



Teachers' Ways of Greeting All Students in Special Schools in Pakistan

Muhammad Uzair-Ul-Hassan and Muqadas Arshad

Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha-Pakistan

Received: September 1, 2014

Accepted: November 13, 2014

ABSTRACT

The study investigates how special education teachers greet students with and without special education needs in schools in Pakistan. The study gets roots from theory and practices of inclusion across globe where emphasis is to explore the possibilities of inclusion in both regular and special schools to socialize all students i.e., students with and without special education needs. Population of the study consists of male and female teachers from special schools of Punjab, Pakistan. Teachers (n=80) were selected on convenient basis from urban special schools. Questionnaire was used as a tool for data collection. The results indicate that teachers greet and welcome all students with and without special education needs in their schools although sometimes they get confused. The study supports global inclusive practices although variations exist. Teachers' reflections show that they favour shift from segregation to inclusion in special schools also. Based on the study, it is suggested that opening up and widening the gates of existing special schools for both students with and without special education needs would be fruitful rather limiting special schools only to students with special needs.

KEYWORDS: Ways of greeting, All students, Special schools

INTRODUCTION

The idea of greeting all students in special schools is conceived from philosophy of inclusive education. Instead of setting separate institutions, opening up special institutions for all students is becoming a need of the day to socialize all students including students with special education needs. Inclusive education is a move that gives stress on how to change learning systems in order to accommodate variety of learners. Convention against Discrimination in Education emphasizes that government has to expand educational opportunities and facilities for all learners. Similar to other developing countries, Pakistan has also been practicing inclusion on the basis of various international and national declarations e.g.; the United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child UNCRC (1989), the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action, UNESCO (1994), and the Dakar Framework for Education for All (2000). There are many NGOs running formal and informal education program related to inclusion in Pakistan. However, the number and facility of such special schools are not enough, as there is vast number of children who are excluded and are outside from schools. The Government of Pakistan is trying to establish inclusive education practices at primary level through educational projects from the Ministry of Education and with the support of non-government organizations (NGOs). Since inclusive education is a new phenomenon in Pakistan, inclusion is now being trialed in various projects administered by the Government of Pakistan with the help of others non-government organizations as well as foreign agencies like IDP Norway, sight savers Pakistan and USAID (Rieser, R. 2012). As emphasis is being given to open up and widen the regular schools so that these can accommodate and absorb both students with and without special education needs. Similarly, it seems also appropriate to opening up and widening the gates of existing special schools to greet both students with and without special education needs that ultimately promote socialization among them. Inclusion means that every child has a right to belong and to share normal experiences with family, neighbors and peers. Every child has a right to a quality education in his or her school. All children can learn and develop, working side by side with peers with various skills and abilities (Booth & Ainscow, 2002).

Teachers become a vital force to make the practices successful. At present, special and regular education teachers are facing the challenge of providing services in regular education classrooms that were historically provided in two different educational settings. Terms like integration, mainstreaming, and, ultimately, inclusion have been used to describe this educational movement. UNESCO (1994) states that inclusion or participation is necessary to human dignity, satisfaction and exercise of human rights. In the field of education, the schooling of students with special educational needs is reflected by these ideas that is, to provide equal education opportunity to that which exists for other students. Foreman (2005) states that the concept of inclusion is based on the notion, that school provides need of all children, whatever the level of their ability or disability. The philosophical basis for

* **Corresponding Author:** Muhammad Uzair-ul-Hassan, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha-Pakistan

inclusive education then, becomes a belief that all students should be included within the traditional classrooms and provided with the support and assistance needed to succeed at a level that is appropriate for the individual (Booth & Ainscow, 2002). Inclusive education advocates that all children should learn together in mainstream schools, regardless of their abilities. Children with Special Needs have the same rights to education as other children (Booth & Ainscow, 2002). Salamanca declaration (1994) advocates all children should be educated together regardless of their ability. Children with special needs have the right to receive schooling in mainstream schools along with their same age peers. The special schools in Pakistan can also be mainstreamed through inclusion because inclusive education recognizes that all children can learn together and socialize at the same place not in isolated settings and their potential can be explored to its fullest.

