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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate teachers’ attitudes towards academic performance of students with disabilities in selected regular secondary schools in Bauchi state, Nigeria. The objectives of the study were to investigate the teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion of students with disabilities into regular classrooms, assess the instructional strategies used by teachers, explore the teachers’ previous work experience, examine administrators’ support and provisions towards teachers work and compare the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in regular school settings. The study was guide by Albert Bandura Social Learning Theory and supported with Lev Vygotsky’s Guided Learning Theory. Survey and correlational designs were used. The location of the study was the three geographical zones of Bauchi state (South, Central, and North). The target population of the study was 746 regular teachers, 34 principals, 9812 students without disabilities and 614 students with disabilities. Stratified random sampling technique was employed in selecting the schools, simple random sampling was used in choosing the teachers, purposive sampling technique was used in selecting the principals, simple random sampling was used in sampling students with and without disabilities. The sample size of the study was 15 schools, 75 regular teachers, 90 students with disabilities, 90 students without disabilities and 15 principals. The instruments used for data collection were survey scales (ATIAS and LSAS), Questionnaire on Instructional Strategy (QIS), interview, Students’ Examination Records (SER) and observation checklist. Both quantitative and qualitative techniques were used in data analysis. Data collected using scales, questionnaires and students’ examination records were analyzed quantitatively using SPSS descriptive and correlational statistics. While the data gathered using interviews and observation checklist were analyzed thematically. The results of this study revealed that regular teachers hold negative attitudes towards including students with special needs, teachers with more years of work experience appeared to be more positive than those with fewer years and finally, students without disabilities outperformed students with disabilities in the selected secondary schools of Bauchi State, Nigeria. It is recommended that the regular teachers should be given more training on inclusive education; this study can be replicated in other States of Nigeria and other studies should be conducted in primary school to find out the attitudes of teachers towards the inclusion of learners with disabilities.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

Presented in this section are the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, the significance of the study, assumptions, limitation and delimitations, theoretical and conceptual framework and definitions of operational terms.

1.1 Background to the Study

Inclusion was defined by UNESCO (2005) as a process through which the diverse educational needs of all students will be addressed through full involvement and encouragement in learning philosophies and communities as well as reduction of segregation within and from all forms of learning. Inclusion therefore, encompasses modifications and changes in the strategies, techniques/methods, content and structure with a shared vision which cover all individuals within a given age range. Through inclusion, the differences that exist between the regular system of education and special education would be eliminated by providing a proper system of education relevant and suitable to all learners in their local schools irrespective of their cultural or disability levels.

It also includes a total re-organization of the educational system by making sure that institutions have the opportunity of providing the needed resources, materials, facilities, and relevant curriculum which will accommodate the educational needs of students regardless of their culture, disability type or level of severity. Inclusion is therefore, moving away from the ordinary integration of individuals with disabilities into a regular classroom for a certain time, to a total and complete accommodation of
learners with special needs into a general education classroom in the name of inclusion where every student is considered a full member, and where the educational needs of all the students will be achieved. This movement is positioned within an agenda of social justice, which contends that fairness to individuals must involve getting an access by learners to their community schools. This program was endorsed by the Policies of United Nations towards the rights of individuals such as the UN Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (1993); the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989; the Salamanca Declaration of (1994), at which about 300 individuals from 92 countries and twenty five international organizations gathered in the city of Salamanca, Spain from 7th-10th June 1994 for the purpose of furthering the goals of Education For All (EFA) by recommending changes in policies to uphold the approach of inclusion and the current Sustainable Development Goals (SDG, 2015).

Educational policies in both developing and advanced nations responded to the social justice agenda of educating students with special needs in regular schools. The right of children with special needs in the United States were preserved in the statute, Education for all Handicapped Children Act 1975; the IDEA, 1990, 1997, 2004, 2008). In United Kingdom, the Warnock Report of (1978) which directly led to the promulgation of Education Act (1981), which was modified to the Education Act (1993) in which the rights of learners with special needs to be members of regular schools was established.

According to Magumise & Sefotho (2018), Teachers and parents are confident with the inception of inclusive education. They considered it as a practice that persistently explores more valuable ways of meeting the diverse educational challenges of
learners with disabilities. They contend that inclusive education can empower equal opportunities by providing a conducive learning environment, facilities and material through which the educational needs of learners can be addressed together in age appropriate regular classrooms. Teachers as well as parents, who view inclusive education positively, disregard special education program (Magumise & Sefotho, 2018).

In Nigeria, the National Policy of Education (NPE, 2004) orders the integration of all learners with disabilities into regular classrooms and free education for all exceptional students at any level. However, based on the above, only a few states implemented the inclusive education in Nigeria; other states are just beginning by creating piloting units in some schools (Fakolade, Adeniyi, & Tella, 2009). This study evaluated regular teachers’ attitudes towards the academic performance of learners with disabilities in the piloting inclusive classrooms in some selected secondary schools in Bauchi state.

Research has shown that among the elements of successful inclusion is the attitudes of teachers towards students with disabilities and inclusion program (Colber, 2010). Negative or positive attitudes affect academic performance of learners with disabilities (Cochran, 1998). In a study conducted by Familia-Garcia (2001), in New York City, the teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of individuals with special needs into general education classrooms were assessed. Among the surveyed special education teachers, majority responded positively concerning working in an inclusive educational setting (Familia-Garcia, 2001). While out of the general regular teachers, half of them expressed their willingness to have a trial on the inclusion program while the remaining half completely declined even to attempt inclusion. Among the teachers
who declined, 80% of them indicated that inclusion would not work and they were ready to either change schools or stop working in preference of working in inclusive schools. Based on these findings, the researcher concluded that such negative attitudes of the teachers would affect the students’ performance, (Familia-Garcia, 2001).

In Ghana, Ocloo & Subbeya (2008), examined the factors that predisposed teacher’s perceptions, and attitudes, towards inclusion of learners with disabilities into regular classrooms. Their findings showed that regular teachers were fully aware of the inclusion program and maintained positive attitudes towards it, but declared that insufficient materials, equipment, and resources would not make inclusion a reality (Ocloo & Subbeya, 2008).

In Cameroon Ngwokabuenui (2013), investigated attitudes of principals towards inclusion of children with disabilities into regular classrooms and its effects on their academic performance. The results showed that the principals expressed positive attitudes towards inclusion of individuals with disabilities into regular schools and their positive attitudes led to the students’ positive results. The researcher, therefore, concluded that the principals’ knowledge of special education laws had a significant effect on the attitudes they had towards including students with disabilities.

In Nigeria, majority of the previous researches on attitudes focused on ‘the attitude of the community toward people with disabilities’. For instance, Onwuegbu (1977) in Mba, (1978), in his study on the attitude of the community toward individuals with mental retardation, indicated prominently that the attitude of Nigerians toward people with intellectual disabilities is negative. Gani (1981), in his study of the attitude
toward individuals with disabilities (visual and hearing impairment) found the following responses:

- Send them to beg.
- I am shame of them.
- It is not my business.
- Something good ought to be done for them.

Gani said that, the first two responses above are the attitudes of the relatives and families of the people with disabilities. The third response represents the reactions of those who do not have people with disabilities in their family. The last response is for few people such as religious leaders, teachers of special need people and some of their parents/guardians. Ozoji (1988) recorded the following attitudes when conducted a research on the attitude of the community toward people with visual impairment;

- Attitude of protection. This simply means the community realized that people with disabilities have special problems, and therefore need special treatment.
- Hostile attitude. That is the attitude of maltreatment, cheating as well as denying their rights.
- Attitude of indifference or neutral attitude (I don’t care attitude).
- Acceptance attitude.

Ozoji, puts forward that attitudes of Nigerians toward people with disabilities is negative but have started changing.

Oluremi (2015), examined the attitudes of teachers towards learners with special needs in public secondary schools and its effects on their academic performance in Southeastern Nigeria. The results showed that, more than seventy-five percent of the
regular teachers displayed favorable attitudes towards learners with disabilities. Only sixteen percent of the teachers portrayed negative attitudes towards the students and seven percent of the teachers, held neutral views. He therefore, recommended for other studies to be carried out in the other parts of Nigeria.

Bauchi State has been chosen as the study location for this study because students with disabilities in the state complained regarding their inability to access the regular schools physical environment, use of non-inclusive teaching methods by the regular teachers, non-inclusive assessment strategies. This therefore made them prefer going to the special schools than the inclusive secondary schools.

It was against this background that the researcher evaluated the regular teachers’ attitudes and its effects on the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in the selected secondary schools in Bauchi State, Nigeria.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Individuals with disabilities in Bauchi State were educated in a segregated setting (special school) by special education teachers since, 1984. Currently, in compliance with the global mission on inclusive education and based on the provisions of the Nigerian National Policy on Education (NPE, 2008) some regular secondary schools started catering for all students in the same classrooms under inclusive education program. Most of the students with disabilities in the state prefer the segregated special schools than their neighboring inclusive education schools (Sirajo, 2013).

In another study Uche, Dan & Callitus (2014), found that students with disabilities make different complaints on the inclusion which ranged from inability to access the
physical environment, use of non-inclusive teaching methods by the regular teachers, non-inclusive assessment strategies and inadequate provision for curricular and non-curricular activities.

Research also indicated that many regular teachers in Nigeria were trained when special education courses were not part of the teacher training programs and those taught recently lacked adequate professional training to work with all categories of learners in inclusive settings. Because the special education courses in the regular teacher training programs were inadequate, only two unit were offered in some schools and four in others (Agomoh, 2012).

Oluremi (2015), investigated the attitudes of teachers towards students with special needs in government secondary schools of Southeastern Nigeria. The results indicated that, almost three quarters of teachers displayed an affirmative attitudes towards students with disabilities, and the students performed better. Hence, he recommended for other studies to be conducted in the other geographical zones of the country to fill in the gap in knowledge.

This study aims at evaluating the regular teachers’ attitudes towards the academic performance of learners with disabilities in selected secondary schools in Bauchi State, (Northern) Nigeria.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of regular teachers’ attitudes towards the academic performance of learners with disabilities in selected regular secondary schools in Bauchi State, Nigeria.
1.4  Objectives of the Study

This study sought to:

i. Investigate regular teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities in regular secondary schools in Bauchi state.

ii. Assess instructional strategies used by regular teachers in teaching students with disabilities in regular secondary schools.

iii. Explore previous working experience of regular teachers in the selected secondary schools in Bauchi state.

iv. Examine support and provisions given by administrators towards the education of students with disabilities in regular secondary schools.

v. Compare academic performance of students with and without disabilities in regular classrooms in selected secondary schools of Bauchi State.

1.5  Research Questions

i. What is the general attitudes of regular teachers towards students with disabilities in some selected regular secondary schools in Bauchi State?

ii. What are the instructional strategies used by regular teachers in teaching students in regular school settings in Bauchi state?

iii. What is the previous working experience of the regular teachers teaching in the selected secondary schools?

iv. What are the supports and provisions given by administrators towards inclusion of students with disabilities in selected secondary schools?

v. What are the differences between the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in regular classrooms in selected secondary schools of Bauchi state?
1.6 **Significance of the Study**

This study intended to complement existing studies and contribute to a new knowledge gap in the area of inclusive education for individuals with hearing, visual and physical impairments.

Inclusive education was chosen to be a topic of this study because there is a global quest towards inclusion of all persons with disabilities as endorsed by the United Nations policies on the rights of individuals such as the UN Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (1993); the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989 and the current Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 2015-2030.

The findings of the study therefore, may assist the government and policy-makers to improve the existing educational policies on inclusive education for students with hearing, visual and physical impairments. It is expected that the results of this study might be used to enhance the development of an inclusive education curriculum for inclusion of individuals with hearing, visual as well as physical impairments. The results of this study may also facilitate teachers in changing their teaching strategies and attitudes towards including students with hearing, visual and physical impairments in regular classes. It is also expected that, findings of this study will promote collaborative teamwork among personnel in service provision. The study also hopes to form a foundation for further research in the effective implementation of inclusion for individuals with disabilities not only at Bauchi state secondary schools but elsewhere in Nigeria.
1.7 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

1.7.1 Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted in one of the Nigerian States, therefore its findings cannot be generalized.

1.7.2 Delimitations of the Study

Even though there are many subjects taught in secondary schools, this study was narrowed to the evaluation of regular teachers’ attitudes towards the academic performance of learners with disabilities on English language and Mathematics subjects in some selected secondary schools of south, central and north zones of Bauchi State, Nigeria.

1.8 Assumptions of the Study

In this study, the following assumptions were made:

i. Both the regular teachers, learners with disabilities and administrators were willing to participate in the study.

ii. Participants were truthful and honest in their responses to the interviews and questionnaires.

1.9 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

1.9.1 Theoretical Framework

To explain how attitudes are acquired by people as well as how learning takes place in inclusive classrooms, this study was based on the Social Learning Theory of Albert Bandura (1977) supported by Lev Vygotsky’s Guided Learning Theory (1978). According to Scotland (2012), multiple theories can be used in research to support and develop a model.
1.9.1.1 Bandura’s Social Learning Theory.

Bandura’s Social Learning Theory is well recognized for its clarification of how information is acquired by people and how individuals acquire certain attitudes either positive or negative. Bandura maintained that people acquire knowledge through several means, either directly or indirectly. The direct learning may include imitation or modeling from one person to the other. People can also learn indirectly through observation of other peoples’ behavior. He further stressed that almost all learning phenomena emanating from direct experiences of an individual occur through the observation of another person’s behaviors and their outcomes.

Therefore, if an individual can learn through the observation of someone else behaviors, it is rational to arrive at the conclusion that negative or positive attitudes can be obtained through the process of social learning (Antonak & Livneh, 1988).

To clarify this point more, (Ross-Hill, 2009) concluded that attitudes (both negative and positive) are predisposed by every portion of community, society, religion, family, and school interaction. These interactions are constantly occupied by the exchange of direct and indirect learning, which paves way to the formation of attitudes on people or objects. Therefore attitudes towards individuals with disabilities are essential to the accomplishment or otherwise of inclusion process (Ross-Hill, 2009). The Social Learning Theory of Albert Bandura stressed that individuals learn from one another through observation, modeling, and imitation. This is the reason why inclusionists emphasized on this theory because learners with disabilities can observe their colleagues (who do not have disabilities) and their teachers and imitate them behaviorally as well as academically.
In addition to the social learning theory, Lev Vygotsky’s Guided Learning theory also has an impact on inclusion. According to him, the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) indicates that when students are directed by a grown-up or when interacting with more skillful mates, their learning will be more effective. This is because a capable person will collaborate and support the child by helping him to progress from where he is at the moment to where he can reach with help. This person achieves this accomplishment using prompts, cues, encouragement, joint participation, modeling, explanation, leading questions, discussion, and controlling the attention of a child which are all characteristics of inclusion (Miller, 2011). Persons with special needs can learn from their colleagues without disabilities with the support of adult supervision. For instance McDuffie, Scruggs & Mastropieri, (2009) found peer tutoring to be effective for learners with disabilities.

