

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTION ABOUT INCLUSIVE
EDUCATION OF HEADS AND EXECUTIVES

Abdul Basit¹, Zahid Majeed², Muhammad Irfan Arif³, Sayyeda Rabia Basri⁴

¹Ph.D Scholar Institute of Special Education University of the Punjab, Lahore

²Director Academic Planning & Course Production Allama Iqbal Open University,
Islamabad.

³University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan

⁴Lecturer, Special Education University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: [1basitranakkot@gmail.com](mailto:basitranakkot@gmail.com) [2zahid_majeed@aiou.edu.pk](mailto:zahid_majeed@aiou.edu.pk)

[3drmirfanarifphd@gmail.com](mailto:drmirfanarifphd@gmail.com), [4rabia.basri@ue.edu.pk](mailto:rabia.basri@ue.edu.pk)

**Abdul Basit, Zahid Majeed, Muhammad Irfan Arif, Sayyeda Rabia Basri.
Comparative Analysis of Perception About Inclusive Education of Heads and
Executives-- Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 19(1), 1406-1415.
ISSN 1567-214x**

ABSTRACT

The study aimed at exploring the perceptions of Heads and Executives of Inclusive Education about Inclusive education practices in Pakistan. The study was descriptive in nature, further it was survey research. The data was collected from Heads and Executives working in General and Special Education schools. The sample of the study included 15 Executives and 30 Heads. The instrument for data collection used in this research was a questionnaire. A self-made Questionnaire was designed to obtain perceptions of various stakeholders. The results of this study indicated that most of the stakeholders want to establish the inclusive setup. School heads believe that children with disabilities can achieve academic accomplishment effectively from being included in the general education. The Stakeholders of this study felt that policy and law should be made to include children with disabilities into the general education and also providing sufficient resources and training. This research reveals that the stakeholders have to face difficulties in implementing inclusive education. It will also contribute in field of educational leadership.

INTRODUCTION

When it comes to inclusion, it's not only about disabilities and schools. Social fairness is at the heart of inclusion. What kind of inclusion requests would we wish to make from the rest of the world? Which skills and responsibilities are

required to thrive in different societies? We can create a better society for all of us if we hang on to Inclusion as a model of social equity (Sapon-Shevin, 2003). A school's commitment to inclusion should not be viewed as an add-on. The school's mission, reasoning, principles, routines, and exercises demand that this be taken for granted. Instead of a member who is included in an ordinary school, full inclusion must be deeply ingrained in the school's founding, missions, convictions, and day-to-day activities (Segal, 2007). This refers to how we plan and implement our schools, programmes and activities so that all students can learn and participate together without any form of prejudice. When it comes to education, Sandkull defines Inclusive Education as, "The process of tending and responding to the diverse requirements of all learners and to enhance training" (Sandkull, 2007).

Ballard (2003) characterized inclusive education as "non-prejudicial regarding handicap, society and sexual orientation. It includes all special needs students in a group, with no exemptions and regardless of their educated person, physical, tangible or other contrast, having equivalent rights to get to the socially esteemed educational program of their general public as full-timed esteemed parts of age-fitting standard classes. Inclusive accentuates differences over osmosis striving to keep away from the colonization of minority experience by predominant modes of inclusions and activity".

The essential standard of the inclusive educationist that all youngsters ought to learn together, wherever conceivable, paying little respect to any troubles, or other contrasts they may have. Inclusive education must perceive and react to the assorted needs of their special needs students, pleasing both distinctive styles and rates of learning and guaranteeing quality instruction to all through proper curricula, hierarchical plans, showing methodologies, asset utilization and associations with their groups. There ought to be a continuum of help and administrations to match the continuum of exceptional needs experienced in every school (Wang, 2009).

The vicinity of special needs students with inclusion gives an impetus to learning open doors and encounters that may not generally be a piece of the educational program, particularly identifying with social equity, preference, value, et cetera (Jorgensen, 2007). Based on the encounters reported by the members, fruitful inclusion brought about expanded understanding of contrast and differences by the ordinarily creating special needs students in the classroom (Finke, Mcnaughton, & Drager, 2009).