Inclusive education depends on many factors such as; teachers' attitude, quality of instruction they offer their students and also consideration of students' cultural background including their languages. According to Iqbal, Zaman, & Ghafar (2013), acquiring education in one's mother language is a right of individual. Teachers if wanted to include students in classroom then they should provide space to students keeping in view various factors. Attitudes of the teachers about inclusive education have been significant factor that lays impacts on implementation of inclusion for children with special educational needs. In Pakistan, implementation of inclusive education in selected number of schools in Islamabad started in 2007 with the collaboration of Federal Directorate of Education (Islamabad), Directorate General of Special Education (Islamabad), the sight savers Pakistan and IDP (International Development Partners), Norway. The purpose of the project was to create awareness about inclusion and remove the barriers of learning, development and participation in schools and communities through implementation of the programs. These were the schools which were selected for inclusive purpose, already working for general education (Rieser, R 2012). Children with special needs have the right to receive schooling in mainstream schools along with their same-age peers. Many researchers do their research on the inclusion of special students into regular classrooms. The idea we are working on is to include all students with and without special education needs in special schools in Pakistan.

2 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Special education teachers' experiences and practices revolve around students with mild to severe disabilities. They know to what extent it is difficult to work with these students. Getting their stance about inclusive setting is primarily important as their direct experiences in special education set-up can be productive for inclusive setting. Hence the study was designed to investigate the greeting mode of special education teachers towards all students for inclusive settings in special schools. The experiences they gained inform us how confining students with special education needs within the boundaries walls of special schools ultimately segregate them in a society. The schools which are the centre of socialization deprive these students away from getting social with students without special education needs. Teachers lacking in experience to interact with students with special education needs do not fully support inclusion. Hassan, Farooq & Parveen (2012) explored that teachers of regular schools have qualms to include students with special education needs in regular schools. The present study emerged to find out whether special education teachers have the same greeting mode towards all students for inclusive settings or their ways of greeting vary.

3 Statement of the problem

The purpose of the study is to investigate the ways the special education teachers adopt to greet students with and without special education needs for inclusive setting. It further examines the kind of stance of special education teachers who have been experiencing students with special education needs in segregated-cum-integrated classrooms. Moreover, this study facilitates to discern possibilities of socializing students in inclusive setting hence to improve schools for all students with and without special education needs.

4 Objectives

1. To investigate greeting mode of special education teachers toward students with and without disabilities for inclusive setting
2. To examine the kind of stance special education teachers have towards inclusion
3. To entail possibilities of socializing students with and without disabilities in inclusive setting.

5 Research questions

1. Do teachers hold a positive, neutral or negative ways towards greeting all students for inclusive settings?
2. Do teachers believe that all students can be benefitted from inclusive setting?

3. Is inclusion the best setting for socializing students with and without disabilities?
4. Is there any significant difference between male and female teachers' mode of greeting, awareness, advantages, disadvantages, barriers, training's need to teach in inclusive setting?
5. Is there any significant difference between urban and rural teachers' mode of greeting, awareness, advantages, disadvantages, barriers, training's need to teach in inclusive setting?
6. Is there any significant difference between public and private teachers' mode of greeting, awareness, advantages, disadvantages, barriers, training's need to teach in inclusive setting?

6 Significance of the study

The present study paid attention on identifying teachers' ways of greeting of special education teachers towards inclusion. Similar to other developing countries, Pakistan is trying to perform the philosophy of inclusive education on the basis of various international and national declarations: The United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child UNCRC, (1989). The study contributes in the development of field and knowledge in inclusive education in Pakistan. It is significant for stakeholders like teachers, educationists, parents, policy makers and other relevant public or private institutions and agencies. It is also significant for future teachers to get well-informed knowledge and current practices in the field of inclusive education. It further highlights manifold barriers in transforming special to inclusive schools. The study identifies the advantages, disadvantages, nature of training needed as teachers perceive. It intends to contribute in understanding and investigating teachers' ways of greeting towards all students with and without special education needs in special schools. It also flashes most significant barriers for teachers, administrators, parents and public to understand and in achieving the goal of inclusion in Pakistan.

7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Educational research is based on some ways of thinking and certain methods of establishing beliefs and knowledge (Cresswell, 2009). This research is quantitative and descriptive in nature and in this context (Borg & Gall, 1996) reported that descriptive research is a type of quantitative research that involves making careful descriptions of educational phenomena.