Therefore, Vygotsky’s theory of ‘Zone of Proximal Development’ presents the background for efficient inclusion tutoring and learning in a regular classroom. Going by the theory, ‘learning’ is a trail, and ‘zone’ refers to the space amid things which students can do alone and things that they can do with the support of skilled ones, like colleagues or tutors. With ZPD, the students will be progressing from what they know to what they do not know with the assistance of skilled ones. Going by the above, Rowlands (2006), claims that learning takes place usually when assistance is given.

According to Vygotsky (1986), four stages must be present before learners’ progress reach their zenith development; the first stage is if a students have the capability of performing a task but lack the understanding of how to do it correctly. This stage is like when an individual is learning how to ride a bicycle but does not know where to begin. This beginner needs help from more skilled people to offer good training, until
a time when he/she will start riding the bicycle himself/herself. This knowledge is acquired through dialogue when the training is in progress. Also, the support given to individuals at this stage will be significant for their future development.

Next stage is for him to practice alone with no support from other individuals, although perfection has not been completely accomplished (Pettigrew & Akhurst, 1999).

The third stage is for the student to effectively initiate a certain task, but along the way realized that it will be difficult for him/her to complete, due to inherent reasons, like tension/anxiety, ailment, or any other problem. The student in this situation may require various support from others (Lee, 2000).

The last stage is if the task has been successfully completed, and carried out efficiently in an assimilated manner, which finally indicates that the assignment has been mastered. At this stage, support from skilled ones is no longer required and learning becomes self-regulated. At this stage, the learner will practice and complete an assignment without help or intervention from other individuals. For instance, if individuals are given research projects on a certain topic, they possess the skills and knowledge to do it by following all its required stages and techniques (Pettigrew & Akhurst, 1999).

It is worth nothing that, ZPD assists in knowing the experiences of learners as they progress and also in discovering the responsibility of educators as well as peers in the process. Under this theory, the implementation of inclusion will be discovered through learners’ contact with teachers, classmates, and the school setting in the process of progressing through ZPD.
These two theories emerged relevant to this study as they covered all the variables and clearly described how individuals acquire attitudes and how learning occurs socially and academically in an inclusive setting.
1.10 Conceptual Framework

The relationship between the independent variable (Regular teacher’s attitudes) and its influence on the dependent variable (Academic performance of students with disabilities).

As indicated in Figure 1.1, the independent variable (Regular teachers’ attitudes) affects the dependent variable (academic performance of students with disabilities) through negative or positive attitudes of the teachers, teachers’ working experience, instructional materials and support and provisions by the administrators. More so,
there are certain intervening variables which can also affect the students’ performance such as, curriculum content, means of communication, culture and government policies.
1.11 Definition of Operational Key Terms

**Academic Performance:** is the extent to which students achieve their short or long term educational goals usually measured by examination or continuous assessment.


**Attitudes:** a predisposition or inclination to respond positively or negatively towards a person, object, certain idea, or situation.


**Disability:** functional limitation or a condition that restricts the activity of an individual (IDEA, 2004).

**Evaluation:** is an appraisal of something to determine its worth or fitness.


**Impairment:** is any anomaly whether complete or incomplete loss of the function of the body parts, organs or systems; this may be due directly or indirectly to pathology or injury and may be either temporary or permanent (Keane, 2003)

**Inclusion:** is a process through which the diverse needs of learners are addressed and responded to by increasing their involvement in learning communities and cultures and moderating or eliminating segregation within education. It comprises change and modification in the approaches, content, strategies, and structures with a shared vision which covers all individuals of the appropriate age range, and a belief
that it is the duty of the general system of education to educate all children (UNESCO, 2005).

**Inclusive Education:** is an educational arrangement where all learners share in all facets of ongoing education that will meet his/her unique needs in a regular classroom with similar-aged children (Community Living Ontario, 2015).

**Negative attitudes:** intimidating attitudes demonstrated towards individuals with disabilities. [www.dictionary.reference.com](http://www.dictionary.reference.com) Retrieved 14th August 2015

**Performance:** the accomplishment of a given task measured against preset known standards of accuracy. [www.ehow.com/academic/performance](http://www.ehow.com/academic/performance) Retrieved 28th August 2015.

**Positive attitudes:** encouraging attitudes demonstrated towards individuals with disabilities. [www.dictionary.reference.com](http://www.dictionary.reference.com) Retrieved 14th August 2015

**Special Education Needs:** Refers to some forms of support in education required by an individual with disabilities to carry out a given activity (Ozoji, 2006).

**Physical disability:** is a disorder that limits individual’s physical functioning and results in visible deformity, amputation, or other orthopedic impairments. It is also a limitation on a person's physical functioning, mobility or dexterity @ [www.disability-world.com](http://www.disability-world.com) Retrieved 2nd September 2015
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction
Presented in this chapter is the review of related literature which focuses on the objectives of the study: the teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion; the teachers’ working experience; instructional strategies use by regular education teachers in an inclusive classroom; supports and provisions given by the administrators on inclusive education and the performance of learners with disabilities in an regular school settings.

2.1 An Overview of Inclusive Education

Today, it is widely accepted that inclusion maximizes the potential of vast majority of students, ensures their rights, and is the preferred educational approach for the 21st century. Unfortunately, the philosophy has not always been widely held. Our thinking and acceptance has evolved rapidly over the last century and continues to evolve, in response to political beliefs.

special classes, at first did not exist .later, they were developed as a place for students who could not meet the standard and keep peace with fellow class mates. Many authorities in the field agreed that segregated special classes were not appropriate educational sittings for most students with special needs for it was cleared that educating students with special needs in isolated setting minimized, rather than maximized their potential.

The situation today is thus that a number of initiatives from stakeholder themselves as from various multilateral and lateral organizations NGOs support a growing
consensus that all children have the right to a common education in their locality regardless of their background, attainment or disability. Despite the consensus on the right to education, children with disabilities are still perhaps the group most excluded from schools and within the education system.

Inclusive education has evolved from a movement associated with the struggle against exclusion of learners with disabilities. However, inclusion as such is not a concept that can be clearly and easily defined.

There is a growing consensus globally that all children have the right to be educated. In Nigeria’s National Policy of Education, one of the Nigeria’s philosophies of education says that every Nigerian child shall have a right to equal educational opportunities irrespective of any real or imagined disabilities each according to his or her ability, (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2004). This borders on inclusive education which is a human right issue reflecting on giving equal value, opportunities and ending segregation in separating children with disabilities or those who experience difficulties in learning. Education should be seen by the government as a basic human right and the foundation for a more just and equal society (UNESCO, 2009). This implies that every child, no matter the background, characteristics, need and abilities should be given equal opportunity to learn. Inclusive education necessitates that every learner’s fundamental right be considered as each child has unique abilities and needs. Hence, given the right and equal opportunities, all children can develop their potentials as inclusive education considers differences in the learning and physical abilities of children as opportunities for making education system and schools more responsive and dynamic.
Children with special needs could be seen as those children with situational disadvantages due to physical, mental, or emotional impairments as well as those who experience difficulties in learning at any time during their school age.

Some advantages of inclusive special education is that children who would otherwise not get a chance to study with other children are being offered the opportunity to be educated. Hence, inclusion in education is an approach to educating children or students with special educational needs. Under the inclusion model, students with special needs spend most or all of their timewith non-disabled students (UNESCO, 2003).

Inclusion of learners with disabilities into regular classrooms in the current educational system has become more predominant (Winzer, 1998). Studies conducted in different parts of the world have affirmed that many factors ought to be considered in determining the inclusion success (Huber, Fiorello & Rosenfeld 2001). The most important factors include teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion and teachers’ professional competency in instructing both students with and without special needs (Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; Forlin, 2001). This study therefore, examined one of the factors which is the ‘regular teachers’ attitudes towards students with disabilities and how it affects their academic performance in an inclusive setting.

Inclusion is a philosophy of service delivery which is directly prepared for students with and without special needs. In other words, educating individuals with and without special needs in a general education classroom is what is meant by inclusion or inclusive education. Cooper and Sayeski (2005), maintained a belief that students with disabilities remained part and parcel of a community. Therefore nothing can exclude them from participating in all aspects of that community. York, Doyle &
Kronberg (1992) described inclusion as a value to live in communities where individuals are considered as equal members and by supporting each other to work together in order to exploit individuals’ potential. Lerner (2000), indicated that the philosophical thoughts of inclusion are regularization of persons with disabilities into integrated classes and the removal of all forms of labels for the students with disabilities.

Lerner (2000), proposed that, the term inclusion may have different interpretations among which is enclosure of all students from all classes of disabilities with all levels of severity into a general education classroom (full inclusion), and placement of certain individuals with disabilities into regular classroom from time to time (partial inclusion). Full inclusion model encompasses the breaking down of all instructional systems of special as well as general education, joining them into one instructional system in line with the educational needs of all learners in a classroom (Stainback & Stainback, 1988) and converting educational settings into inclusive communities where everyone is celebrated as a full member (Villa, Thousand, Meyers & Nevin, 1996).

It is without doubt that the differences held towards philosophies of inclusion were tremendously disputed by prominent scholars in the field of inclusive education in many journals, books, and position papers. However, it is evident that up to this moment there is that debate between those supporting full inclusion (Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Reynolds, Walberg & Wang, 1987; Will, 1986 Lily, 1986; McLeskey & Pugach, 1995; Villa et al., 1996) and those supporting partial inclusion (Kauffman, Semmel,& Gerber, 1988; Mesinger, 1985; Zigmond & Baker, 1995;
23 Leiberman, 1985; Vergason & Anderegg, 1989; Roberts & Mather, 1995; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995).

2.1.1 Full Inclusion

In an attempt to support their arguments, full inclusionists (supporters of full inclusion) referred to the lack of practical indications to validate the process of classifying learners and their special programs (Reynolds, Walberg & Wang, 1987). This group of scholars argued that only very little evidence can show that students with disabilities perform better or need a special school setting for their learning to take place (Madden & Slavin, 1983 Gartner & Lipsky, 1987).

Numerous studies conducted in the past have showed that the exclusion of learners with disabilities into segregated classes or schools as the case may be, is detrimental to their social development and academic performance and such students appeared to achieve better in regular classrooms than the segregated settings (Baker, Walberg & Wang, 1995). Shepard, Vojir & Smith (1983), established in their findings that, the procedures of classifying students with disabilities are mostly not consistent or inaccurate. Differentiating between levels of severity of a disability is often not conducted in a sophisticated manner.

Apart from the social benefits, inclusionists have stressed that persons with disabilities could also perform better in regular classrooms beyond their counterparts studying in the special classes or schools. Stainback and Stainback (1992), recommended that, in inclusion programs learners with special needs have the benefit of increased instructional time because they need not to be in resource rooms for extra instructions. Under the inclusion program, regular teachers are saddled with the responsibility of tutoring students with disabilities completely instead of referring
them to resource rooms for further instructions. Researchers have indicated that students with all levels of learning disabilities can be maintained in the regular classroom for the whole school day and their academic achievement level higher when compared with those achieved in segregated classroom settings (Bear & Proctor, 1990; Banerji & Daily, 1995).

Supporters of full inclusion have it in mind that there are social and emotional benefits for students with disabilities when mingled into a regular classroom. Among the social benefits are the opportunities to make friends and free interaction without a feeling of inferiority in mind. By learning in the regular classroom, learners with disabilities will get more time to make and maintain relationships with their normal or non-disabled peers (Stainback & Stainback, 1992). In inclusive classrooms, students with disabilities are less stigmatized and more recognized by their counterparts, and they display more self-confidence than those in special education classes or schools (Stainback & Stainback, 1996; Gartner & Lipsky, 1987).

The provisions of American Public Law desires effective educational services meant for students with disabilities, but it did not in any circumstance need a special education system where students can be educated separately as a result of their disabilities. Gartner and Lipsky (1987), emphasized that unification of general and special educations will require certain fundamental changes and a paradigm shift on the way educators perceive differences among individuals with special needs.

2.1.2 Partial Inclusion

Partial inclusion advocates were of the opinion that, to accomplish a successful inclusion, it would take a tedious curricular and structural changes and educators also ought to be tolerants of the process (Fullan & Miles, 1993). Different researchers
(Kaufman, 1993; Vaughn & Schumm, 1995; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Zigmond, 2003; Kaufman & Mock, 2002; Roberts & Mather, 1995;) in the field of inclusive education have expressed concerns on whether or not full inclusion will be suitable for all students. These researchers have emphasized on the impact of sustaining a variety of services for individuals with disabilities outside the regular classroom base on the following reasons.

(a) The advocates of partial inclusion believe that there is insufficient research and preparation on how to handle learners with different categories of disabilities and their severity level in regular education setting by regular teachers (Messinger, 1985; Lieberman, 1985; Kaufman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988; Vergason & Anderegg, 1989).

(b) They maintain that most of the students with disabilities particularly those with very severe or profound conditions may require individualized educational program (IEP) and explicit instruction, which is believed by these scholars to be complex and challenging to provide in a regular school setting.

(c) Children with disabilities may occasionally require different services which cannot be achieved by general education teachers (such as physical therapy, speech therapy) and it is not fair to deny such services as a result of full inclusion system.

Kaufman (1995), emphasized that if learners with special needs are to remain in an inclusive classroom fully, then regular teachers must meet their educational needs irrespective of their disability which is certainly difficult to be provided. Above all, the accessibility of a range of services (partial inclusion) was authorized since 1975, and it replicates the desires of many instructors, paternities, and lawmakers and a
noncompliance with it will amount to the violation of the students’ civil rights (Kauffman & Hallahan, 1995).

Advocates of partial inclusion went further to argue that, even though some researchers endorsed the positive trends of inclusion agendas (Banerji & Dailey, 1995; Baker, Walberg & Wang, 1995; Bear & Proctor, 1990), other researchers reported an unsatisfactory and substandard academic and social accomplishment through inclusion programs (Zigmond & Baker, 1990; Fox & Ysseldyke, 1997). In their studies, Roberts & Mather (1995), established that if provided with proper support, some of the individuals with learning disabilities will be able to benefit in the general education setting, but other students who have a severe or profound learning difficulties may require more rigorous services, which cannot be provided in general education classrooms. It is without a doubt that inclusion can be advantageous for some learners with disabilities, but it is pertinent to know that not all students with disabilities can fully profit from inclusion.

2.1.3 Benefits of Inclusive Education for Students without Disabilities

It is without doubt that, inclusive education affords a variety of social as well as academic benefits for students with special needs through interacting with their counterparts. Such benefits include higher achievement in language and positive relationships with normal peers among others.

On the contrary, many teachers and parents have concerns that the inclusion of students with special needs will disfavor the non-disabled students in regular classroom. They worried that the accommodations, modifications and provisions that students with special needs want in inclusive settings would obstruct the learning of their children without disabilities (Peltier, 1997). In spite of these fears, different
researches had confirmed that, including learners with special needs into general education classrooms does not in any way harm students without disabilities. Instead, it may even earn them some social as well as academic benefits.

Quite a lot of contemporary researches indicated a neutral or positive impacts on students without disabilities of being taught in the same classrooms with students having disabilities. In the year 2007, scholars from the University of Manchester analytically assessed a huge number of researches by focusing on the consequences of educating both students in inclusive classrooms. After reviewing twenty six (26) research works that were done in Canada, Ireland, Australia and the United States, the researchers established that fifty eight percent (58%) of the studies indicated students without disabilities to experience no effects. While twenty three percent (23%) of the studies portrayed them to have positive effects towards their academic performance for being taught together with students with special needs (Kalambouka, Farrell, Dyson, & Kaplan, 2007).