According to early researchers (Wehmeyer & Agran, 2006), the general training classroom is the best location for students to acquire the general education instructional module. Students with scholarly and other formative disabilities who are taught in all instruction classrooms show better performance in reading and math (McGhie et.al., 2013) and higher gains in flexible conduct when compared to students with sense and other formative inclusion who are taught in specific settings. After doing research on students' academic conclusions, it was discovered that students with severe disabilities have more scholarly reactions and lower levels of competing behaviours when they are in all instruction classrooms compared to the bespoke curriculum setting (Mortweet,

Utley, Walker, Dawson, Delquadri, Reddy, Greenwood, Hamilton, & Ledford, 1999). Classrooms in general instruction provided more guidance, more whole-class direction, and tended to focus on academic content more than specialized curriculum classrooms. Non-disabled associates were used more frequently while grown-ups were utilized less (Helmstetter et.al., 1998). Students' social and interpersonal skills improve when they are taught in inclusive classrooms (Fisher & Meyer, 2002).

The standard educational system in Pakistan works freely for general educational systems. Such isolation is additionally apparent in private sector. The showing-learning paradigm fails to take into account the unique learning needs of children. The population of Pakistan with a disability was 3286630 in 1998, accounting for 2.54 percent of the total population, according to the national census. 2.85 percent of people with disabilities are men, while 2.21 percent are women. In 1998, (Statistics). The figure is wildly exaggerated, as it is likely that moderate and mild special needs pupils were not included in the definition of incapacity. According to the most logical explanation, the registration staff was ill-prepared to recognize and classify children with disabilities. In 2002, Pakistan's government approved a national policy for people with disabilities on the recommendations of the Ministry of Women Development, Social Work, and Special Education. In addition to mainstreaming, this strategy included sections on inclusive education and training, and it also laid out the standards for its implementation (Ishfaq & Rana,2015).

OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY:

1. To know about perceptions of Heads Teachers of General education about the inclusive education in Pakistan.
2. To describe the perceptions of Head Teachers of Special Education about the Inclusive Education in Pakistan.
3. To know the Perceptions of Executives of General Education about the Inclusive Education in Pakistan.
4. To know the Perceptions of Executives of General Education about the Inclusive Education in Pakistan.
5. To reveal the difference of perceptions between the Head Teachers of General and Special Schools about inclusive education.
6. To explore the difference of Perceptions between Executives of General and Special Education about inclusive Education in Pakistan.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between perceptions between the Head Teachers of General and Special Schools about inclusive education.

Ho2: There is no significant difference between Perceptions between Executives of General and Special Education about inclusive Education in Pakistan.

METHODOLOGY

The study was descriptive in nature, further it was survey research. The data was collected from Heads and Executives working in General and Special

Education schools. The sample of the study included 15 Executives and 30 Heads. The instrument for data collection used in this research was a questionnaire. A self-made Questionnaire was designed to obtain perceptions of various stakeholders. The questionnaire is covering the following areas of Inclusive Education.

- Aims, goals and objectives of Inclusive Education
- Vision and mission of Inclusive Education
- Learning experiences in inclusive education
- Learning environment of inclusive education
- Family and community role in inclusive education
- Leadership and human resource management practices for inclusive education
- Quality assurance in inclusive education
- Teachers' professional development for inclusive education
- Instructional material and instructional strategies in inclusive education
- Classroom management in inclusive education
- Social cohesion in inclusive education
- Assessment, measurement and evaluation procedures in inclusive education
- Role of inclusive education for social development of students
- Problems and issues in inclusive education

In order to assess the reliability and validity of the questionnaires the researcher carried out a pilot test. In the pilot test the questionnaire was administered to 30 stakeholders of Inclusive Education. The Cronbach's Alpha estimated the internal consistency reliability by determining how all items in a test relate to other test items and to the total scale. The value of Cronbach's Alpha of the questionnaire for understanding of inclusion was 0.80 which shows that the items of the questionnaire are internally consistent and reliable.