7.1 Description of variables

7.1.1 Context of the study. To investigate the phenomena, the study adopted quantitative approach. The researcher wanted to obtain data to determine specific greeting mode of teachers of special education schools of Punjab. The study finds the significant difference among the variables (awareness, advantages and disadvantages, barriers and nature of training required related to inclusive pedagogy for inclusive settings) on the basis of type, locality of schools & gender of teachers. The study is cross-sectional in survey because the researchers collected the information at just one point in time, although the time it takes to collect all of the data may take anywhere from a day to a few weeks or more. (Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. 2009, p.391). The data for the study had been collected from primary public & private schools located in urban and rural areas.

7.1.2 Research variables. The research variables in the study were awareness, advantages, disadvantages, barriers and nature of training related to inclusive education. Researcher has tried to identify significant difference among the variables (awareness, advantages and disadvantages, barriers and nature of training related to inclusive pedagogy for inclusive settings) on the basis of type, locality of schools & gender of teachers.

Table 1, Variables of the study

Sr No.	Categorical variables	Continuous variable
1	Demographics e.g gender, school locality, school type, Teachers experiences, prof. & academic qualification etc.	Awareness
2	Demographics e.g gender, school locality, school type, Teachers experiences, prof. & academic qualification etc.	Advantages/disadvantages
3	Demographics e.g gender, school locality, school type, Teachers experiences, prof. & academic qualification etc.	Barriers
4	Demographics e.g gender, school locality, school type, Teachers experiences, prof. & academic qualification etc.	Training required

Researchers identified that in our study disability is an issue that turns its advantages into disadvantages. Inclusion would be of little benefit to children with disabilities and therefore questioned the advantages of inclusion. Lack of awareness also becomes the disadvantage of inclusion. Teachers normally have low expectations from students with disabilities. Low expectations towards students with disabilities reflects that the apparent difference of the students causes them to be considered as inferior to other students who are considered as normal in the society. Gyimah, Sugden & Pearson (2009) explained that teachers are said to have the tendency to reject students with significant disabilities because the severity of disability affects perception and expected educational outcomes.

Keeping in view the need of transforming special and regular schools into inclusive, teachers' experiences with students with disabilities have great importance. Analyzing special education teachers' views on the variables like awareness, advantages/disadvantages of inclusive settings, barriers as they perceived and the need of training they suggest for transforming schools to inclusive become important variables for the current study. As special education teachers experiences students with disabilities hence researcher wanted to investigate their mode of welcoming for inclusive settings.

8 Population, sampling and sample

8.1 Population

All male and female teachers of special school of Punjab, Pakistan make the population of the study.

8.2 Sampling and Sample

In this study the researchers used convenient sampling for selecting special education teachers. Total number of participants are n=80 from these special schools. The researchers went to the schools and selected participants with the help of the schools head teachers. All female and male teachers were selected. n=39% of the participants were male and n=61% of the participants were female. The questionnaire was given to all teachers of special schools of Punjab. The researcher distributed the questionnaires by themselves among the heads of the schools and the teachers. The respondents individually respond the questionnaires and returned after two to three days to the researcher. Some teachers did not return. Researchers distributed 106 questionnaires among the teachers and 95 teachers returned. Some questionnaires were found incomplete so after data cleaning, 80 questionnaires were included for final analysis of the study. The return-rate of questionnaires was 89.62%.

9 Instrument

The instrument developed was used to explore the greeting' ways of special education teachers towards inclusion of ordinary students in special schools. The questionnaire asked the teachers to provide the information about the inclusion of ordinary students in the special education classroom. The teachers were to respond on a three point scale – (1) Agree (2) Uncertain (3) Disagree. The reason behind using three point-scale was to capture respondent attention because the construct of the study was simple and researcher didn't want to contaminate the data with extended point-scale. Also both five and seven point scale items take longer to complete (Dolnicar, S., Grun, B. Leisch, F. & Rossiter, J., 2011). The questionnaire was organized to collect complete information in a short time by asking the teachers to answer to specific statements relating to inclusion. The study asked the teachers to respond to some basic demographic information including gender, school (public, private) & school locality. The information addressed on the issues of awareness related to inclusive education, advantages of the inclusive education, disadvantages of inclusive education, barriers in inclusive education, nature of training needed. The 41 items were finalized for data collection.