Another research review also showed that inclusive education was linked with either neutral or positive effects towards the academic performance of normal students, (Ruijs & Peetsma 2009). In inclusion, teachers tend to employ variety of instructional strategies in addressing the educational needs of all students in the classroom. Therefore, among the reviewed studies by Ruijs & Peetsma (2009) three, reported positive results, the researchers noted that the instructors used instructional strategies and teaching methods that met the educational needs of all learners. This therefore shows that, quality of instructional approach employed by teacher in teaching plays a vital role in influencing the success of normal students than whether or not the learners were educated together with individuals with special needs.
Research from large-scale longitudinal studies in several countries (including the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and Finland) also showed that the inclusion of students with special needs does not lead to negative consequences for normal students. Examining the reading achievement of 3rd grade students in the United States from Kindergarten Unit, Gandhi (2007) established no indication that normal students were negatively affected for being taught together with learners with disabilities.

A research conducted by Farrell, Dyson, Polat, Hutcheson & Gallannaugh (2007), primary and secondary school students of British showcased no practically meaningful relationship between the percentage of students with special needs in a school and the academic performance of students without disabilities in that school. Friesen, Hickey & Krauth (2010) studied students of 4th and 7th grades and found a similar conclusion. They established that having students with learning and behavioral problems in an inclusive classroom did not in any way affected the reading and numeracy examination scores of students without disabilities. Their findings supported the study of Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin (2002) who found that the quantity of students with special needs in a mainstreamed classroom was not related with the academic accomplishment of normal students.

While, in another study, Waldron & Cole (2000), in their study conducted in Indiana State of United States, established positive influences of inclusive education on the improvement of the academic achievements of students without disabilities in mathematics. 59% of normal students in inclusive classrooms got higher scores in mathematics exam in contrast to the previous year, while only 39% of students without disabilities in general education schools had similar achievements.
Critics of inclusive education were of the opinion that disorderly behavior of students with severe emotional disabilities may divert the attention of teachers away from concentrating on the academic achievements of all students. Even though most of the research reviewed in this studies show that inclusive instruction yields positive or neutral effects on the academic success of students without disabilities, there are some indication that the including many students with severe emotional disorders in one classroom can yield distinctive challenges for teachers skills (Fletcher, 2010).

2.1.4 Benefits of Inclusive Education for Students with Disabilities

For long, research indicated that instructing learners with special needs in inclusive settings was effective and can yield a very good social and academic benefits for both students with and without disabilities.

Hehir, Grindal, & Eidelman, (2012) studied the academic performance of about 68,000 primary and secondary school learners with special needs in Massachusetts State. The authors, after identifying many factors that positively encourage the academic performance of students, such as quality of school, income of the family, and fluency in English language, they also found that students with special needs who spent most of their school day together with their normal counterparts performed excellently more than students with similar special needs who spent a little or few of their school day together with normal peers. This has been proved even with children in pre-primary educational programs. A research was conducted where 757 three and four year-old children were studied in the Midwestern U.S. the researchers found that pupils with special needs benefited significantly the language skills from attending early childhood program with students with disabilities (Justice, Logan, Lin, & Kaderavek, 2014).
The evidence noticing the academic benefits of inclusion was not restricted to the United States only. Researchers in other countries such as Norway surveyed about 500 students with disabilities in secondary school for approximately six years. After efficient control of other factors associated with students’ accomplishment, they established that students who were educated in inclusive settings were more likely to get good results than those educated in a segregated special classes (Myklebust, 2007). Another study done in the Netherlands, Peetsma, Vergeer, Roeleveld, & Karsten (2001), compared the academic progress of about 200 seven and eight year-old students with behavioral and learning disorders who were enrolled in regular and special education programs. The students were followed for four years and their findings showed that, included students with disabilities out-performed their counterpart in special education programs.

2.1.5 Attitudes

An attitude as a term was introduced in 1862 by a British psychologist Herbert Spencer as indicated by Allport, (1954) in his book “The nature of prejudice”. Throughout the years, many definitions of attitudes arose, but almost all the scholars concurred that some mechanisms of attitudes remain equal such as attitude is learned from others; attitudes differ in quality and amount; attitudes are constant (even rigid); attitudes are multifaceted behaviorally and attitudes are complex (Antonak & Livneh 1988).

Rao, (2004) revealed that a huge number of attitudes definitions have been pronounced, but there is no single acceptable definition. While some definitions are operationally inconsistent and abstract, others are based on a certain component of cognition, behavior or affect. Attitudes comprise of three key components of affect,
behavior, and cognition termed as the ABCs of attitudes. Affect means the emotions of attitudes (e.g., likes and dislikes), behavior describes actions that are associated with internal attitudes while cognition explains how formation and association of an attitudes towards an idea or object are kept (Slininger, Sherrill, Jankowski, 2000).

An attitude has been defined by Katz, (1960) as “predisposition of the individual to evaluate some symbols or objects or aspects of his world in a favorable or unfavorable manner.” Allport based his definition on affect component and defined attitudes as the degree of affect toward or against an object or values. While Hilgard and Atkinson (1967) described attitudes as “an orientation towards or away from some object, concept, or situation, and a readiness to respond in a predetermined manner to these, or related objects, concepts, or situations.”

Other researchers including Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachev (1962), in their definition emphasized on behavior and affect, and they affirmed that attitudes are continuing systems of negative and positive evolutions and feeling of emotions with regard to a social phenomenon. Even though abstract in several definitions, an attitude has been recognized as a concrete threat for learners with special needs.

2.2 Factors that Influence Attitudes in School

Some of the demographic categories identified as having an impact on attitudes towards students with disabilities in schools include disability type, gender, level of education, cultural orientation, contact level, year in school and working experience.

2.2.1 Disability Type and Teachers’ Attitudes towards Academic Performance of Students with Disabilities

Stovall and Sedlacek (1983) explored the linkage between the type of disability and situation when they evaluated the attitudes of college students towards individuals
with orthopedic disabilities. Their study proved that, students studying in colleges displayed more positive attitudes to special needs students in wheelchairs than those with other disabilities such as visual impairment. These findings also proved that the types of disability influences attitudes formation. In another study, Parashar, Chan, & Leierer (2008), found that disability type of a person contributes to the attitudes formation towards him/her. Several studies were conducted in relation to teachers’ attitudes towards students’ type of disability. Cook (2001), related the attitudes of teachers towards students with severe disability to those with mild disabilities. The findings indicated that students with particular behavioral disorders or learning disabilities were chosen more significantly by the teachers for inclusion, than those with other disabilities (e.g., multiple disabilities, cognitive, orthopedic, visual, hearing, and autism).

Alghazo & Naggar-Gaad (2004), pointed out that teachers maintained a more affirmative attitudes towards students with specific learning difficulties, physical disabilities and visual impairment than those with cognitive. This therefore, indicated that many teachers maintained unfavorable attitudes towards including students with mental disabilities and behavioral difficulties. However, Glaubman & Lifshitz (2001), posited that teachers were of different attitudes with regards to a type of disability. They went further to point out that teachers display the greatest readiness towards the inclusion of learners with physical disabilities.

Lifshitz, Issawi & Glaubman (2004), upheld that the attitudes of teachers varied with regards to the disability type. Most of the teachers maintained affirmative attitudes towards inclusion of individuals with mild behavior and emotional disorders, learning disabilities, hearing and visual impairments. From their findings, the lowest score was
obtained among students with severe/profound mental retardation as well as emotional and behavioral disorders.

Children with learning difficulties make up the largest group of children with special needs. Learning difficulties range from mild, through moderate and severe, to profound and multiple learning difficulties. Children with severe, profound, and multiple learning difficulties are small in number compared with those who have mild or moderate learning difficulties who make up the majority of this group. Children identified as having mild learning difficulties experience problems in acquiring basic literacy and numeracy skills. Children with moderate learning difficulties are, in addition, likely to have delayed speech and language development, poor social skills, and also may exhibit emotional or behavioral difficulties. Children with severe learning difficulties are likely to have substantial problems in all these areas as well as possible problems in learning basic self-help skills such as dressing and toileting. Children with profound or multiple learning difficulties will encounter major challenges in acquiring all of the above skills.

2.2.2 Gender and Teachers’ Attitudes towards Academic Performance of Students with Disabilities

Studies conducted on males and females attitudes towards disabilities, yielded different outcomes. Although most of the previous researchers portrayed the attitudes of female teachers to be favorable towards persons with disabilities, the discrepancies in attitudes between males and females declined (Yuker, 1994). Subsequently, some recent studies recorded no difference in attitudes exists between the two genders while other findings are constantly upholding the differences in attitudes between genders showcasing females to have more accommodating attitudes than males especially in
the United States (Upton & Harper, 2000; Hunt & Hunt, 2000). Gething (1991) documented that females had extensively more encouraging attitudes towards individuals with disabilities than their male counterparts in Australia. The study also revealed that, even when the attitudes of students of various age groups were compared, female students appeared to display more positive attitudes. Studies done in Japan and France established no variation between the genders while in Denmark, India and Israel, male students displayed more favorable attitudes than the female ones (Yuker & Block, 1986).

Upton and Harper (2002), studied undergraduate students’ attitudes towards students with disabilities. Their study investigated many important factors that influence attitudes formation, among which gender was inclusive. After studying 852 normal students as well as 71 students with disabilities, their findings showed that female students displayed more favorable attitudes than male students. They concluded that though female students showcased more positive attitudes and students who were newly enrolled had more favorable attitudes than the returning ones. Rao (2004), reviewed literature on the studies of attitudes and found gender to be a vital factor, which could encourage attitudes formation among students. Rao resolved that though gender contributes in attitudes formation, level of individual’s education did not in any way affect females’ attitudes towards disabilities.

Alghazo & Naggar-Gaad (2004), in a different study established a momentous variance between teachers who are male and female regarding including learners with disabilities in a regular classroom. The result found male teachers to show unfavorable attitudes towards inclusion.
Opdal, Wormes, & Habayeb (2001), found that female teachers appeared to be more accommodating towards inclusion than male teachers. Their study revealed that of the 59% of the male teachers supported inclusion of learners with disabilities into regular classrooms, while female teachers were 69% supportive to the idea of inclusion in their answers. On the other hand, the above results appeared to go contrary to the findings of Parasuram, (2006) who indicated that no differences existed between the two genders towards inclusion of individuals with disabilities.

2.2.3 Years of Study and Teachers’ Attitudes towards Academic Performance of Students with Disabilities

Almost all the studies conducted on students’ attitudes towards inclusion measured the impact of years in school on those attitudes (Asmus & Galloway, 1985; Semmel & Dickson, 1966; Antonak; 1981). Most of the studies established that students’ years in school contributed to predisposed attitudes towards students with disabilities. Upton & Harper (2002) and Pitman & Slate (1994), concluded that more of years study for student lead to positive attitudes he/she would display in dealing to students with disabilities. The finding also revealed that attitudes could possibly differ between postgraduates and undergraduate students because the duration they may spend in school appeared to have an influence on their attitudes. Yuker (1994), discovered that higher level of education was associated with favorable attitudes towards students with special needs in America.

2.2.4 Professional Training and Teachers’ Attitudes towards Academic Performance of Students with Disabilities

A number researchers emphasized on importance of pre-service and in-service teacher training programs in relation to the attitudes of teachers towards an inclusion of
learners with disabilities. Avramidis & Kalyva (2007), established that teachers who spend long-term in training maintained more favorable attitudes in comparison to those served for a short term or no training at all. Their finding indicated that the more knowledgeable a teachers are about disability, the more favorable their attitudes may be towards inclusive education and persons with disabilities. Attitudes of teachers are also influenced by the knowledge and information they have about individuals with disabilities. Batsiou, Bebetsos, Panteli & Antoniou (2008), established a good association between knowledge and attitudes as well as information and attitudes. Lifshitz, Glaubman, & Issawi (2004), examined the effects of in-service training on teachers’ attitudes. The findings confirmed that after teachers participated in an in-service training their attitudes changed and their scores on the attitudes scale improved significantly.

This is contrary to the findings of Wilkins & Nietfeld (2004), who recorded that no variation existed among the two groups, the experimental group (who participated in the in-service training) and the control group. Their findings revealed that the in-service training given to the teachers did not in any way impact on their attitudes towards inclusion programs.

In another study, the effects of in-service teacher training program on attitudes of teachers towards inclusion was evaluated (Wilkins & Nietfeld 2004). The findings of the study showed that knowledge increment leads to the change of teachers’ attitudes from unfavorable to favorable attitudes towards inclusion of deaf students into a regular classroom. The experimental group who attended the in-service training program got significantly higher scores during the post-test which is relatively higher than their score during the pre-test.
Similar results were recorded by Kim, Snel & Park (2005), who investigated the influence of written information on the attitudes of teachers towards inclusion programs. They distributed a weekly bulletin to general education teachers who served as the experimental group. The newsletters contained news on special education, students with disabilities, information from special needs classrooms, and feedback on inclusion from teachers of integrated classes. The findings of the study revealed that teachers who read the bulletin displayed more encouraging attitudes towards inclusion of persons with disabilities than those who did not read the newsletter.

2.2.5 Teachers’ Attitudes towards Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

In the USA, a study was conducted by Kenneth, Linscott, & Galis (1996), a total of 714 teachers and middle school principals were randomly chosen to respond to questions about the inclusion of learners with disabilities. The result revealed that principal and special education teachers appeared to display more encouraging attitudes than the regular teachers.

Leyser, Keller & Kapperman (1994), conducted a study which cut across different cultures on the teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion in Germany, USA, Ghana, Israel, Philippines, and Taiwan. Their finding indicated that there were huge dissimilarities in attitudes to inclusion among these countries. In the United States, teachers were found to hold the most positive attitudes towards inclusion. The positive attitudes of teachers in the United States was ascribed to the knowledge of the American public law. The attitudes of teachers were found to be less positive in Philippines, Germany, Ghana, Taiwan and Israel (Leyser et al., 1994).
In Ghana, as in many parts of Africa, culture, social status, and religion had interacted and influenced people's perceptions and attitudes towards disability (Tahidu, 2014). In a study conducted on the attitudes of students towards persons with disabilities in Ghana, Slikker (2009), concluded that teachers and students held an unfavorable attitudes towards students with special needs. In another study, Ocloo & Subbeya (2008), examined the factors that predisposed teachers’ views, attitudes, and perceptions towards the inclusion of individuals with disabilities into regular classrooms. The findings indicated that most of the teachers had information on inclusion, had a favorable attitudes towards it, but complained that insufficient resources would make its implementation difficult (Ocloo & Subbeya, 2008).

In Nigeria, Fakolade et al. (2009), conducted research on attitudes of teachers towards learners with disabilities in an inclusive setting. The findings revealed that female teachers were found to maintain more encouraging attitudes towards inclusion of learners with disabilities than male teachers.