The data collected through questionnaire of stakeholders was computed to find out the percentage of different perceptions of the respondents. The Cronbach's Alpha estimated the internal consistency reliability by determining how all items in a test relate to other test items and to the total test scores. Reliability statistics were calculated of the questionnaire to ensure the quality of the instruments. One sample t-test was applied on the mean score of the respondents by considering 75% of the maximum score as a cut score or test value to analyze the following questions of the study i.e.

List is given below:

Table: 1: Sampling Chart

Sr No	Names of stakeholders	public	Private
1.	Executives	10	5
2.	Heads of Institutes/Schools	15	15
	TOTAL	25	20

DATA ANALYSIS

One sample t test between cut score and mean score of the responses of Executives of general education's perceptions about Inclusive Education.

One Sample t-Test

Test Value =117						
N	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff	Mean	SD
05	.877	4	.430	4.200	121.20	4.790

The mean score of 5 respondents was 121.20. One Sample t-test was used by applying test value = 117 (75% or cut score = 117), the t value was and .877 the p value i.e. level of significant (two tailed) is .430 which is greater than 0.05. It revealed that there is not any significant difference between the mean value and test value. It indicates that a perception of General executives of education about inclusive education is nearly equal to cut score.

One sample t test between cut score and mean score of the responses of Special education Executive's perceptions about inclusive education.

One Sample t-Test

Test Value =117						
N	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff	Mean	SD
10	3.051	9	.014	9.300	126.30	3.048

The mean score of 10 respondents was 126.30. One Sample t-test was used by applying test value = 117 (75% or cut score = 117), the t value was and 3.051 the p value i.e. level of significant (two tailed) is .014 which is less than 0.05. It revealed that that there is significant difference between the mean value and test value. It indicates that perceptions of executives of special education are significantly better than the test value i.e. 75% of total score.

One sample t test between cut score and mean score of the responses of General Schools Head's perceptions about inclusive education.

One Sample t-Test

Test Value =117						
N	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff	Mean	SD
15	2.337	14	.035	4.667	112.33	1.997

The mean score of 15 respondents was 112.33. One Sample t-test was used by applying test value = 117 (75% or cut score = 117), the t value was 2.337 the p value i.e. level of significant (two tailed) is .035 which is less than 0.05. It revealed that that there is significant difference between the mean value and test value. It indicates that a perception of heads of regular school is significantly less than test value i.e.75% level.

One Sample T Test Between Cut Score and Mean Score of The Responses of Heads of Special Education Schools Perceptions About Inclusive Education.

One Sample t-Test

Test Value =117						
N	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff	Mean	SD
15	2.149	14	.040	3.667	126.67	1.706

The mean score of 15 respondents was 126.67. One Sample t-test was used by applying test value = 117 (75% or cut score = 117), the t value was and 2.149 the p value i.e. level of significant (two tailed) is .040 which is less than 0.05. It revealed that that there is a significant difference between the mean value and test value. It indicates that perceptions of special education heads teachers are significantly better than the test value.

Independent Sample T-Test Between the General and Special Education Heads Perceptions About Inclusive Education.

Group Statistics							
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation			
Total	Head of Gen.Edu	15	112.33	7.734			
	Heads of Spe.Edu.	15	120.67	6.608			
Independent Samples Test							
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
	Equal variances assumed	.227	.638	3.17	2	.004	-8.333

Since the mean scores of General education Heads is 112.33 and special education heads is 120.63. It revealed that p value i.e. level of significant (two tailed) is 0.04 which is less than 0.05. It indicated that there is a significant

difference between general and special education heads perceptions about inclusive education. Special education heads are clearer, and their understanding about inclusive education is better than the heads of general education schools.

Independent Sample T-Test Between the Executives of General and Special Education's Perceptions About Inclusive Education.