9.1 Pilot Study

Before collecting the final data, the researchers carried out a pilot study to ensure instrument's reliability and validity. Pilot testing of research instruments was made in Sargodha and Hafizabad districts. Reliability of the questionnaire was .88 after analysis. In order to establish face validity for the survey, the instrument was reviewed by expert reviewers. Suggestions were incorporated into a revision of the instrument. The survey was administered to elementary, middle, and high school special education teachers in six District of Punjab. After pilot testing, the questionnaires were revised. Every effort was made to design comprehensive questionnaires to get relevant and precise information from all concerned teachers.

10 Data Collection Procedure

The instrument for data collection used in this study was a questionnaire that was divided into two parts. Part one of this instrument was designed to obtain participants professional and demographic data. Special schools'

teachers in Islamabad, Faisalabad, Gujranwala, Sheikhpura, Chiniot and Hafizabad were asked to provide information about different demographic variables such as gender, residential status, school (public, private), age, academic qualification, professional qualification, a number of special students, type of special students, the number of ordinary students and teaching experience. Part two of the questionnaire was developed by the researchers to investigate the ways of greeting of special education teachers towards inclusion of ordinary students in special schools. After piloting, final data were gathered.

10.1 Problem Encountered During Data Collection

As the research was carried out, the researchers encountered many problems concerning data collection. First, there was a problem faced by the researchers for receiving permission from the head teachers of schools for collecting data from others teachers. After getting permission and cooperation of head teacher, the researchers talked with the participants and provide them information on this research and also gave the instructions which were required for participants to complete the questionnaire. After visiting so many times, researcher got data from teachers. Secondly, the dates scheduled for data collection were not convenient for some schools, because of their admission days and exam vacations also, which made it difficult for the researchers to collect data to the school teachers. Another problem faced was that many teachers had no information about inclusive education.

10.2 Limitations

Current study is based on smaller sample of teachers (n=80) because in special education less staff is recruited because of less number of students. Further, due to convenient sampling result might not be as generalizable as these should be in quantitative research.

11 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by using inferential and descriptive statistic. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) has been used for data analysis. Descriptive statistics to measure means and percentages were used. Inferential statistics such as t-test and one-way ANOVA were used to examine statistical difference between respondent's views. Analysis shows that most of the participants 60.9% are females, only 39.1% are male. It shows that at primary level most of the female teachers are teaching in inclusive schools. Most of the participants 75% are urban and only 25% are rural. Most of the participants 95.3% belong to public schools. Only 4.7% belong to private schools. Analysis shows the frequency distribution of respondent according to their age. In this study 50.5% respondents are between the age group of (25-30) years, 23.8 % are between the age group of (31-35) years, 7.1 % respondents are between the age group of (46-50) years, 6.0 % respondents are (41-45) and less than 25 years of age. Only 1.2 % respondents are (51-55) and above 55 years of age. Analysis shows that most respondents agreed that both students should learn in the same schools. It also shows that most respondents agreed that problems and difficulties arise if both students will be learning together. Most respondents agreed that learning together will increase social skills of all students. According to this table most of the teachers agreed that “all teachers have enough time to teach students with and without disabilities. Analysis shows that special education teachers and regular teachers need to work together in order to teach all students including students with and without disabilities. Analysis indicates that majority of teachers agreed that special education teachers and ordinary teachers’ collaborations may become fruitful to support all students in the same class and school. It also indicates that majority of teachers agreed that special education teachers have the skills necessary to provide instructions to all students including students with and without disabilities. Analysis shows that special educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for all students including students with and without disabilities. According to analysis, most of the teachers are agreeing that the presence of all students in my classes have a positive impact on all students with and without disabilities. The analysis shows the majority of the teachers agreed that students with disabilities” may develop friendships with classmates without disabilities. According to analysis, 45% teachers agreed that ordinary students will benefit from the students with disabilities in classrooms. It is clear indication that majority of teachers agreed that special students have the right to get an education with their counterparts without disabilities in the same classes. The analysis shows that teachers agreed that special and ordinary students are socially well adjusted in the same classroom. The analysis also shows that the teachers agreed that the Parents of all students including with without disabilities will accept, provide adequate support and assistance to the teachers to teach all students in the same class.