For inclusive program to be fruitful, teachers’ attitudes are important as indicated by Cochran (1998) and Forlin (1997), that the success of including students with special needs into general education classrooms depend largely on the favorable manners of teachers towards such students. Many studies were conducted on the teachers’ attitudes towards persons with disabilities, but few were done in Northern Nigeria, and none was found by the researcher to have been undertaken in Bauchi state. The researcher, therefore, filled the gap by evaluating the attitudes of regular teachers towards students with disabilities in selected secondary schools of Bauchi State.
2.3 Instructional Strategies Used by Teachers

Schmidt, Greenman, and Rozendal (2002), identified that if inclusive classrooms are really intended to be different from the regular classrooms where students with special needs were removed as a result of poor achievement, then a thorough examination of instructional strategies, context and content of what will be taught must be done. Their study also identified several mechanisms that convert a regular classroom into an inclusive one. In such setting, students’ needs are accomplished and teachers are prepared to make the necessary adjustments in their instructional methods and use of teaching/learning materials (Schmidt, Rozendal, Greenman, 2002).

A huge number of researchers have concentrated on the best instructional strategies to be employed in teaching students in an inclusive classroom. The researchers, however, differ in the phrases they use in describing their findings. King-Sears (1997), referred his research as 'best academic practice for inclusive classroom,' Schmidt, Rozendal, & Greeman (2002), called it ‘research-based practices for inclusion,’ and King-Sears & Cummings (1996), referred to it as ‘inclusive practices of classroom teachers.’ These researchers specified that teachers who displayed negative attitudes towards inclusion tend to employ less effective instructional strategies, which result in increasingly poor performance of learners with disabilities who were included in inclusive classrooms (Nutter, 2011). Bender, Vail, & Scott (1995) investigated the types of instructional strategies that were implemented in mainstreamed classrooms, and how the use of instructional strategies relates to teachers' attitudes towards mainstreaming.

Bender (1990) established that, teachers who maintained favorable attitudes towards mainstreaming, tended to report more frequent use of significant instructional
strategies than teachers with more negative attitudes towards mainstreaming and that negative attitudes towards mainstreaming appear to have a direct link to the infrequent use of instructional strategies that are useful in facilitating mainstreaming. In addition, Bender (1990) suggests that although the results did not indicate any direction of causal effects, there appears to be the possibility of a potentially negative interaction cycle through which teachers who are less positive about mainstreaming utilize effective teaching strategies less often which in turn may contribute to a decrease in their mainstreaming efforts, thereby resulting in their attitudes about mainstreaming becoming even more cynical.

According to Mastropieri & Scruggs (2004), the views and attitudes of regular teachers about teaching students with disabilities are learned and seem to be inclined to the level of one’s education and previous contact that the teacher has regarding a certain person or group of persons. Keenan (1997), contended that whenever a teacher increases his knowledge on the process of integrating learners with disabilities and the channels of addressing the students’ needs, such an individual is minimizing the level of his negative attitudes towards inclusion. In another perspectives, some researchers revealed that most of the teachers are not sure of meeting the student's needs in an inclusive setting even after undergoing a staff development training. Some teachers doubt whether they are competent to handle the students and whether the support and resources needed for the program were adequately provided (Kearney & Durand, 1992 and Avramidis, Burden & Bayliss, 2000).

Different instructional strategies were suggested to be helpful in working with students in inclusive classrooms. However, researchers stressed that excellent teaching is not only a technique of teaching but rather sequences of activities and
processes, which can be chained to a variety of methods of teaching. A good and efficient instruction strategy involves planning, implementing strategies, managing, delivering, and assessing instructional outcome (Ysseldyke & Salvia, 1995). Some of the instructional strategies include but are not limited to:

2.3.1 **Teacher Directed Instruction**

There are two instructional strategies (Explicit instruction and Strategy instruction) concerning the theme of teacher-guided teaching because both methods share the common features of teacher directions, participation, planning, and implementation.

2.3.1.1 **Explicit Instruction**

Explicit teaching is one of the teachers directed instruction. For students with learning problems to understand new information, such new information needs to be instructed clearly with a good connection and linkage with the content already taught in order not to complicate the new knowledge with the previous one (Kame’enui & Simmons, 1999). Concepts, ideas, and skills are addressed in an understandable, direct and sequential manner that encourages the student to master the content. Using an explicit teaching, teachers present a description of a concept or idea and then monitor the students over the learning processes, by giving them many chances of independent training to guarantee mastery and generalization of the knowledge acquired (Mercer & Mercer, 2001). If students with special needs have successfully achieved better results in an inclusive setting, almost all the need elements concerning explicit instruction which includes guided practice, demonstration, self-practice, active student participation, and useful linkage between content ought to be transformed to real life activity (Kings-Sears, 1997).
2.3.1.2 Strategy Instruction

Students need strategies to efficiently and effectively study new information and resolve problems. Learners with and without disabilities are required to be educated on explicit strategies which would help them learn new information even though some students often develop strategies independently (Rosenberg, McLesky & Westling, 2008). Many teachers model and instruct students on different methods, tools, techniques or techniques that allow them to finish assignments successfully using strategy instruction. The aim of using strategy instruction is to equip the students academically so that they can be independent learners. While using strategy instruction technique, teachers are required to exemplify the use of the strategy and give them sufficient time to have rehearsals on using strategy tasks effectively (Mercer & Mercer, 2001). Strategy instruction is in some instances described using terms such as self-monitoring, self-questioning strategies, conspicuous strategies, and metacognitive strategies.

Mnemonics are another strategy instruction taught to students who have difficulties in remembering essential information. Students are helped to associate information into significant embedded words by using different tactics such as using sentence mnemonic, rhyme mnemonic, making memorable associations, using first-letter mnemonics or creating mental images (Rosenberg, McLesky & Westling, 2008). BODMAS is an instance on how first-letter mnemonic is used to aid students in remembering the rules of ordering in mathematics. BODMAS means Brackets, Orders, Division, Multiplication, Addition and Subtraction. Researchers such as Fontana, Mastropieri & Scruggs (2007), have found mnemonics to be extremely important in improving the memory of students as well as assisting them to remember information simply. Mastropieri & Scruggs (2000), examined a meta-analysis of
thirty four tests including the use of mnemonic approaches for learners with mild learning disabilities; the findings recorded an excellent level of success.

2.3.2 Collaboration

Collaborative strategies established during the regular education initiative movement and mainstreaming as a method of supporting persons with disabilities into regular classrooms. Collaboration is when most of the school members of staff jointly support themselves by working together in providing a curriculum which will address the educational needs of all students (Pugach & Johnson 1995). Ordinarily, with collaboration, all the teaching and the non-teaching staff would deliberate and share thoughts together on ways to help students succeed in their classes.

Pugach & Johnson (1995) mentioned five vital factors for actualization of collaboration: appreciating individuals’ intelligence and contribution; replicating about specialized practices and varying measures based on careful study of advantages and consequences; appreciating the communal nature of cooperative problem resolving, although challenging; recognizing the improved creativeness that such dual efforts often yield and identifying the need for combined effort to accomplish compound goals. By studying the teachers’ collaboration in three years consecutively, Pugach & Johnson (1995), established that teachers who participated in collaboration exercise drastically reduced their numbers of referring to teachers with special education training and therefore emerged more self-confident in instructing students with special needs.

2.3.3 Co-Teaching

Co-teaching is an instructional strategy in which the special and general education teachers deliver the teaching together to all learners. Bauwens & Hourcade (1991),
explained 3 categories of co-teaching: supportive learning activities, complementary teaching, and team teaching. Under team teaching all the instructors conjointly design and teach the students the equal content together. In complementary teaching, the regular teachers are responsible for instructing the students a precise content, while the special education teacher instructs exact strategies or services (e.g., summarizing main idea, note taking). Lastly, under supportive teaching, the special teachers design the content to be taught and objectives together while the regular teacher teaches the lesson and special education teacher will be consolidating and inspiring the content by using supportive learning activities. Many studies affirmed that students with disabilities had recorded positive results in co-taught classes (Margiera & Zigmond, 2005). Co-teaching of students with and without disabilities is well recognized as instructional methods and has a lesser teacher/students ratio for the reason of partaking two teachers in the same classroom at the same time (Cook & Friend 1996).

Margiera & Zigmond (2005), established that students with special needs get more coaching in a co-taught classroom, but fewer contact period with the regular teacher whenever the special education teacher is available in the classroom teaching. The most effective factor leading to the students’ success in the co-teaching method is the planning together of regular and special education teacher who engaged on co-teaching (Bear and Proctor, 1990).

2.3.4 Parallel Instruction

Differentiated (or parallel) instruction, is one of the greatest approaches on inclusion of individuals with and without disabilities in an inclusive classroom where goals, curricula, pace, methods, or conceptual level of teaching accomplishments are diverse according to individual needs (King-Sears, 1997). Many studies confirmed the efficiency of parallel instruction. For instance, Ryndak, Morrison & Sommerstein
(1999), found out that students achieve outstandingly when integrated into regular classrooms and had tasks reformed to their intellectual/capability levels. Another study also proved that parallel instruction increases the attitudes of learners without special needs that their peers with disabilities are a full members of the class and study like they do, which leads to a better understanding (McDonnell, Thorson & McQuivey, 2000).

2.3.5 Community-based Instruction

Community-based instruction is the involvement of the community natural setting as well as utilization of its resources for teaching. This form of instruction has been supported in many inclusion manuscripts for its significance in dealing with students with developmental disabilities for their difficulties in generalizing their learning to a new setting (Meyer & Fisher, 1999; Mercer, 2001). Normal students also profit from the opportunities they get of applying the knowledge and skills they gained in the classroom practically (Mercer, 2001).

2.3.6 Instructional Grouping

Instructional grouping denotes the ways teachers place students while teaching. Under it are: small group instruction, cooperative learning and peer tutoring. When different instructional grouping are used by regular instructors in teaching students, the knowledge gained is frequently more concentrated on individualized needs than entire group tutoring (Vaughn, Gersten, & Chard, 2000). Using this method will also pave way for more practices and improve the opportunities for students to express what they have learnt after lessons (Vaughn, Gersten, & Chard, 2000).
2.3.6.1 Cooperative Learning

Slavin (1995), opined that cooperative learning is a process where students learn together and become responsible for the learning of their team-mates. Usually, the groups or teams are made up of students who are of lower achievement, average or moderate achievement and those with high achievement levels. The group/team will also consist of girls and boys, as well as students from varied ethnic inclinations (Slavin, 1995). Teachers usually step away from leading instruction when using cooperative learning; instead, the teachers transform to guide and encourage students to be active and focused learners. An instance of cooperative learning is joining a group of four or five students work together on an assignment or homework after entire teamwork or students to conduct a research on any topic of interest with every student assigned a specific responsibility to carry out as a participant in the group. Cooperative learning was proven to be effective in improving the quantity and quality of educational achievement for individuals with and without disabilities in an inclusive setting (Udvari-Solner & Thousand, 1996). Regarding academic accomplishment, cooperative learning displayed progressive effects on students’ ability to work cooperatively, self-esteem, attitudes towards school, and intergroup relations (Slavin, 1991). Finally, Slavin (1991), studied several researches on cooperative learning and conveyed that thirty-seven out of forty-four studies showcased momentous effects of cooperative learning when compared to traditional methods.

2.3.6.2 Peer Tutoring

Peer tutoring as defined by Mercer & Mercer (2001), is an instructional planning in which instructor divides the learners into two groups of tutor-tutee. The peer tutor assists the student tutee to learn, review academic skills or practice. Under this
approach, it is the responsibility of the teacher to select the academic tasks and offer the tutoring resources to be used. Even though the emphasis of peer tutoring is to improve academic abilities of the students, it also promotes social services, confident interactions between the students, and self-confidence for both students who participated in the lesson (Mercer & Mercer, 2001). Peer tutoring method can be used by all students either those who are within the same age limit or across different age groups. Elbaum, Moody, Hughes, Schumm, & Vaughn (2000), found that when students with special needs acted as tutor on reading, irrespective of whether it is in a same-age situation or cross-age it is associated with very high outcome than when such students acted as a tutee. Some examples of peer tutoring tasks include but not limited to reading sentences, spelling words, solving math problems or writing. Fuchs & Fuchs (1997), found that students with disabilities improved in the reading skills (in an inclusive schools) by employing different peer tutoring methods.

2.3.6.3 Small Group Instruction

Small group instruction ordinarily involves 3 to 7 students with comparable needs in an exact academic area. In making comparison between large group instruction and small group instruction models, Mercer & Mercer (2001) and Elbaum et al. (2000), mentioned some benefits of small group instruction which include: Students would be able to engage more and develop at their own pace; it allows for individualized instruction; teacher monitoring and feedback as well as more student-teacher interactions; teachers will be able to offer feedback and observe the progress of the students better.

The literature was reviewed in which some of the instructional strategies in teaching students in an inclusive school were discussed. These include teacher-directed
instruction, collaboration, co-teaching, parallel instruction and instructional grouping appeared among the effective instructional strategies while including students with special needs. However, inclusive education can never be fruitful with a single method of instruction (King-Sears, 1997). Marzano (2007), indicated that, no study which singled out instructional strategies that will always be appropriate for every student, in every classroom and on every subject. The best research done was informing teachers the strategies that were already used and displayed a good chance of working properly with students. It is therefore, the role of every classroom teacher to decide on instructional strategies to be used by considering his mind his students, content area, time of the day among other things (Marzano, 2007). Despite a large amount of effective and efficient instructional methods available in teaching all students in an inclusive classroom, it had been established that some strategies are applied in an inclusive setting by regular teachers (Malouf & Schiller, 1995; Schumm, Andergg & Vergason 1989). Finally, Marzano, (2007) stressed that successful teaching is only a combination of knowledge in a huge collection of instructional strategies with a deep understanding of the needs of every student in the class at a specific time.

This research therefore, investigated the instructional strategies used by the regular teachers in some selected secondary schools piloting inclusive education.

2.3.7 Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive strategies are methods used by teachers to help students know the ways they can employ in learning. This approach of training entails clear teaching and drilling of learners toward thinking abilities through which they can improve and improvise ways that can assist them to learn. Instructors using metacognitive
strategies in teaching can certainly influence the academic performance of students with special needs positively (McLeskey, Rosenberg & Westling, 2013). Three among the most effective types of metacognitive strategies include but not limited to Study Skills, Concept Mapping and Reciprocal Teaching (Hornby 2014).

**2.3.7.1 Study Skills**

Under this are the skills which can assist learners to comprehend, synthesis and retrieve a learning task. It comprises of skills such as note-taking, summarizing, organization, using checklists, as well as learning various techniques for memory improvement such as mnemonics and rehearsal (Mitchell 2014).

**2.3.7.2 Concept Mapping**

Concept mapping which is also known as graphic organizers or semantic mapping is an instructional approach that can be used in all subject. Concept mapping is mainly suitable for children who have learning disabilities. It can be used at the start of a lesson to set out the concepts and vocabulary involved in the subject to be taught.