Group Statistics				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Total	executives of Gen	5	121.20	10.710
	Executives of Special	10	126.30	9.638

Independent Samples Test							
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Total	Equal variances assumed	.144	.711	-.933	13	.368	-5.100

Since the mean scores of Executives of General education is 121.20 and special education executives' is 126.30, it revealed that p value i.e. level of significant (two tailed) is .368 which is less than 0.05. It indicated that there is a significant difference between general and special education executive's perceptions about inclusive education. Special education executive's perceptions are clearer, and their understanding about inclusive education is better than general executives of education.

FINDINGS

1. There is not any significant difference between the mean value and test value. It indicates that a perception of General executives of education about inclusive education is nearly equal to cut score.
2. There is significant difference between the mean value and test value. It indicates that perceptions of executives of special education are significantly better than the test value i.e. 75% of total score.
3. There is a significant difference between the mean value and test value. It indicates that perceptions of special education heads teachers are significantly better than the test value.
4. There is a significant difference between general and special education heads respondents about the perceptions of inclusive education. Special education heads are clearer and their understanding about inclusive education is better than the heads of general education.
5. There is a significant difference between general and special education executives' respondents about the perceptions of inclusive education. Special education executives are clear understanding than the General executives of

education.

CONCLUSION

In order to ensure that all children have access to an education, inclusive education is essential. Stakeholder views are critical to a successful process of inclusive education for students with disabilities. The current investigation is a descriptive one. One of the most commonly used quantitative research in education is this form of study. School heads and executives feel that including students with impairments in regular classes can help them succeed academically. It was concluded that policy and law should be changed to ensure that students with disabilities are included in the general education and that adequate resources and training are available for teachers and administrators. According to the findings of this study, stakeholders confront challenges while attempting to promote inclusive education. As a result, it will have an impact on educational administration.

DISCUSSION

The standard educational system in Pakistan works freely of uncommon educational systems. Such isolation is additionally apparent in private division. The showing learning methodology does not address the individual learning of youngsters. As per the national censuses 1998, the population of Pakistan with disability was 3286630 constituting 2.54 percent of the aggregate population. Among the persons with disability 2.85 percent are male and 2.21 percent female (Statistics, 1998) the figure is exceedingly underestimated, as characterize incapacities likely did exclude moderate and gentle special need students. The more conceivable theory for this modest representation of the truth is that the registration staff was not prepared to recognize and order the classifications of special need students. The Government of Pakistan, on the proposals of Ministry of Women Development, Social Work and Special Education endorsed the National policy for persons with inclusion in 2002. This policy had a various parts on mainstreaming, inclusive education, training; it also gave planning the rules for its execution of Inclusive education. (Hameed, 2002). . Education for all is a shared goal of this initiative, which is aimed at reducing and overcoming all exclusion from the human right to education at least at the primary level (Marzano, 2007).

The study aimed at exploring the perceptions of stake holders about the practice of inclusive education. The study found that all main stakeholders were in favor of including children with disabilities in the general education classroom and there is not any significant difference among the perceptions of stakeholders of general and special educational sectors. The mainstream school needs to work for the arrangements of education of special need children. The results this study indicated that most of the stakeholders want to establish the inclusive setup. The special education set up is not capable to cope with this challenge. The most of the respondents agreed with this statements that the inclusive setup is the essential. It is the need to target out of school children with disabilities in their nearby school by facilitating them with special equipment's. Special school are present at every tehsil and district level but majority of the population lives in union council and sub tehsil level which could not be facilitated due to far from

special education centers. The only solution to facilitate these outreach students is hide in EFA which facilitate all the children with any discrimination.

According to the foregoing discussion, the concept of inclusion is not only complex, but also multi-dimensional. Controversial philosophies and practises are woven throughout it. However, it is evident that inclusion is not solely an issue of 'rights'. In addition, it takes into account factors such as "Who," "How," "When," and "Where" are being educated. In addition, it is crucial that policies, methods, and system requirements be in place to assist teachers and other staff in promoting an inclusive culture and practice.