Table 2:Independent Samples t-test comparing male and female teachers towards the advantages of inclusion

Gender	N	Mean	S. D	T	Sig. (2tailed)
Male	32	37.6765	8.95687	-.318	.751
Female	48	38.4906	10.09307		

This table shows t- value -. 318 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between male and female teacher where female teachers mean was greater than male teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 3: Independent Samples t-test comparing male and female teachers to the disadvantages of inclusion

Gender	N	Mean	S. D	T	Sig.(2tailed)
Male	32	10.1765	2.81199	.843	.402
Female	48	9.4340	2.49237		

This table shows t- value .843 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between male and female teacher where female teachers mean was greater than male teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 4: Independent Samples t-test comparing male and female teachers to the barriers to inclusion

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig.(2tailed)
Male	32	9.0294	2.99985	-1.369	.174
Female	48	9.8679	3.01941		

This table shows t- value -1.369 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between male and female teacher where female teachers mean was greater than male teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 5: Independent Samples t-test comparing male and female teachers to the awareness of inclusion

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	32	3.4706	1.30814	.471	.639
Female	48	3.3396	1.23947		

This table shows t- value .471 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between male and female teacher where female teachers mean was greater than male teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 6: Independent Samples t-test comparing male and female teachers to the training need

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	32	5.9706	1.50726	-1.369	.174
Female	48	6.5472	2.13547		

This table shows t- value -1.369 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exist between male and female teacher where female teachers mean was greater than male teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 7: Independent Samples t-test comparing male and female teachers to ways of greeting

Gender	N	Mean	SD	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	32	66.3235	11.98919	-.444	.658
Female	48	67.6792	14.99458		

This table shows t- value -. 444 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between male and female teacher where female teachers mean was greater than male teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 8: Independent Samples t-test comparing urban and rural teachers with respect to the advantages of inclusion

Residence	N	Mean	SD	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Urban	60	37.0000	10.03630	-2.123	.037
Rural	20	42.1000	6.91984		

This table shows t- value -2.123 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exist between urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean was greater than rural teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 9: Independent Samples t-test comparing urban and rural teachers with respect to the disadvantages of inclusion

Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Urban	60	9.6567	2.57348	-.435	.664
Rural	20	9.9500	2.87411		

This table shows t- value -.435 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean was greater than rural teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 10: Independent Samples t-test comparing urban and rural teachers with respect to the barriers of inclusion

Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Urban	60	9.3134	3.00610	-1.286	.202
Rural	20	10.3000	3.02794		

This table shows t- value -1.286 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean was greater than rural teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 11: Independent Samples t-test comparing urban and rural teachers with respect to the need of training of inclusion

Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Urban	60	6.3284	1.97245	-1.286	.202
Rural	20	6.3000	1.80933		

This table shows t- value .057 which is significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean was greater than rural teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 12: Independent Samples t-test comparing urban and rural teachers with respect to the need of training of inclusion

Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Urban	60	3.2985	1.27938	-1.254	.213
Rural	20	3.7000	1.17429		

This table shows t- value -1.254 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean was greater than rural teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 13: Independent Samples t-test comparing urban and rural teachers with respect to the awareness

Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Urban	60	3.2985	1.27938	-1.254	.213
Rural	20	3.7000	1.17429		

This table shows t- value -1.254 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean is greater than rural teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 13: Independent Samples t-test comparing urban and rural teachers with respect to ways of greeting

Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Urban	60	65.5970	14.33586	-1.946	.055
Rural	20	72.3500	10.77656		

This table shows t- value -1.946 which is not significant at .05 significant levels. The difference exists between urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean is greater than rural teacher but this difference is not statistically significant.

Similarly the differences existed between public and private schools' teachers mean score with respected to advantages, disadvantages of inclusion, barriers, awareness and ways of greeting students in schools were calculated and found that public schools teachers mean scores were greater than private schools' teachers but these differences are not statistically significant.

12 Findings

- 1) Mostly teachers agreed that ordinary students should learn with special students.
- 2) It showed positive way of greeting all students with inclusive setting. Teachers were agreeing that both students should learn in the same schools.
- 3) A significant difference exists between male and female teachers with respect to the way of greeting of teachers toward inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 4) A significant difference exists between male and female teachers with respect to the advantages of inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 5) Difference exists between male and female teachers with respect to the disadvantages of inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 6) Significant difference exists between male and female teachers with respect to the barriers to inclusion of ordinary students into special classes
- 7) Significant difference exists between male and female teachers with respect to the awareness of inclusion.
- 8) Difference exists between male and female teachers with respect to the training of inclusion.
- 9) A difference exists between urban and rural teacher where urban teachers mean is greater than the rural teacher.
- 10) Significant difference exists between urban and rural teachers with respect to the advantages of the inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 11) Difference exists between urban and rural teachers with respect to the disadvantages of the inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 12) Difference exists between urban and rural teachers with respect to the barriers of the inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 13) Significant difference exists between urban and rural teachers with respect to the training of the inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 14) Difference exists between urban and rural teachers with respect to the awareness of the inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 15) A difference exists between public and private school teacher where public school teachers mean is greater than private school teachers.
- 16) Significant difference exists between public and private teachers with respect to the advantages of inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 17) Difference exists between public and private teachers with respect to the disadvantages of inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 18) Significant difference exists between public and private teachers with respect to the barriers to inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 19) Difference exists between public and private teachers with respect to the needs of training of inclusion of ordinary students into special classes.
- 20) Significant difference exists between public and private teachers with respect to the awareness toward the inclusion of ordinary students into special classes