**2.3.7.3 Reciprocal Teaching**

Reciprocal teaching was founded by Palincsar & Brown (1984) who also conducted trials to determine its efficiency. They found that seventy percent (70%) of students advanced their knowledge of what they read after reciprocal teaching. Reciprocal teaching uses the skills of generating questions, text summarizing and clarifying, (Gilroy & Moore 2010). Each of these sub-strategies is used as a means of aiding students to construct meaning from text.
2.4 Regular Teachers’ Working Experience

According to Minke, Griffin, Deemer, & Bear (1996), the previous working experience of a teacher with persons with disabilities whether in an inclusive classroom or special school can yield an affirmative result on teacher’s attitudes towards inclusion. The study investigated 185 regular teachers who were teaching in traditional classrooms as well as seventy one regular teachers and sixty four special education teachers who taught together in an inclusive school. The findings revealed that the regular and special education teachers who taught together in an inclusive classroom held the most favorable attitudes of integration than the regular education teachers in traditional classroom settings. The researchers therefore, resolved that the regular teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion may change (to the encouraging manners) by having some years of working experience with students with special needs, (Minke et al., 1996).

Giangreco et al. (2005), conducted a study consisting of nineteen regular teachers from ten government owned schools in Vermont. The regular teachers interviewed initially maintained an unfavorable attitudes towards the inclusion. However, after some time when the teachers interacted with the students, the attitudes of seventeen out of the nineteen teachers changed to favorable attitudes (Giangreco et al., 2005). The researchers finally concluded that, having direct contact with students with disabilities will be a means of attitudes transformation from unfavorable to favorable.

Forlin (2001), examined the possible factors teachers should consider when including students with disabilities. The researcher surveyed a group of five hundred and seventy one primary school teachers on four areas. The results of the study revealed that the professional competence of teachers, which comprise the teacher’s concern in
maintaining a good instruction for all students in their respective classrooms, became an area of stress for the teachers. The findings of the study further indicated more years of working familiarity helped in the stress reduction towards instructing students with disabilities.

Alghazo & Naggar-Gaad (2004) found that teachers who have teaching experiences of one to five years appeared to show a significant positive attitudes towards including individuals with special needs in comparison with the other teachers who have six to eleven years of working experience and also those that worked for twelve or more years of experience. Also Glaubman & Lifshitz (2001), showed that teachers whose teaching experience is 1–10 years were found to have a significantly more favorable attitudes in dealing with learners with disabilities than teachers with teaching experience of 11 years and above.

Experience with inclusion has been portrayed by many researchers as elements which influence attitudes of teachers towards including persons with disabilities. Avramidis & Kalyva (2007), revealed that differences exist even between schools who had more experience and those schools with very little or no experiences with inclusion. As indicated above, teachers with inclusion experience displayed more accommodating attitudes towards including students with disabilities than other teachers having very little or no experience at all. Kalyva, Tsakiris, & Gojkovic (2007) arrived at a similar position in their study of Serbian teachers attitudes towards students with disabilities. The findings showed that teachers who have past knowledge in teaching students with disabilities were more affirmative in comparison with those who had no experience.

Everington, Winters & Steven (1999) also established that teachers with previous experience hold more favorable attitudes towards inclusion than those without or with
very little experience. Opdal, Wormæs, & Habayeb (2001), established that among teachers who had previous knowledge in handling students with disabilities (29%) were favorable towards inclusive education whereas only (9%) of the teachers without experience were positive. Batsiou, Bebetsos, Panteli, & Antoniou (2008), showed a significant positive relationship amongst teachers’ attitudes and teachers’ experience demonstrating that teachers’ favorable attitudes is mostly defended on their previous experience.

Apart from experience with inclusion, the previous interaction with persons with disabilities also gives an impression to the attitudes of teachers. Teachers who had contact with individuals with disabilities as family members, friends and classmates displayed more helpful attitudes towards including them than teachers who did not interact with anybody with a disability (Parasuram 2006).

Previous working experience with students with disabilities tends to be helpful towards molding the teachers’ attitudes towards students with disabilities. There are no studies that show the impact of regular teachers’ working experience towards the performance of students with disabilities in secondary schools of Bauchi State. This research, therefore, sought to investigate the impact of regular education teachers working experience on the academic performance of students with disabilities in secondary schools of Bauchi state.

2.5 Administrators’ Support and Provision towards Inclusive Education

Many studies have confirmed administrative provision as a vital aspect for successful inclusion program and effective way of providing good results for both students. Villa et al. (1996), examined six hundred and ninety teachers across Canada and the US. Their findings indicated that administrators’ support is one of the features related to
more positive attitudes towards inclusion. However, inadequate support was identified by Heflin and Bullock (1999), as a factor leading to failure of including students with disabilities. Guzman (1994), stressed that a successful implementation of inclusive education depends on the principals’ efforts, they are responsible for the organization of professional development and training of their staff, supervision of ongoing programs and serve as correspondence with the higher authorities.

Cook, Gerber, & Semmel (1999), studied the attitudes of sixty-four special teachers and forty-nine principals towards inclusive education using Regular Education Initiative Teaching Survey (REITS). Their findings established that principals showed more concerns on a notion that, academic performance of included students improved more than those not included. However, both the principals and the special teachers agreed that regular teachers lacked special teaching skills to handle and provide for the needs of all learners in inclusive classroom.

Through observations and interviews, Mamlin (1999), identified effective leadership as being an element in making inclusive education program a reality. The study concluded that a strong leadership style is a factor that every leader requires to achieve successfully and have the capability of guiding his staff towards understandings ways that could lead to success (Mamlin, 1999). Stanovich & Jordan (2002) emphasized that principals’ influence is a major factor leading to successful inclusion of individuals with special needs in inclusive classrooms. In order to build an excellent inclusion environment, administrators’ support is essential (Villa et al., 1996; Heflin & Bullock, 1999). The support of administrators is highly required to offer schools with chances of teamwork and professional development as well as training of staff on particular services and clear understanding of including students.
with disabilities (Guzman, 1994). Without adequate support from the administrators, the inclusion of students with disabilities would be a failure (Heflin & Bullock, 1999).

The European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2012), indicated that administrators are in charge of planning, setting out standards, provision of instructional guidance, encouraging curriculum improvement, teacher development through in-service, resources management and collaboration. According to Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson (2006), school principals are duty bound to determine the focus and direction of work in the schools they work. Therefore, school principals are in essential position in making inclusion work in their schools.

Kesalahti (2014) stated certain procedures needed from administrators to foster inclusive education in their schools as: to encourage in-service training; workshops, and seminars on inclusive education; support parents and learners to participate in school activities; initiate changes and strongly support any positive change proposed by others; establish good rapport with the staff through collaborative problem solving, teamwork, as well as encourage sharing of ideas in teaching and learning among staff; make sure parents, teachers and students interact effectively and understand each other.

Going by the above reviewed literature, several studies have indicated that administrative support and strong leadership are critical factors for a successful inclusion program and effective ways of providing good results for students, (Villa, Thousand, Meyer, & Nevin, 1996). There is scarcity of literature on the influence of administrative support on the academic performance of persons with disabilities in regular school settings in Bauchi state. This research, therefore, aimed at investigating
the support and provision given by the administrators to the teachers in regular secondary schools of Bauchi state, in Nigeria.

2.6 Comparison of Students’ Academic Performance

A large number of a theoretical studies have been conducted by different individuals most of which were concerned with determining the academic performance of different groups of students, and the variables that influence successful academic outcomes. Measuring academic performance can occur at multiple levels and serve multiple purposes. For example, classroom teachers often conduct formative and summative tests to evaluate students’ progress in course content and provide grades for students. In US, State tests are designed to measure progress and to ensure accountability for results at the school or school district level. Other standardized tests are used in decision making processes to determine eligibility for special services. Each of these uses encompasses topics of debate and significant questions related to test design, types of assessments, and type of decisions supported by the results, alternative assessments, and accommodations (Guzma et al. 2005).

Although performance on standardized tests receives the greatest attention in discussions of students’ academic performance, teachers’ evaluations of performance as indicated in course grades represent a common metric of student performance that often is more directly tied to the day-to-day business of teaching and learning than are annual standardized test scores. Grades serve a number of important functions which include communicating to students and parents the information about students’ mastery of course content. In high school, a passing grade also is the criterion for a course’s contributing to accumulated credit for graduation. Finally, grades provide information for consideration in college admissions. However, as a measure of academic performance, teacher-given grades have well-known limitations. Grades
are composite measures that account not only for students’ content mastery but often for other factors, such as their class participation, attitudes, progress over time, and attendance. Both general and special educators are known to consider these various factors when grading, but to emphasize different factors. For example, special education teachers are less likely than general educators to consider homework or attendance to be important in grading student performance, but are more likely to consider in-class participation to be important (Guzma et al. 2005). Moreover, substantial variations in grading practices occur across teachers, schools, and school districts. Despite these complicating factors, student grades still are an important indicator within the academic performance outcome domain for students with disabilities because they indicate success by a teacher’s standards and success relative to other students in a given classroom.

The comparison of performance, mainly for students with special needs, has become a debatable topic among measurement experts, educators and policymakers (Huber, Rosenfeld & Fiorello, 2001). Research and data collection on the comparison of the academic performance of individuals with disabilities is sparse (not much). Studies conducted in America provided contradictory findings on the academic results of students with disabilities. For instance, a study conducted in Gavilan College in California, USA, revealed that learners who have learning disabilities out-performed those with other disabilities together with students without disabilities in English and mathematics courses. Richardson & Roy, (2002) correlate students without disabilities and those with visual impairment. It was established that even though students without disabilities performed better, students with visual impairment also performed as required.
Guzman, Garza, Chorost, and Blackorby (2005), investigated the difference in academic performance associated with individual disability category. The result indicated that there is no much variation regarding the academic achievements of three groups; hearing, visual and physical impairments (Guzma et al. 2005). The difference is only on the severity of the disability, but not disability category. Fillman (2009) studied the academic performance of persons with disabilities at Cabrillo College. The result indicated that students without disabilities out-performed those with disabilities. The average result in English and Math among students with and without disabilities was 54.8% /60.2% and 74.9% /77.5% respectively.

Going by the above review, no research was found by the researcher to have compared the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in Northern part of Nigeria. This study therefore, addressed this research gap by comparing their academic performance in selected secondary schools in Bauchi State, Nigeria.

2.7 Summary of Literature Review

The reviewed literature revealed that, for inclusive education to be successful teachers’ attitudes towards students with disabilities is among the crucial factors. Many studies were conducted on teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion in both developed and developing countries but, the findings appeared inconsistent. While some indicated regular teachers’ positive attitudes (Ocloo & Subeya, 2008), others indicated negative attitudes (Slikker, 2009 and Tahidu, 2014).

The review also indicated that teachers who maintained positive attitudes towards students with disabilities tend to use more instructional strategies than those who have
negative attitudes, but the studies failed to clearly showcased the kind of the instructional strategies teachers use and their effectiveness or otherwise.

Teachers working experience was identified in many studies as important in modeling attitudes towards students with disabilities (Giangreco, 2005; Forlin, 2001), but no single study was found by the researcher to be conducted in Bauchi State concerning teachers’ work experience and their attitudes towards students with disabilities.

In the review also, administrative supports and provisions were identified among factors associated with positive attitudes towards inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the regular classrooms (Villa et al., 1996). Mamlin (1999), identified strong leadership as a vital factor in creating successful inclusive education. However, all the literature reviewed focused only on the principal supports toward teachers work. Non of the studies addressed the support and provisions principals received from the government.

Most of the studies on the relationship between performance of students with and without disabilities in inclusive classrooms indicated that there is no significant difference concerning their academic performance, but these studies focused mainly on the academic performance of normal students and students with learning disabilities not all categories of disabilities. Above all, none of the above studies used similar scales which were employed in this study.

This study therefore addressed the above gaps left by the literature by evaluating the attitudes of regular teachers on the academic performance of students with disabilities. In Bauchi state, students with disabilities complained about the teaching strategies, teacher’s attitudes and accessibility of the curricular and non-curricular activities. There is need for a study on the attitudes of regular teachers towards learners with
disabilities; the instructional strategies used in teaching students with special needs in the regular classroom; the regular teachers’ working experience; the principals’ support toward teachers work and administrative support and provision by the government toward inclusion. The performance of both students with and without disabilities also need to be reviewed in a regular classroom.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the research design, research variables, location of the study and target population, sampling technique, sample size, instruments of data collection, piloting, validity and reliability, methods of data collection, data analysis, logistical and ethical issues.

3.1 Research Design

Research design is a structure which shows how the sample, data collection, and analysis method would be connected to address the central research questions. Based on topic of this study, survey and correlational designs were employed.

According to Best & Khan (2011), survey research is a technique of gathering information through asking questions. In some instances, interviews can be done face-to-face with the target respondents of the study in school, at home, or at work, other times inquiries may be sent to the respondents via mail to respond and mail back. Progressively, surveys are conducted via mobile phones, fax and many other ways (Best & Khan, 2011). While, correlational research design allows researcher to find out the relationship between variables through the use of correlational statistics. In this study, the researcher contacted the people under study face to face and administered the instruments for data collection.

3.2 Research Variables

Trochim (2006) defined a research variable as any entity that can take on different values. It can be independent, dependent, or intervening. Variables are the main ideas that researchers want to collect information on to address the objective of their studies.
(Creswell, 2005). Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), described different classifications of variables such as dependent, independent, intervening, and antecedent variables. This study considered independent, intervening and dependent variables.

3.2.1 Independent Variables
Creswell (2005), defines an independent variable as an attribute or characteristic that influences or affects an outcome. In this study, the independent variable are the regular teachers’ attitudes; instructional strategies; teachers’ working experience, and administrative supports.

3.2.2 Dependent Variables
A dependent variable is an attribute that is influenced by the independent variable (Creswell, 2005). The dependent variable of this study is the academic performance of students with disabilities.

3.2.3 Intervening Variable
Intervening variable is a hypothetical variable used to explain the causal link between other variable. In this study, the independent (regular teachers’ attitudes), influences the defendant variable (students’ academic performance) through the intervening variables such as culture, curriculum content, means of communication and government policies.

3.3 Location of the Study
This study was conducted in the three zones of Bauchi State (South, Central, and North). Bauchi State is among the thirty-six states of Nigeria created on the 3rd February 1976 with its headquarters in Bauchi town. It is located in the North-Eastern part of the country with a total population of 4,676,465 people spread into its three zones. This location was chosen because previous research indicated that most of the
students with disabilities in the state prefer going to special schools than the inclusive secondary schools (Sirajo, 2013). The state is divided into three geographical zones, and each zone is subdivided into Local Governments (LGs). These include South zone seven LGs, Central Zone six LG’s and North zone seven LGs.

3.4 Target Population

According to Waters (2011), a target population refers to the entire population from which a sample is chosen. Therefore, the target population of this research included all regular teachers teaching in the 34 secondary schools piloting inclusive education in Bauchi State which comprised of 746 regular teachers, 34 principals of these secondary schools, 9812 students without disabilities and 614 students with disabilities from the 34 secondary schools under the study.
Table 3.1

Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Students without Disabilities</th>
<th>Number of Students with Disabilities</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>3544</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2978</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3290</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>9812</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOE Bauchi State 2015.

3.5 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

This section describes the sampling techniques and the size of the sample.

3.5.1 Sampling Techniques

The sampling techniques used in selecting the subjects of this research is as follows;

3.5.1.1 Sampling of Schools

A stratified sampling technique was employed in selecting 15 out of the 34 schools. Trochim (2006) stated that stratified random sampling is to divide the population into strata (geographical zones in this case) and then take a simple random sampling in each stratum (Trochim, 2006). Stratified random sampling was employed in this research through dividing the state in three strata (geographical zones). By this it possible for all the schools in each zone to have an equal chance of being chosen.
3.5.1.2 Sampling of the Teachers

Simple random sampling is a sampling technique in which a certain number of respondents is selected as a sample from the target population. Under this technique, all respondents were given an equal chance of being involved in the study (Valarie, Easton, & John, 1997). Simple random sampling technique was employed in selecting the regular teachers.

