(1), 20-23.
- Rossi, P. H., & Freeman, H. E. (1985). *Evaluation: A system approach*. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications.
- Rouse, M. (2010). Reforming initial teacher education. A necessary but not sufficient condition for developing inclusive practice. In Forlin, C. (Ed.) (2010), *Teacher education for inclusion*. Changing Paradigms and Innovative Approaches. London: Routledge.
- Rouse, M., & Florian, L. (1996). Effective inclusive schools: A study in two countries. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26(1), 71-85.
- Salend, S. J., & Duhaney, L. M. (1999). The impact of inclusion on students with and without disabilities and their educators. *Remedial and Special Education*, 20(2), 114-126.
- Sanders, W. L. & Horn, S. (1998). Research findings from the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) database: Implications for educational evaluation and research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3), 247-256.

- Savolainen, H. (2009). Responding to diversity and striving for excellence: The case for Finland. *Prospects Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, 39(3), 119 -124.
- Schumm, J. S. & Vaughn, S. (1999). Getting ready for inclusion. Is the stage set? *Learning Disabilities Research and Practices*, 10(3), 169- 179.
- Schumm, J., & Vaughn, S. (1995). Meaningful professional development in accommodating students with disabilities: Lesson learned. *Remedial and Special Education*, 16(6), 344-353.
- Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1996). Teacher perception of mainstreaming-inclusion, 1958-1995: A research synthesis. *Exceptional Children*, 63, 59-74.
- Scruggs, T., Mastropieri, M., & McDuffie, K. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasyn thesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73, 392-416.
- Shaddock, A., MacDonald, N., Hook, J. Giorcelli, L., & Arthur-Kelly, M. (2009). *Disability, diversity and tides that lift all boats: Review of special education in the ACT*. Chiswick, NSW: Services Initiatives.
- Shade, R. A., & Stewart, R. (2001). *General education and special education pre-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusion*. *Preventing School Failure*, 46(1), 37-41.
- Sharma, U. E. J., & Desai, I. (2003). A comparison of Australian and Singaporean pre-service teachers' attitude and concerns about inclusive education. *Teaching and Learning*, 24(2), 207-217.

- Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2007). What concerns pre-service teachers about inclusive education: An international viewpoint? *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy KJEP*, 4(2), 95-114.
- Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2008). Impact of training on pre-service teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education and sentiments about persons with disability. *Disability and Society*, 23(7), 773–785.
- Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2011). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices: An international validation. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 12(1), 12-21.
- Sheridan, S. M., Welch, M. & Orme, S. F. (1996). Is consultation effective? A review of outcome research. *Remedial and Special Education*, 17, 341-354.
- Shippen, M. E., Crites, S. A., Houchins, D. E., Ramsey, M. L., & Simon, M. (2005). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of including students with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 28(2), 24-39.
- Short, D. (1993). Assessing integrated language and content instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 627 – 656.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2008). *Descriptive research design*. Retrieved Dec 14, 2016 from Explorable.com: <https://explorable.com/descriptive-research-design>.
- Skidmore, D. (2004). *Inclusion: The dynamic of school development*. Cornwall: Open University Press.
- Smith, C. R. (1991). *Learning disabilities*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

- Special Attention Project (2011). *Children with learning difficulties in public basic schools in Ghana: A study involving local stakeholders in Greater Accra Region*. Retrieved 14th April, 2015 from www.sapghana.com.
- Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (Eds) (1996). *An excellent source book explaining these programs and other best practices is inclusion: A guide for Educators*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Stewart, T. A. (2001). *The Wealth of Knowledge: Intellectual Capital and the Twenty-first Century Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated instruction: A research basis. *International Education Journal*, 7(7), 935–947.
- Subban, P., & Sharma, U. (2006). Teachers' perception of inclusive education in Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25(3), 211 – 218.
- Sweetland, J. (2008). Making dissatisfaction divine: An inspired approach to whole school reform. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 4(1), 1-9.
- Tait, K., & Purdie, N. (2000). Attitudes toward disability teacher education for inclusive environments in an Australian University. *International Journal of Disability Development and Education*, 47(1), 25-28.
- The Salamanca (1994). *Statement on principles, policy and practice in special needs education*. Retrieved 13th May 2015 from www.unesco.org/education/educprog/sne/salamanc/stateme.html.