1. DISCUSSION

The study was intended to contribute to understanding and investigating of teachers' way of greeting all students with and without special education need in special schools. Mostly teachers were agreeing that ordinary students should learn with special students. It shows positive way of greeting all students in special schools. Teachers were agreeing that both students should learn in the same schools. Mostly respondents were agreeing that learning together will increase social skills of all students. The results showed that special teachers should accept ordinary students in their classes.

Majority of teachers were agreeing that all teachers receive adequate training related to teach all students including students with and without special education need. Majority of teachers are agreeing that they had the instructional background to teach all students including students with and without disabilities effectively. Most of the teachers were agreeing that ordinary students would have a negative impact upon the learning environment of

classroom. It is contrary to some global researches conducted in regular schools. For example, Lifshitz, Glaubman and Issawi (2004) found that Palestinian school teachers' views were not encouraging of inclusion in the education coordination. Their quantitative study in Botswana showed that school teachers held somewhat negative attitudes. They also found that teachers felt untrained and fearful to work with children who have learning disabilities because they do not have enough knowledge about how to teach in inclusive settings. Research had also shown that both groups of teachers have similar feelings of uncertainty with regard to the ability of the regular education. Many studies have also shown that special education teachers had a propensity to hold more constructive and confident views about inclusion. The global studies conducted on special education teachers have shown positive conclusion towards socialization. For example, special education teachers tend to be more tolerant of inclusion and see themselves as important in facilitating positive social relationships between children with and without special education need and are more likely to mediate during conflict (Pavri & Lufting, 2001). Teachers show to be more willing to integrate students with mild disabilities, rather than those with more severe disabilities and with challenging behavioural problems in regular schools. Naturally, there are great variations and individual differences in teachers' beliefs, attitudes and confidence in moving toward inclusion (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Teachers, generally, have been found to be less willing to include students with emotional and behavioural disorders in regular schools. Female teachers have commonly been found to have greater tolerance for implementing inclusive education and generally have higher levels of sympathy and lower levels of fear than reported by male teachers (Carroll, Forlin, & Jobling, 2003).

Researchers suggest that there is a positive relationship between disability education and educator's positive modes towards inclusion. Studies that have examined teachers' modes and anxiety towards inclusive education have accounted successful accomplishment of inclusive policy that is dependent upon holding positive ways and having received appropriate training together with the availability of physical and human resources. Similarly, positive cooperation with parents is an important facilitating factor in achieving an inclusive education (Bradshaw & Mundia, 2006). A most significant barrier in achieving goal of inclusion is lack of education provided to teachers, administrators, parents and publics to the understanding of inclusive education. According to Khurshid, Gardezi, & Noureen (2014) teaching is a noble and challenging profession and it is important to note that those teachers can better perform this responsibility that are sufficiently prepared and have strong professional attitude because this attitude is transferred to the new generation. Inclusion also increases their academic abilities. It gives students a feeling that they are performing more productively. The environment gives students with disabilities a real sense of belonging in the community they live in because they are receiving instruction and practicing skills in the community.