3.5.1.3 Sampling of the Administrators

Purposive sampling technique was used to sample out fifteen (15) administrators (principals) from the fifteen sampled schools because it is only one individual that handles the post in each school. When only one person is occupying a given position and has the information desired for the study, a purposive sampling technique is the only option (Trochim, 2006).

3.5.1.4 Sampling of Students with Disabilities

A simple random sampling technique was employed in selecting students with disabilities. This sampling technique was used in order to give all the subjects of the research equal chance of being selected (Trochim, 2006).

3.5.1.5 Sampling of Students without Disabilities

Simple random sampling technique was used in choosing the 90 students without disabilities (thirty from each of the three zones under study) who participated in the study. This decision had been arrived at during the pilot study in the process of comparing the academic performance of students with and without disabilities. These students were randomly chosen from the same classes with the students with disabilities.
3.5.2 Sample Size

The sample refers to a small proportion of the population that is selected for observation which has the same characteristics, values, and attitudes of the general population (Best & Khan, 2011). The sample size of this study was as follows.

**Table: 3.2:**

Distribution of the sample size from the target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Sampled schools</th>
<th>Sampled regular Teachers</th>
<th>Sampled students without disabilities</th>
<th>Sampled students with disabilities</th>
<th>Sampled principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOE Bauchi State 2015.

3.6 Research Instruments

In this study, the researcher employed a questionnaire, interview guide, observation checklist and Students' Examination Records (SER). The use of a variety of instruments provided an opportunity to facilitate triangulation of data and enhance confidence in the result of the study as well as the collection of comprehensive data (Atrichter, Felman & Somekh, 2008).

3.6.1 Interview

Orodho (2006) defines an interview guide as a set of questions, which the researcher asks the respondents. Using an interview will make it possible for the researcher to obtain data required to meet the research objectives. The purpose of any research
interview is to discover the views, experiences, and motivations of individuals on specific matters (Gill, Stewart, Treasure & Chadwick, 2008). The interview guide were very important in this study because they were used to collect information from the principals. The researcher personally interviewed the principals regarding the inclusion program.

3.6.2 Scales/Questionnaire

The attitudinal scales used include the Attitudes Towards Inclusion in Africa Scale (ATIAS) an adapted (slightly modified) version which was developed by Agbenyega, Deppeler, & Harvey (2005), the Littrel Survey of Administrators Support (LSAS) which was developed by Littrel (1994) and Questionnaire on the Instructional Strategies (QIS). These scales and questionnaire were used to collect the teachers’ motives, views, perceptions, and attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classrooms as well as the support teachers get from the administrators.

3.6.2.1 Attitudes Towards Inclusion in Africa Scale (ATIAS)

ATIAS is a survey instrument used for measuring attitudes towards inclusion of learners with disabilities into inclusive classrooms in Africa which was developed by Deppeler, Harvey & Agbenyega, (2005). The first part of the instrument was designed to capture the participants’ demographic information which include each participants’ gender, the highest qualification attained, marital status, teaching experience, and whether the respondent has a relative with a certain disability, whether he/she had ever been educated on inclusive education program, and the school that the respondent is currently teaching in (during this research).
In part 2, of this instrument, respondents were requested to respond to 20 items using Likert’s five-point scale starting from a value of 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The 20 items are distributed according to the four major factors which were identified by Agbenyega (2008) namely: Behavioral Issues, Professional Competency, Student Needs and Resource Issues.

3.6.2.2 Littrell’s Survey on Administrators Support (LSAS)

Littrell’s Survey on Administrators Support (LSAS) consists of 20 items relating to principals’ support. Respondents are required to respond using a 2-points scale demonstrating 1 for ‘No extent’ and 2 ‘Great extent’.

3.6.2.3 Questionnaire on Instructional Strategy (QIS)

Questionnaire on instructional strategy was used to find out the instructional techniques used by regular teachers in this study. The nine-item questionnaire, requires the respondents to indicate either ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ on the instructional strategies they used in teaching in inclusive classrooms.

3.6.3 Students’ Examination Records (SER)

The examination records of learners with and without disabilities on two subjects viz, English language and Mathematic was collected. These subjects were chosen because research indicated that student’s performance in English language and Mathematics are interrelated especial for students who English is their second language (Barton & Barton, 2005). The examination records of the students with and without disabilities were compared to see whether a difference exists in their academic achievement or not. More so, the examination records of the three categories of students with impairment were compared to find out which group performs better than the other in an inclusive classroom.
3.7 Piloting the Study and Pre-Testing the Instruments

Robson (1993) argues that piloting provides a chance for the researcher to test his/her assurance in identifying obstacle and obstructions that could hinder the actual collection of useful data. In summary, a pilot study helps to examine the effectiveness and validity of the instruments to be used in collecting data. The pilot was conducted through test-retest method in Government day secondary school, Hardawa one of the schools in the central zone within two weeks before the conduct of the main study. The respondents were five regular teachers and one administrator (principal). The researcher piloted the instruments to ascertain their effectiveness, validity, and reliability. The findings of the pilot study showed the validity and reliability of the instruments. The subjects used in the pilot study did not take part in the main study.

However, during the pilot study, the researcher found that the only way to compare the academic performance of individuals with and without disabilities is for the subjects to be equal in number which was not there in the proposal. The researcher, therefore, equalized their number (90 students with disabilities and 90 students without disabilities).

3.7.1 Validity

Validity is an extent to which a research instrument measures what it was designed to measure (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Lowe, 2002). According to Denscombe (2003), validity can be checked by ensuring that, the instances selected for investigation have been chosen on explicit and reasonable grounds as far as the aims of the research are concerned and that findings can be triangulated through alternative data sources as a way of bolstering confidence in the validity. All the instruments designed for the study were tested and found effective in the pilot study.
3.7.2 Reliability

Reliability is an instance to which a research instrument produces constant results after frequent trials (Orodho, 2004). Firstly, the study used test-retest method to ensure reliability of the quantitative data. This method of measuring the reliability of data involves presenting the same tool to the same group twice (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). For the test, a total of 15 (5 for each of ATIAS QIS and LSAS) were filled by the teachers who provided information that was used to calculate the reliability of the questionnaire. A Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient formula for the test-retest was employed in computing the correlation coefficient.

Secondly, the reliability of qualitative data was achieved through: member check, after the interview the participants were shown the final transcription of their interviews and confirmed that was what they meant to say; long time in the field, the researcher spent a very long period of time while conducting the interview with the respondents which gave him chance of recording all the responses of the respondents verbatim: notes in the field, the researcher wrote down all the conversation with the respondents; triangulation, the data was collected from different respondents using different methods and the respondents were also asked probing questions in an effort to determine a perfect reliability of the information given.

3.8 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher trained a research assistant who helped him in the process of data collection. The data were collected using two survey scales; Attitudes Towards Inclusion in Africa Scale (ATIAS), Littrell’s Survey on Administrators’ Support LSAS), questionnaire on instructional strategies, and an interview which was administered to the principals on their support of inclusive education as well as the students’ previous examination records. The researcher and his assistant started from
the schools in the South zone, then Central zone and finally North zone according to the distance of the areas. Each school was allocated two days.

The study was therefore conducted within thirty days, two days for each school. In the process of the data collection, the researcher started administering the interview to the administrator (principal) in his/her office and recording all the responses verbatim. He later, joined the research assistant in administering the ATIAS, LSAS and questionnaire on instructional strategies to the regular teachers. On the second day, the researcher filled in the observation checklist by observing all the facilities, materials, and equipment for inclusion available in the school. Later, the researcher and his assistant jointly collected the examination records of both students with and without disabilities for comparison.

3.9 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the procedure of analyzing, interpreting, presenting and summarising data to get information that can be used to answer the research questions, (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Kvale & Brinkkmann, 2009). In this study, the researcher used qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze the data.

3.9.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected using scales and questionnaire from the teachers of the students and observation checklist were analyzed through (SPSS) descriptive statistics that included frequencies and percentages while the examination records of the students was analyzed using (SPSS) correlational statistics.

3.9.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data collected through interviews observation checklist was analyzed thematically.
3.10 Ethical and Logistical Considerations

Below is the ethical and logistic considerations followed in the conduct of the study.

3.10.1 Ethical Considerations

Several ethical considerations were made in this study. The researcher operated within the ethical consideration of Kenyatta University regarding research on human subjects which requires that informants be assured of the confidentiality of the information given to the researcher and his assistants. The purpose of the data collected was clarified to the respondents to allay fears that may arise from the exercise. Efforts were made to ensure the provision of an environment that allows subjects to respond willingly and voluntarily without feeling threatened.

The anonymity of the respondents was also assured as a way of enhancing honesty in their answering of questions which helped in the acquisition of the genuine opinions of the respondents, thus strengthening the reliability of data. Use of informed consent before involving the respondents in the study and requesting them to participate kindly in the study and withdraw voluntarily was done. Only those who consented to be part of the study were involved in the research. Lastly, when the research is finalized, the findings would be made available to the respondents as a way of giving them feedback.

3.10.2 Logistical Considerations

Logistical considerations are paramount in any research. The researcher collected an introductory letter from Kenyatta University which was taken to Bauchi State Ministry of Education (MoE) who granted a research permit to conduct the pilot and the main study in the respective areas. After collecting the permit from the Bauchi state ministry of education, the researcher went to the schools under the study to
familiarized himself to the administrators and informed them about the intension of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION, AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the findings, interpretation, and discussion of the collected data. The organization of the chapter is guided by the research objectives and themes emerging from data analyses.

The objectives of the study were to:

i. Investigate regular teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities in regular secondary schools in Bauchi State.

ii. Assess instructional strategies used by regular teachers in teaching students with disabilities in regular secondary schools in Bauchi State.

iii. Explore previous working experience of regular teachers in the selected secondary schools in Bauchi State.

iv. Examine support and provision given by the administrators towards the education of students with disabilities in regular school settings in Bauchi State.

v. Compare academic performance of students with and without disabilities in an inclusive classroom in Bauchi State.

The data gathered in this study was analyzed using SPSS descriptive and correlational statistical analysis. The findings were summarized and presented in form of tables and charts, while the interviews were analyzed and discussed.
The presentation was organized into two main parts. The first part presents a
description of the demographic variables. While the second part presents the analysis
and discussion of the collected data, objective by objective.

SECTION ONE

4.2 General and Demographic Information

Presented below, are the results of the demographic information of this study:

4.2.1 Rate of Return on Research Instruments

The findings in Table 4.1 show the rate of return on the research instruments that were
used to collect data in the study. The respondents who were involved in this study
include principals, students, and teachers.

Table 4.1:

Rate of return on research instruments used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATIAS Scale</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAS Scale</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire (QIS)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.1, of this study achieved all responses on the three research
instruments (ATIAS, LSAS, QIS) and the examination results of the students were
collected from the examination officers and form-masters of the respected classes. All
the fifteen principals were also interviewed and their responses written. This is in
conformity with Hagger et al. (2003), who indicated that a response rate of 60% and
above provides sufficient information to conclude a study. The data collected using
scales and questionnaires was analyzed using (SPSS) descriptive statistics, students’
examination records was analyzed using a SPSS correlational statistics while the interviews was discussed thematically.

4.2.2 Demographic Information

The demographic information of the study covers; gender, marital status, qualification, and types of school.

4.2.2.1 Gender

The findings in Figure 4.1 show the gender distribution of the respondents of this study (principals and regular teachers).

![Gender distribution chart]

Figure 4.1: Gender of the respondents by frequency and percentage

The findings in Figure 4.1 show that 63.3% of the participants were male whereas 36.7% of the respondents were female.

4.2.2.2 Marital Status of the Respondents

Figure 4.2 shows the marital status of the respondents who included principals and regular teachers.
The findings in Figure 4.2 establishes that 71% of the respondents were married, and 29% were not married.

4.2.2.3 Qualifications of the Respondents

Table 4.2 shows the qualifications of the respondents in this study.
Table 4.2:

Qualifications of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Certificate of Education (NCE)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s own (2016)

The findings in Table 4.2 indicates that 47.8% of the respondents had National Certificate of Education (NCE) qualifications and were seconded by 30% who had degree qualifications, 10% of the respondents had a Master degree and lastly 12.2% had other qualifications (Ordinary Diploma, HND High National Diploma, PTC Pivotal Teacher Certificate, STUC Special Teacher Upgrading Certificate). The positive attitudes of teachers towards inclusion of students with disabilities is associated with the teachers’ level of education, class size, previous experience on handling students having special needs, teachers’ workload, and the availability or otherwise of support (UNESCO 2000, Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000).
4.2.2.4 Type of Schools

Figure 4.3 shows the distribution of the type of schools that were involved in the study.
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**Figure 4.3: Type of schools**

The findings in Figure 4.3 show that 40% of the schools were boys and girls (mixed), 40% boys’ schools, while 20% were girls’ schools.
SECTION TWO

4.3 Regular Teachers’ Attitudes towards Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Selected Secondary Schools in Bauchi State

Objective One: Aimed at finding out the regular teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities in regular secondary schools in Bauchi state. To achieve this, the researcher used a twenty-item attitudinal scale with a Likert’s five scale key. The 20 items were divided according to the four factors identified by Agbenyega (2008) as factors to be considered when including students with disabilities, namely: Behavioral Issues, Students’ Needs, Resource Issues, and Professional Competency of the teachers. The findings were therefore presented in four tables (Tables 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 respectively).

4.3.1 The Behavioral Issues of Students with Special Needs in an Inclusive classroom

Table 4.3 shows the responses of regular teachers on the behavioral issues with regards to the inclusion of students with special needs in an inclusive classroom.
Table 4.3: Responses of Regular Teachers Attitudes towards Inclusion base on Students’ Behavioral Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>1 = SA</th>
<th>2 = A</th>
<th>3 = NS</th>
<th>4 = D</th>
<th>5 = SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students with difficulty following school rules should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>7 9.3%</td>
<td>10 13.3%</td>
<td>15 20%</td>
<td>43 57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students who are physically aggressive towards their peers in school should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 28%</td>
<td>5 6.7%</td>
<td>49 65.3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students who are verbally hostile towards their peers should be in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>4 5.3%</td>
<td>49 65.3%</td>
<td>12 16%</td>
<td>10 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students who insistently experience difficulty in expressing their thoughts should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>10 13.3%</td>
<td>13 17.3%</td>
<td>52 69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students who have difficulty in adjusting their behavior should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>12 16%</td>
<td>10 13.3%</td>
<td>53 70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students who are often absent from school should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>14 18.7%</td>
<td>61 81.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, NS = Not Sure, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

Disagree

1. The Behavioral Issues comprised of the characteristics that may be displayed by students with disabilities which teachers might find difficult to work within an inclusive setting. Item 1 ‘Students with difficulty following school rules should be in regular school’, 57% of the regular teachers strongly disagreed with the statement, 20% disagreed, 13.3% were not sure and 9.3% agreed with the statement. Item 2 ‘Students who are physically aggressive towards
their peers in school should be regular school’. 65.3% of the respondents were not sure, 6.7% agreed with the statement and 28% strongly agreed with the statement. Item 3 ‘Students who are verbally aggressive towards their peers should be in regular schools’. 65.3% were not sure, 16% of the regular teachers disagreed with statement and only 5.3% of the respondents agreed with the statement.