REFERENCES

- Ashfaq, M., & Rana, A. B. (2015). A study of inclusive stakeholder's perceptions for successful inclusion at higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 3(1), 80.
- Ashraf, S., Fatima, G., & Bashir, R (2017), *The Acceptability Level of Ordinary School Teachers towards the Inclusion of Children with Visual Impairment*.
- Ballard, C., & Banks, G. (2003). Resource wars: the anthropology of mining. *Annual review of anthropology*, 32(1), 287-313.
- Bruns, B., & Rakotomalala, R. (2003). *Achieving universal primary education by 2015: A chance for every child (Vol. 1)*. World Bank Publications.
- Fear-Segal, J. (2007). *White man's club: Schools, race, and the struggle of Indian acculturation*. U of Nebraska Press.
- Finke, E. H., Finke, E. H., McNaughton, D. B., & Drager, K. D. (2009). "All children can and should have the opportunity to learn": General education teachers' perspectives on including children with autism spectrum disorder who require AAC. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 25(2), 110-122.
- Fisher, D. (1999). *According to their peers: Inclusion as high school students see it*.
- Fisher, M., & Meyer, L. H. (2002). Development and social competence after two years for students enrolled in inclusive and self-contained educational programs. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 27(3), 165-174.
- Garner (eds), *Inclusive Education—Supporting Inclusion in Education Systems*. London: KoganPage Limited.
- Hameed, A. (2002). Documentation of good practices in special needs Specialneed studentsped Pupils in Western Societies. In C. Clark, A. Dyson and A. Millward.
- Helmstetter, E., Curry, C. A., Brennan, M., & Sampson-Saul, M. (1998). Comparison of general and special education classrooms of students with severe disabilities. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 216-227.
- Helmstetter, E., Curry, C.A., Brennan, M., & Sampson-Saul, M. (1998). Comparison of Implementation of Higher Education Reforms in Europe. Trentham: Trentham Books. In *Inclusion and School Reform: Transforming America's Classrooms*. D. K.
- Jorgensen, C.M., Mc Sheehan, M., & Sonnenmeier, R. (2007). Presumed competence *Journal of Inclusive Education*' 3 (1), 75–87.

- Levin, H. (2007). *Doing What Comes Naturally: Full Inclusion in Accelerated Schools*.
- Lindqvist, B. (1999). Education as a fundamental right. *Education Update*, 2(4), 7.
- Lindqvist, R., & Grape, O. (1999). Vocational rehabilitation of the socially disadvantaged long-term sick: inter-organizational co-operation between welfare state agencies. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 27(1), 5-10.
- Lipsky, D.K. and A. Gartner. 1999. *'Inclusive education: A requirement of a democratic* London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Ascd.
- McGhie-Richmond, D., Irvine, A., Loreman, T., Lea Cizman, J., & Lupart, J. (2013). Teacher perspectives on inclusive education in rural Alberta, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 36(1), 195-239.
- Mortweet, S. L., Utley, C. A., Walker, D., Dawson, H. L., Delquadri, J. C., Reddy, S. S., ... & Ledford, D. (1999). Classwide peer tutoring: Teaching students with mild mental retardation in inclusive classrooms. *Exceptional Children*, 65(4), 524-536.
- Mortweet, S. L., Utley, C. A., Walker, D., Dawson, H. L., Delquadri, J. C., Reddy, S. S. Moscow. http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/education_17933.html.
- Sandkull, O., & Schill, G. (2007). Everyone at Side should do an immersion!. *Participatory Learning and Action*, 57(1), 71-73.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (2003). Inclusion: A matter of social justice. *Educational Leadership, society'*, in H. Daniels and P. Garner (eds), *Inclusive Education—Supporting Inclusion in Education Systems*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Wang, H. L. (2009). Should All Students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) Be Included in Mainstream Education Provision?--A Critical Analysis. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 154-161.
- Wehmeyer, M., & Agran, M. (2006). Promoting access to the general curriculum. Witherell, C. & Noddings, N. (1991). Prologue: An invitation to our readers. In C. York: Mc Millan. Cole, C.M., Waldron, N., & Majd, M. (2004). Academic progress of students across