- The Universal Education Grant of the Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
(2011). *A teacher's guide to universal/inclusive education*. Florida:
Florida Developmental Disabilities Council.
- Thompson, S. J., Johnstone, C. J., Thurlow, M. L., & Alt-man, J. R. (2005). *State special education outcomes: Steps forward in a decade of change*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved November 16, 2007, from <http://cehd.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/2005StateReport.htm>.
- Thurlow, M. (2004). *how state policies and practices for alternate assessment impact who is included in NAEP for state assessments*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Centre on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved August 24, 2007, from www.nagb.org/pubs/conferences/thur.
- Thurlow, M., & Case, B. J. (2004). *Alternate assessments: State of the states*. Presentation at the Council of Chief State School Officers Large Scale Conference in Boston, MA.
- Tierney, R. J., Carter, M. A., & Desai, L.E. (1991). *Portfolio assessment in the reading-writing classroom*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Turner, J. L. (1992). Creating content-based language tests: Guideline for teachers. *CASTESOL Journal*, 5(1), 43-58.
- Twendle, M., & Malki, T. (1999). *Re-thinking teacher education: Collaborative response to uncertainty*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

- U.S. Department of Education (2005). *Twenty fifth annual report to congress on the implementation of the individual with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary & Secondary Education. (2004). *Standards and assessments peer review guidance: Information and examples for meeting requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Washington, DC: Author.
- UNESCO (1993). *Teacher education resource pack: Student materials*. Retrieved 17 July 2007 from: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/eric>.
- UNESCO (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Paris: UNECSO.
- UNESCO (2005). *Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring access to education for all*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2008). *Every learner counts: 10 questions on inclusive quality education*. Retrieved 6th May, 2014 from www.unesco.org/education.
- UNESCO (2009). *Reaching the marginalized: How to approach inclusive education*. UNESCO International Conference, Düsseldorf, Germany, 10-11 September 2009.
- UNESCO (2012). *Education: Addressing exclusion*. Retrieved 20th April 2015 from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/strengthening>.
- UNESCO IBE (2011). Preparing teachers for inclusive education in Latin America. Prospects. *Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, 20(30), 12 – 30.

- United Nations (1993). *The United Nations standard rules on the equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations General Assembly (1948). *The universal declaration of human rights*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2010). *Ninth meeting of the high-level group on education for all: Addis Ababa declaration*. Retrieved 17th June 2014 from unesdoc.unesco.org.
- United Republic of Tanzania (2006). *Education sector development programme: Primary education development programme II (2007-2011)*. Dares Salaam: Author.
- United State Department of Education (2003b). *No Child Left Behind provision gives schools increased flexibility while ensuring that all children count, including those with disabilities* (press release). Retrieved April 1, 2007, from <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/2003/12/12092003.htm>.
- Vaidya, S. R. (1997). *Meeting the challenges of an inclusive classroom of improving learning for all students*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from www.findarticles.com/p/article/mi-/html.
- Van Schalkwyk, O. J. (1994). *Educational management: Tutorial letter 10214*. Pretoria: UNISA.
- Vlachou, D. A. (1997). *Struggles for inclusive education*. Buckingham: University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).

- Wade, S. E. (2000). *Inclusive education: A casebook and reading for prospective and practicing educators*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wagoner, M., Friend, M., Bursuck, W., Kutash, K., Duchnowski, A. J., Sumi, W. C., & Epstein, M. (2006). Educating students with emotional disturbances: A national perspective on school programs and services. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 14*, 12-30.
- Walter-Thomas, C., Korinek, L., McLaughlin, V. L., & Williams, B. T. (2000). *Collaboration for inclusive education: Developing successful programs*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Warnock Report (1978). *Special educational needs report of the committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1978 from <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/warnock/>.
- Watkins, A. (Ed.) (2007). *Assessment in inclusive: Settings key issues for policy and practice*. Odense: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- Watkins, A., & D'Alessio, S. (2009). International comparisons of inclusive policy and practice: Are we talking about the same thing? *Research in Comparative and International Education, 4*(3), 40-53.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitworth, J. (2001). *A model for inclusive teacher preparation*. Abilene, Texas: Department of Education, Abilene Christian Education.

- Wilkinson, D., & Birmingham, P. (2003). *Using research instruments: A guide for researchers*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Winter, E., Fletcher-Campbell, Connolly, P., & Lynch, P., (2006). *Resource requirements for the diagnosis and assessment of special educational needs in Ireland: Research report* (Unpublished) Trim Co. Meath: National Council for Special Education.
- Yarboi, T. D., (2008, July 08). Review entry requirement of teacher training colleges. *The Ghanaian Times* (No. 38567), p. 4.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

The purpose of this study was to find out the views of teachers about inclusive education in the basic schools in Cape Coast Metropolis. The study is for academic purpose. Your candid response to this questionnaire would help find answer(s) to the problem under investigation. Your confidentiality and anonymity would be protected.