Item 4 ‘Students who persistently experience difficulty in expressing their thoughts should be in regular school. 69.3% strongly disagreed, 17.3% disagreed while 13.3% were not sure. Item 5 ‘Students who have difficulty in controlling their behavior should be in regular school’. 70.6 of the respondents strongly disagreed, 17.3% disagreed and 13.3% were not sure. Item 6 ‘Students who are often absent from school should be in regular school’. 81.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed and the remaining 18.7% disagreed.

The study therefore established that 62.7% of the responses in this study indicated negative attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities concerning their behavior. 28.8% of the respondents were ambivalent by choosing ‘Not sure’ option, while only 8.1% agreed to work with the students with disabilities in an inclusive classroom with regard to their behaviors.

4.3.2 The Needs of Students with Special Needs in an Inclusive Classroom

Table 4.4 shows the responses of the regular teachers on the requirements of students with special needs in an inclusive classroom.
Table 4.4: Responses of Regular Teachers on their Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities based on Students’ Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>1 = SA</th>
<th>2 = A</th>
<th>3 = NS</th>
<th>4 = D</th>
<th>5 = SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Students who need assistance to move about should be in regular school.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Students whose speech is difficult to understand should be in regular school.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Students who cannot read printed writing and require Braille should be in regular school.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Students who lack daily living services and need training in handling themselves should be in regular school.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Students who need help in speech should continue to be in regular school.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students who need sign language as a medium of communication should continue to be in regular school.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, NS = Not Sure, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

2. The Students’ needs comprised of challenges that might be linked to students with sensory disabilities that teachers may feel to require extra support. **Item 1** ‘Students who need help to move about should be in regular school’. 45.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed with statement, 21.3% agreed, 21.3% strongly agreed with statement and 12% were not sure. **Item 2** ‘Students whose speech is difficult to understand should be in regular school’. 49.3% respondents were not sure regarding the statement, 42.7% disagreed and 8% strongly disagreed with statement. **Item 3** ‘Students who
cannot read standard print and require Braille should be in regular school’. 68% respondents strongly disagreed, 18.7% disagreed and 13.3% were not sure. Item 4 ‘Students who lack daily living skills and need training in managing themselves should continue to be in regular school’. 62.7% respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 14.7% agreed, while 22.7% of the students disagreed with the statement. Item 5 ‘Students with speech problem should continue to be in regular school’. 44% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 17.3% disagreed while 38.7% were not sure. Item 6 ‘Students who need sign language as a medium of communication should continue to be in regular school’. 42.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 41.3% agreed and 16% of the respondents strongly agreed with statement.

The finding of this study established 51.5% the respondents disagreed to work with the students with disabilities on the basis of their needs. 29.4% agreed to their inclusion despite their needs, while 18.8% of the regular teachers were not sure. This indicated that majority of the respondents maintained negative attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities base on students’ needs.

4.3.3. The Resource Issues Needed for the Education of Students with Special Needs in an Inclusive Classroom

Table 4.5 displays the responses of the regular teachers concerning the resource issues towards the education of students with special needs in an inclusive classroom.
Table 4.5: Responses of Regular Teachers on their Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities Based on Resource Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = SA</td>
<td>2 = A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Inappropriate teacher/student ratio in inclusive class will lead to stress and anxiety.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of sufficient resource and special materials will make inclusion difficult.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inappropriate infrastructure will make inclusion impossible.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Class size will make inclusion difficult to operate.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, NS = Not Sure, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

Disagree

3. The Resource issues include organizational and structural support which may be helpful to the teachers in the inclusive classroom. **Item 1 ‘Inappropriate teacher/student ratio in inclusive class will lead to stress and anxiety’.** 68% of the respondents strongly agreed and 32% agreed with the statement. **Item 2 ‘Lack of adequate resource and special materials will make inclusion difficult’**. 78.7% strongly agreed and 17.3% agreed with the statement, while 4% strongly disagreed. **Item 3 ‘Inappropriate infrastructure will make inclusion impossible’.** 62.7% of the respondents strongly agreed, 16% agreed while 13.3% agreed and 8% strongly disagreed. **Item 4 ‘Class size will make inclusion difficult to operate’.** 72% strongly agreed, 26.7% agreed, while 1.3% were not sure.
Unlike the statements in the items under behavior issues and students’ needs in Tables 4.3 and 4.4, where disagreeing indicates negative attitudes, in the section, agreeing with the statements indicates negative attitudes while disagreeing showcases positive attitudes. The finding shows that 93.3% of the regular teachers agreed not to work with students with disability on the basis of resource issues, 6.3% of the respondents disagreed with the statements of the items, and 0.3% was not sure. Finally, the finding indicated that regular teachers held negative attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities concerning resource issues.

4.3.4 The Professional Competency of Teachers in Teaching Students with Special Needs in an Inclusive Classroom

Table 4.6 displays the responses of the regular teachers concerning their professional competency towards instructing students with special needs in inclusive classrooms.
Table 4.6: Responses of Regular Teachers on their Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities based on Teachers’ Professional Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>1 = SA</th>
<th>2 = A</th>
<th>3 = NS</th>
<th>4 = D</th>
<th>5 = SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>F</em></td>
<td><em>%</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Working with students with special needs was challenging for me because working with them is boring.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was difficult to give equal attention to all students in inclusive classrooms.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am not professionally competent to cope with students with special needs in regular school.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not have knowledge and skills to teach students with special needs.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** *SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, NS = Not Sure, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree*

4. The Professional Competency means the capability of teachers in instructing students with disabilities in regular classrooms. Item 1 ‘*Working with students with special needs was difficult for me because working with them is boring*.’ 76% of the respondents strongly agreed and 24% of the respondents agreed with the statement. Item 2 ‘*It was difficult to give equal attention to all students in inclusive classrooms*.’ 56% of the respondents agreed with the statement and the remaining 44% of the respondents also strongly agreed. Item 3 ‘*I will not be able to cope with students with special needs in regular school*.’ 52% strongly agreed, 25.3% agreed, while 22.6% were not sure. Item 4 ‘*I do not have knowledge and skills to teach*
students with special needs’. 73.3% of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement, while the remaining 26.7% strongly disagreed.

In this section also, agreeing with the statements indicates negative attitudes while disagreeing indicates positive attitudes. 87.6% of the responses of regular teachers agreed not to be professionally competent in teaching both students with and without disabilities in regular classroom, 6.6% indicated they are professionally competent to carry out the task, and 5.6% of the respondents held a neutral position (not sure). From the above, it clear that majority of the regular teachers held negative attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities into regular classrooms with regard to professional competency.

From all the four factors (Behavioral Issues, Student Needs, Resource Issues, and Professional Competency) identified by Agbenyega (2008) as factors to be considered in determining teachers attitudes towards inclusion, majority of the responses of the regular teachers were found to be negative towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular education classrooms.

This finding supported by Forlin (2001), who investigated the prospective stressors for teachers while including persons with disabilities into regular classrooms. Five hundred and seventy one teachers of the primary schools were engaged in the study. The results indicated that teachers’ professional competency matters a lot. It was also established from the study that an increase in the number of years spent by teachers and extra training acquired help in mitigating stress in teaching. Similarly, the finding supported Hastings & Oakford (2003) who surveyed the attitudes of primary and secondary schools students. The study showed that students’ attitudes increased negatively by including more students with behavioral and emotional disorders as
related to those with intellectual disabilities. It was also found that students of secondary schools displayed more favorable attitudes in comparison to their counterparts in elementary or primary schools (Hastings & Oakford, 2003).

Similarly, the findings of Alghazo & Naggar Gaad (2004), pointed out that teachers maintained more positive attitudes towards students with physical and specific learning difficulties and these categories were chosen most in preference to those with cognitive disabilities such as mental retardation and autism. This therefore indicated that most teachers maintained negative attitudes on the inclusion of students with mental disabilities, behavioral problems and sometimes those with hearing impairment which is in line with this study especially considering the responses of the regular teachers on items, 1, 2, 4, 5 of Table 4.3, and item 4 of Table 4.4.

The results of this study supported the findings of Lifshitz, Glaubman, & Issawi (2004), who maintained that the attitudes of teachers differed about the disability type. Most of the teachers have positive attitudes on the inclusion students with mild emotional disorders, learning disabilities and those with mild hearing and visual impairments. From the findings of this study, the lowest scores were obtained among the items which displayed the characteristic of students with moderate/severe mental retardation, emotional and behavioral disorders (items 1, 2, 3 of Table 4.3 and item 4 of Table 4.4). This established that, teachers are required to partake in continuing professional development that aims at inclusion and gets needed support from their administrators.

Finally, this study reflects the findings of Edmunds (2000), who found that, the three highest pre-requisite factors for successful inclusion program were experienced in
teaching students with disabilities, in-service sessions regarding inclusion, and university courses specific to inclusion.

4.4 Instructional Strategies used by Regular Teachers in Teaching Students with Disabilities in Regular Secondary Schools

Objective Two: Sought to establish the instructional strategies used by the regular teachers’ in teaching all students in regular secondary schools in Bauchi state. To achieve this, a questionnaire was used to collect data on teaching strategies employed by the teachers and the results were presented in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7:
Responses of Regular Teachers on the Instructional Strategies ever used in Teaching Students in Regular Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Strategies</th>
<th>Number of teachers who ever used a strategy/method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy instruction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel instruction</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based instruction</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group instruction</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative teaching/learning</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large group instruction</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other strategies/methods</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 indicates that out of the 75 teachers under this study, 69 (92%) used other strategies/methods in teaching in an inclusive classrooms. This is inline with the findings of Marzano (2007), who maintained that, even though different instructional strategies are available, teachers should employ right strategies to the right students at a right time. 47 (62.7%) use large group instruction. 33 (44%) use small group instruction, under this instructional approach. In this method, students are provided with the opportunities of expressing their previous experience and been guided further by other students and the teacher. Teachers using this model should be able to monitor the progress of the students better with small group instruction and normally it is not
tiresome and it can also be beneficial to other students having problems in a large group instruction.

23 (30.7%) teachers employ the use of peer tutoring, peer tutoring promotes positive relationships among the students, and provide social skills and confidence for both students involved in the exercise. 18 (24%) teachers use cooperative teaching, cooperative learning is a process whereby students work jointly to help one another. Usually the grouping is made up of those with high, low and average achievement levels, males and females, as well as normal and disabled students or those with diverse ethnic backgrounds. Cooperative learning was proved to be effective in improving the academic achievements of learners (Udvari-Solner & Thousand, 1996). Slavin, (1991), analyzed some studies on cooperative learning in comparison to traditional methods. The findings indicated that 37 out of 44 studies revealed a more positive significant effect of cooperative teaching in contrast to the traditional teaching.

17 (22.7%) of the teachers use strategy instruction in an inclusive classroom. This strategy instruction help teachers to equip their students with tools, techniques, methods and procedures that would enable them to complete a task successfully. Through this process, students become independent learners if given sufficient time to practice the strategy tasks.

The study also established that 16 (21.3%) teachers use parallel instruction. This instructional model help both students in accomplishing their individualized educational needs. Different studies confirmed the efficiency of parallel instruction. McDonnell, Thorson & McQuivey (2000), proved that Parallel instruction increases
the awareness of normal students towards disability and make them to embrace their counterparts (students without disabilities) as full members of the classroom.

14 (18.7%) of the teachers used co-teaching, under this instructional approach, both general and special education teachers plan and teach the lesson together in the same classroom. Margiera & Zigmond (2005), reported a significant positive academic results for both students with and without disabilities in co-taught classrooms.

Lastly 9 (12%) teachers used community-based instruction. This approach refers to the involvement of the community as a natural setting as well as utilization of community resources for teaching, such as showing the students the real domestic animals instead of their picture, different trees and objects instead if mere pictures. Mercer (2001), found that Students without disabilities benefit more from the opportunities they get of applying the knowledge and skills they gained in the classroom practically. Hobbs and Westling (1998), showed that teachers who maintain positive attitudes towards inclusion are likely to be efficient in encouraging inclusion for the reason that such positive attitudes will likely transform in to instructional approaches that will better meet up the varied needs of all students in an inclusive classroom situation.

4.5 Previous Working Experience of the Regular Teachers in the Selected Secondary Schools in Bauchi State

Objective Three: This objective sought to establish the previous working experience of the regular teachers in the selected secondary schools in Bauchi state. The findings were presented in Fig 4.5
4.5.1 Working Experience of the Regular Teachers

The results in Figure 4.4 show the distribution of the years of work experience among regular teachers in the secondary schools under this study.

**Figure 4.4: Regular Teachers’ Years of Work Experience**

From the findings in the Figure 4.4 the study affirmed that 61.3% of the respondents of the study had 4-9 years work experience and were followed by 21.3% who had 0-4 years work experience. Lastly 17.3% of the respondents had a work experience of 10 and above years.
4.5.2 Regular Teachers, Working Experience versus Attitudes towards Students with Disabilities

Many researchers indicated that years of work experience influence teachers attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities. This study investigates the influence of years of working experience on the teachers’ attitudes.

Table 4.8:

The Influence of Regular Teachers’ Working Experience on their attitudes towards Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>A/SA</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D/SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and above</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 presents the percentage of the attitudes of regular teachers in selected secondary schools of Bauchi State based on their years of working experience. The attitudes were compared based on the students’ behaviors and their needs in an inclusive classroom which was captured in items 1-6 of Tables 4.3 and 4.4. The findings indicated that teachers with 10 and above years of working experience appeared to have a more encouraging attitudes towards persons with disabilities, followed by those with 5-9 years and finally those with 0-4 years of work experience. This shows that even though the regular teachers of the selected schools of this study had negative attitudes towards students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms, teachers who served longer (10 and above years) were more positive than those with 5-9 and 0-4 respectively.

Duration of working experience was showcased in many researches as helpful in shaping teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion. While many studies associated more
years of work experience with positive attitudes towards inclusion, others hold negative views. The findings of Alghazo & Naggar Gaad (2004), revealed that teachers who had 1 to 5 years of work experiences appeared to hold a more significant favorable attitudes towards the inclusion of students with special needs in comparison with the other teachers who have 6 to 11 years of teaching experience and also those who had 12 or more years. Glaubman & Lifshitz (2001), held the same view with Alghazo, their findings indicated that teachers with fewer years of work experience (1–10 years) appeared to have a more significantly positive attitudes on including students with disabilities than those with more years (more than 11 years).