2. Conclusion

The study concludes that special education teachers based on their direct interaction with students with special education need albeit warmly greet all students with and without special education need for inclusive settings but they equally have reservations. Some of them warmly greet but some do not. A number of teachers feel it suitable for all students with and without special education need to be learned in the inclusive setting, while others are saying it is not beneficial for some of the students (UNESCO, 2006). Teachers were agreeing that both students should learn in the same schools. Special education teachers support and greet both students with and without special education need for inclusive setting. They reflected that the hub for socialization of students with and without special education need is inclusive setting. Rather retaining students with disabilities in special schools, the students special education needs can only be fulfilled in inclusive settings. They agree that both kinds of students should learn in the same class and school. They continue to respond that students' can be fulfilled if they learn together in the same class and school. Based on their experiences within special schools, teachers also require training to teach in diverse classroom of inclusive setting. Even then reservations concerning teaching and learning process in inclusive setting remain prevail. The results indicate that teachers greet and welcome all students with and without special education needs in their schools although sometimes they get confused. The study supports global inclusive practices although variations exist. Teachers' reflections show that they favour shift from segregation to inclusion in special schools also. Based on the study, it is suggested that opening up and widening the gates of existing special schools for both students with and without special education needs would be fruitful rather limiting special schools only to students with special needs.

REFERENCES

1. Ainscow, M., Booth, T., Dyson, A., Farrell, P., Frankham, J., Gallannaugh, F., Howes, A., & Smith, R. (2006). *Improving schools: developing inclusion*. London: Routledge.
2. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for Inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*.

- Bristol, UK: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
3. Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1996). *Educational Research: An introduction*. USA: Longman.
 4. Bradshaw, L., & Mundia, L. (2006). Attitudes to and concerns about inclusive education: Bruneian in-service and preservice teachers. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21(1), 35-41.
 5. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for Inclusion: Center for Studies on Inclusive Education*. CSIE
 6. Carroll, A., Forlin, C. and Jobling, A. (2003). The impact of teacher training in special education on the attitudes of Australian pre-service general educators towards people with disabilities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30 (3), 65-79
 7. Cresswell, J. W. (2009). *Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. USA: Sage Publication.
 8. Croll, P., & Moses, D. (2000). Ideologies and utopias: educational professionals views of inclusion. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 15(1), 1-12.
 9. Forlin, C (2010). *Teacher Education for Inclusion. Changing Paradigms and Innovative Approaches*. London: Routledge.
 10. Foreman, P. (2005). Disability and inclusive: Concepts and principles. In P. Foreman Geneva: UNESCO. Retrieved on 5 June, 2011 from http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Policy_Dialogue/48th_ICE/ICE_FINAL_REPORT_eng.pdf
 11. Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. USA:
 12. Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education. UNESCO, (2001) Report National Conference on Education for All. Islamabad.
 13. Gyimah, E. K., Sugden, D. Pearson, S. (2009). Inclusion of the children with special educational needs in mainstream schools in Ghana: Influence of teachers' and children's characteristics. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 13(8).
 15. Hassan, M. U., Farooq, M. S. & Parveen, I. (2012). Recognition or rebuff? Inclusion of students with special education needs in ordinary schools in Pakistan. *Journal of educational and social research*. 2(1): 73-92.
 17. INICO (2009). *Better Education for All: When were included too*. Spain: Instituto Universities Integración Comunidad.
 18. Iqbal, J., Zaman, A., & Ghafar, A. (2013). Inclusion of Pashto in 'O' Level Cambridge Education. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 1(1).
 19. Khurshid, K., Gardezi, A. R., & Noureen, S. (2014). A Study Of Attitude Of University Students Of MA/M. Sc Towards Teaching Profession. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 3(1).
 20. Lipsky, D. K. and Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and School Reform: Transforming America's Classrooms*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
 21. Lifshitz, H., Glaubman, R., & Issawi, R. (2004). Attitudes towards inclusion: the case of Israeli and Palestinian regular and special education teachers. *European Journal of Special Needs Children*, 19(2), 171-190.
 22. Pavri, S., & Lufting, R. (2000). The Social Face of Inclusive Education: Are Students With Learning Disabilities Really Included in the Classroom? *Preventing School Failure*, 45(1), 8-14.
 23. Rieser, R. (2012). *Implementing inclusive education: A commonwealth guide to implementing article 24 of UN convention on the rights of people with disabilities*. London: commonwealth secretariats.
 24. Scruggs, T. E. and Mastropieri, M. A. (1996) Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming inclusion, A research synthesis. *Exceptional Children*, 63, 59-74
 25. United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. New York: UN.
 26. United Nations. (1993). *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities*. New York: UN.
 27. UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*, Paris, France.
 28. UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs Education*. World conference on special needs education, Salamanca, Spain.
 29. UNESCO. (2006). *Positive discipline in the inclusive, learning-friendly classroom: a guide for teachers and teacher educators*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education.