Section A: Background information

Instruction: Please tick [] for the response which corresponds with your background information

1. Gender:
Male
Female
2. Educational level:
Diploma in Education
B. Ed
MA/Med/Mphil
Others specify
3. What subject do you teach?.....
4. Do you have any training in inclusive education?
Yes
No
5. Number of years you are teaching in the basic school
 6-10 years
 11-15 years
 16-20 years
Others specify.....

Section B

Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies Adaptations in Inclusive Class

For each of the statement, indicate with a tick (✓) the one that best reflects your views.

The figures stand for the following: **1= strongly, 2= disagree, 3=agree, and 4 =strongly agree.**

| No. | Statement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Relevance of the curriculum to enable teachers to know the procedure for screening and identification | | | | |
| 7 | Relevance of curriculum to exposes teachers on the knowledge of early identification. | | | | |
| 8 | The relevance of curriculum to teachers on the causes, behaviour and problems. | | | | |
| 9 | How teachers see the curriculum on informal method of information gathering. | | | | |
| 10 | Relevance of curriculum to teachers on instructional strategies for children in inclusive classrooms. | | | | |
| 11 | Teachers' perception on appropriate behavioural intervention in inclusive classroom. | | | | |
| 12 | Relevance of records to teachers in an inclusive classroom. | | | | |
| 13 | Perception of teachers on designing learning | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | materials. | | | | |
| 14 | Relevance of diversity in learning among pupils in inclusive classroom. | | | | |
| 15 | Knowledge of teachers to teach children in inclusive classroom. | | | | |
| 16 | Perception of teachers in classroom management. | | | | |
| 17 | Ability of teachers to use resources and technology in inclusive set up. | | | | |

Section C
Adaptations in Inclusive Class

For each of the statements, indicate with a tick (√) the one that best reflects your views.

The figures stand for the following: = **strongly**, 2= **disagree**, 3=**agree**, and 4 =**strongly agree**.

| No. | Statement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | The curriculum enables teachers to know how to modify teaching and learning materials to suit the needs of children in inclusive class. | | | | |
| 19 | The curriculum helps teachers to know how to modify instructional strategies. | | | | |
| 20 | The curriculum helps teacher to give the required tasks to children. | | | | |
| 21 | The curriculum enables teachers to adopt assessment practices/procedures to meet learning diversities in class. | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 22 | The curriculum enables teachers to adopt the learning environment to suite the various special needs in class. | | | | |
| 23 | The curriculum guides teachers to remove barriers to learning in classroom. | | | | |

Section D
Collaboration and support in Inclusive Setting

For each of the statements, indicate with a tick (√) the one that best reflects your views.

The figures stand for the following: = **strongly**, 2= **disagree**, 3=**agree**, and 4 =**strongly agree**.

| No. | Statement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | The curriculum enables teachers to form school-based support team. | | | | |
| 25 | The curriculum enables teachers to do clinical consultation for identifying and assessing learning problem and describing intervention. | | | | |
| 26 | The curriculum teaches how to partner with parents in educating special need children. | | | | |
| 27 | The curriculum enables teachers to offer parent opportunity to be part of the decision making process in the school | | | | |
| 28 | The curriculum help teachers to do collaborative teaching | | | | |
| 29 | The curriculum enables teachers to do collaborative evaluation. | | | | |
| 30 | The curriculum guides teachers to write collaborative lesson plan. | | | | |

SECTION D

For each of the statements, indicate with a tick (✓) the one that best reflects your views.

The figures stand for the following: 1= **strongly disagree**, 2= **disagree**, 3=**agree**, and 4 =**strongly agree**.

The figures stand for the following: 1= **strongly disagree**, 2= **disagree**, 3=**agree**, and 4 =**strongly agree**. For each of the statements, indicate with a tick (✓) the one that best reflects your views.

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|
| 31. | Knowledge of teachers to select criteria for evaluation. | | | | |
| 32. | Preparedness of teachers to involve parents in the assessment process to underscore the pupils. | | | | |
| 33. | Preparedness of teachers to conduct conference with pupils. | | | | |
| 34. | Teachers to encourage pupils to do self-evaluation. | | | | |
| 35. | The skill of teachers to observe pupils' performance. | | | | |
| 36. | Teachers to provide an appropriate setting for pupils' performance. | | | | |
| 37. | Teachers to provide judgment on pupils performance. | | | | |
| 38. | Preparedness of teachers to design assessment task. | | | | |
| 39. | Teachers' perception on pupils self evaluation. | | | | |
| 40. | Preparedness of teachers to create welcoming environment with their pupils. | | | | |