While previous researchers (Alghazo & Naggar Gaad, 2004; Glaubman & Lifshitz, 2001) associated fewer years of work experience with positive attitudes towards inclusion, the finding of this study was in line with other studies that maintained ‘teachers who work for more years, display more positive attitude than those with less years’. Avramidis & Kalyva (2007), indicated that teachers with more years of inclusive education experience held significantly more positive attitudes towards including students with disabilities than teachers with little or no experience. The study went further to stress that such differences exist even between schools with more experience and those with little or no experiences of inclusive education. In the same vein, this study was in line with the findings of Opdal, Wormes & Habayeb (2001), who established that among teachers with previous work experience in teaching learners with disabilities (29%) maintained more positive attitudes towards inclusion, whereas only (9%) of the teachers without experience expressed positive attitudes.
Similarly, this study supported the findings of Kalyva, Gojkovic & Tsakiris (2007), who compared between Serbian teachers with inclusive work experience and those without. Their finding showed that teachers with previous knowledge in teaching learners with disabilities were found to hold more encouraging manners compared to those without experience. Everington et al. (1999), also found that teachers with previous experience maintained positive attitudes towards inclusion than those without or with very little experience. Lastly, Batsiou et al. (2008), showed a significant positive relationship between teachers’ experience and teachers’ attitudes demonstrating their previous experience as predisposing factor towards their positive attitudes.
4.6 Support and Provision given by the Administrators towards the Education of Students with Disabilities in regular school settings

**Objective Four:** intended to establish the support and provision given by the administrators towards educating learners with disabilities in regular school settings.

4.6.1 The Materials and Equipment Available in the schools.

Table 4.9:

**Materials and Equipment available in the Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Schools Available</th>
<th>Schools Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note takers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff conversant with sign language</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing devices</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special resource room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate, style and abacus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff conversant with Braille and abacus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation and mobility personnel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide corridors/veranda</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low toilets for students in wheelchairs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 4.9 showed the availability or otherwise of the materials and equipment in the schools under the study, it was found that all the schools had wide corridors/veranda for the smooth movement of the students with visual impairment and those on the wheelchairs. Majority of the schools had low toilets for all students especially those in wheelchairs. All the schools under the study had libraries and laboratories, but none of them was found to have a resource room for the special educational needs equipment and materials. Majority of the schools of this study had note takers who helped students with hearing impairment in taking notes during a lesson, but the researcher observed that all the note takers were students and did not have formal training on note-taking. Slate, stylus, and abacus were found in the majority of the schools, staffs conversant with the use of Braille and abacus were also found in most of the schools. Orientation and mobility personnel were found available in many schools. Lastly, staff conversant with sign language and hearing aids were found wanting by few of the schools of this study.

According to Avramidis et al. (2000), the availability of physical, material and human support can be related with attitudes towards inclusion. Their findings were supported by Hobbs & Westling (1998) in their study ‘Promoting successful inclusion through collaborative problem-solving.’ The teachers reported that they were under-supported. The finding also showed that teachers would like to have available materials and equipment for the successful inclusion of students with special needs in their classrooms (Hobbs & Westling, 1998).
4.6.2 Administration Support to the Regular Teachers towards the Education of Students with Disabilities in Regular Secondary Schools of Bauchi State

The researcher established the extent to which teachers received administrative support on their work towards inclusion of students with disabilities into regular classrooms. Thus they were presented in Table 4.10 to indicate the level of their agreement concerning various statements in relation to the administration support towards their work.
Table 4.10:

Responses of Regular Teachers on the Administration Support on their Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent: 1 = Yes  2 = No</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Acts kindly towards me</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The principal is easy to contact</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gives me full attention when I am talking</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The principal is frank and straightforward with the staff</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shows genuine concern for my program and students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shows appreciation for my work</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Offers positive comment after observing my teaching</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides frequent response about my performance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provides supportive information for improving personal managing skills</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides information on conversant teaching methods</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assists with appropriate identification of special education students</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The principal is available to help when needed</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Establishes ways of communiqué between general and special education teachers.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Helps me during parent confrontations if needed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Provides time for various extra-curricular responsibilities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provides enough planning time.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Provides relevant materials and resource needs.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Participates actively in all educational arrangements, meetings, and conferences.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Works with all teachers in planning specific objectives and goals to all programs of school.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Provides additional support when I become overloaded.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 4.10 of the study showed that 65.3% of the respondents indicated that the administrators acts friendly towards them. 60% of the respondents indicated that it was easy to approach the administrators. 61.3% of the respondents indicated that they were not given undivided attention when they are talking. 68% indicated that the principal was honest and straight forward with the staff.

Findings also affirmed that 58.7% of the respondents indicated that the administrator did not show much concern for my program and students. 61.3% indicated that principal showed appreciation for my work. 52% indicated that principal did not offer positive response after observing my teaching. 62.7% indicated that principals provides frequent feedback about my performance. 81.3% of the respondents indicated that administrators provide useful suggestions for improving personal skills.

43 (57.3%) indicated that administrators did not provide information on the current teaching methods. 72% of the respondents indicated that principals helped with proper identification of special needs students. 51 (68%) affirmed that administrator was available to help when needed. 54.7% indicated that principals provide channels of discussion between general and special education teachers. 57.3% showed that the administrators helped them during parent confrontations when needed. 64% of the respondents indicated that the administrators provide time for various non-teaching activities.

50.7% respondents indicated that the administrators did not provide adequate planning time. But 69.3% indicated that they were provided with material, space, and resource needed. 76% also indicate that the administrators participated in child study, meetings and conferences. 65.3% indicated that the principals always worked with them in planning specific objectives and goals to all programs of school.
Lastly, 74.7% indicated that the administrators provide extra support when they become overloaded. From the finding of this study, it has been found that more than 59.9% of the respondents indicated that their principals effectively support them in dealing with students with disabilities in an inclusive classroom, whereas 40.1% of the respondents reported that they did not get the required support needed from the administrators.

Without sufficient support from the administrators, including students with disabilities in regular classrooms will result in total failure (Heflin & Bullock, 1999). According to Ainscow, Booth & Dyson (2006), the responsible individuals in determining the focus and direction of any inclusive education program at the bedrock stage is the principal of that school. Therefore, school principals possess an essential task in making inclusion work in their schools.

Kes-Alahti (2014), stressed that administrators are in charge of planning as well as setting out standards, provision of instructional guidance, encouraging teacher learning and development, curriculum improvement, resources management and collaboration building both in and outside the school.

4.6.3 Interview with Principal on the Administrative Support towards Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in to Regular Secondary Schools

The principals of all the 15 schools under the study were interviewed regarding support and provisions by the government towards of inclusion programs in their schools.
When asked what support they receive from the government regarding inclusion of students with disabilities in their schools? The principals affirmed that they received additional teachers, new classes, and received some materials and equipment of inclusive education required in an inclusion program, even though most of them complained for the insufficiency of materials. The researcher also asked the type of professional training their staff received prior to the commencement of inclusion program? The principals indicated that all the teachers of the 15 schools attended seminars and workshops prior and after their being in the inclusive classroom. When the principals were asked how competent their staff are in facilitating the inclusion program, all the principals indicated that their staff are competent and ready. The principals also attributed the success of the inclusion practice in their schools to the government and the efforts of their staff. However, one of the principals went further to state that;

“I will personally attribute this success to the previous government which supported the launching of a program called ‘Challenge Your Disability (CYDI) since June 2007. This program helped much in rehabilitating and including persons with disabilities into their community activities and schools. This, therefore, can be considered as the bedrock for the inclusion in the state.”

When the principals were asked regarding the challenges they encountered in an attempt to include students with disabilities in their schools? They highlighted many challenges facing the teaching of students with disabilities in regular schools such as lack of adherence to the teacher/students ratio, lack of parental support, inadequate professional teachers, inadequate material and equipment, lack of enough sitting facilities, overload work for teachers, few number of trained personnels, large number
of students in each a class, inadequate staff both teaching and non-teaching, and rampant complains by students with disabilities towards their interaction with their peers without disabilities.

Finally, the researcher asked the principals what they suggest the government should do regarding including students with disabilities in their school. The principals suggested that the government should provide good and enough sitting materials, provision of relevant and enough materials and equipment, more teachers to be employed or deployed to teaching, adherence to special education teacher/pupil ratio 1:10, More classes should be built to address overcrowding, organization of more sensitization programs on inclusion, Government should be more serious in implementing policies and fulfilling all the promises made on the program, Government to embark on radio and television sensitization/orientation on the benefits of teaching students with and without disabilities together, purchase and distribution of all materials needed for inclusion to all schools.

4.7 Comparison Between the Academic Performance of Students with and without Disabilities in Selected Regular Secondary Schools in Bauchi State

Objective Five: aimed at comparing the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in a regular classroom. The findings were presented in the following sub-headings

1. Results of students with disabilities from all the three zones.

2. Comparison between the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in an inclusive classroom.
4.7.1 Results of Students with Disabilities from all the three Zones

The academic performance of all the 90 students with disabilities for three consecutive terms (first term through third term of 2014/2015 academic session) were collected by the researchers. This comprises results from fifteen schools in the three zones under the study (South, Central and North zones). The researcher added the scores of each student in each school and finally summed up all the scores earned by each category of disabilities in every zone in Tables 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13. Meanwhile, the cumulative result of all the categories of disabilities were summed up and presented using bar chart in Figure 4.5.

Table 4.11:

*Marks of students with Special needs on English and Mathematics for three terms in the South Zone Schools (Zone A)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SCH 001</th>
<th>SCH 002</th>
<th>SCH 003</th>
<th>SCH 004</th>
<th>SCH 005</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI1</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI2</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI1</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI2</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 shows the results of the students with disabilities from all the five study schools of the South Zone (Zone A). In the first instance, each student’s marks on
English and Mathematics for the three terms (first through third terms) were summed up. Then the scores of all students with the same disability from all the five schools (VI1, VI2, HI1, HI2, PD1, and PD2) were added together to give the total. From Table 4.11, students with PD1 scored the highest marks, followed by HI1, VI1, VI2, PD2, and HI2.

**Table 4.12:**

**Marks of Students with Special needs on English and Mathematics for three terms in the Central Zone Schools (Zone B)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SCH 001</th>
<th>SCH 002</th>
<th>SCH 003</th>
<th>SCH 004</th>
<th>SCH 005</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI1</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI1</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI2</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 displays the results of the students with disabilities from all the five schools of the Central Zone (Zone B). The marks of each student on English and Mathematics for the three terms (first, second and third terms) were summed up. Then the scores of all students with similar disability and label from all the five schools (VI1, VI2, HI1, HI2, PD1, and PD2) were added together to give the total. The result
showed that students with PD2 were the best, followed by VI2, PD1, VI1, HI1, and HI2.

Table 4.13:
Marks of students with Special needs on English and Mathematics for three terms in the North Zone Schools (Zone C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SCH 001</th>
<th>SCH 002</th>
<th>SCH 003</th>
<th>SCH 004</th>
<th>SCH 005</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI2</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI2</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 presents the scores of the students with disabilities from all the five study schools in the North Zone (Zone C). The marks of each student in Mathematics and English for the three terms (first, second and third terms) were summed up. So also, the scores of all students with the same disability and label from all the five schools (VI1, VI2, HI1, HI2, PD1, and PD2) were added together to give the total. Students with PD2 appeared the best followed by HI2, HI2, VI1, VI2, and finally PD2.
Student academic performance is a more important outcome for education reform and the move to improve that performance by including students with disabilities is extremely essential. Most students with disabilities receive passing or even exemplary marks, which might indicate successful accomplishment of curriculum goals. Instructors of general education classes report that about half of students with special needs perform brilliantly in those classes. However, only few numbers of students with special needs categories function appropriately below average level in reading and math.

Different studies were conducted on performance of students with disabilities in inclusive settings, the results of some indicated that educating students with disabilities in an inclusive setting yields a range of both academic and social benefits for those students. A study from Gavilan College of California, USA showed that students with learning disabilities out-performed students with other disabilities as well as students without disabilities in Mathematics and English courses. A research conducted in Norway where about 500 secondary school students with disabilities were followed for over six years. The result indicated that seventy five percent of students with disabilities taught in regular classrooms earn a higher vocational and academic performance than the other students with disabilities who were taught in segregated classes or schools (Hehir & Grinder, 2016). In another study, Peetsma, Vergeer, Roeleveld, & Karsten (2001), compared the academic achievement of more than 200 included students with learning and behavioral difficulties or mild intellectual disability with those who are in special education schools. After assessing the pairs of these students for a consecutive four years, the results indicated that the included students with disabilities recorded significantly greater academic performance than their counterparts studying in special education classes.
4.7.2 Comparison Between the Academic Performance of Students with and without Disabilities

Tables 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16 display the total scores of students with and without disabilities from the three zones, South, Central, and North respectively. However, the cumulative results of all the students with and without disabilities under this study were summed up and presented using a bar chart in the Figure 4.6.

Table 4.14:

*All students’ marks of English and Mathematics for three terms*

*South Zone Schools (Zone A)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SCH 001</th>
<th>SCH 002</th>
<th>SCH 003</th>
<th>SCH 004</th>
<th>SCH 005</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI1</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI2</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI1</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI2</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW3</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW4</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14 showcases the scores of all the students with and without disabilities from all the five study schools in the South Zone (Zone A). The marks of each student in Mathematics and English for the three terms (first, second and third terms) were summed up. The scores of all students with the same label from all the five schools (VI1, VI2, HI1, HI2, PD1, PD2 SW1, SW2, SW3, SW4, SW5, and SW6) were added together to give the total. Students labeled SW1 scored the highest marks, then followed by SW2, PD1, HI1, SW3, SW5, SW6, VI1, SW4, VI2, PD2 and HI2.

Table 4.15:

All students’ marks of English and Mathematics for three terms

Central Zone Schools (Zone B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SCH 001</th>
<th>SCH 002</th>
<th>SCH 003</th>
<th>SCH 004</th>
<th>SCH 005</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI1</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI1</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI2</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW3</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW4</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15 presents the scores of all the students with and without disabilities from all the five study schools in the North Zone (Zone C). The marks of each student in Mathematics and English for the three terms (first, through third terms) were summed up. Meanwhile, the scores of all students with the same disability and level from all the five schools (VI1, VI2, HI1, HI2, PD1, PD2 SW1, SW2, SW3, SW4, SW5, and SW6) were calculated together to give the total. Students labeled SW2 scored the highest marks, followed by SW1, SW4, SW3, PD2, VI1 & SW6, PDI, VI1, SW5, HI1, and HI2.
Table 4.16:

*All students’ marks of English and Mathematics for three terms*

*North Zone Schools (Zone C)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SCH 001</th>
<th>SCH 002</th>
<th>SCH 003</th>
<th>SCH 004</th>
<th>SCH 005</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI2</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI2</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW3</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW4</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 displays the results of all the students with and without disabilities from all the five schools of the North Zone (Zone C). The scores of each student in English and Mathematics subjects for the three terms (first, second and third terms) were summed. Then the scores of all students with similar disabilities from all the five schools (VI1, VI2, HI1, HI2, PD1, PD2 SW1, SW2, SW3, SW4, SW5, and SW6) were added together. Students without disability SW1 performed better, followed by SW6, SW5, PD1, HI2, HI1, SW3, SW4, VI1, VI2, PD1, and lastly SW2.
Figure 4.5: Cumulative Results of all Students in the three Zones

Figure 4.5 presents the cumulative academic performance of all the students with and without special needs for three consecutive academic terms in mathematics and English (subjects) from all the fifteen secondary schools in the three zones under study (South, Central and North zones). The scores of each group of disability (VI1 & VI2, HI1 & HI2, and PD1 & PD2) were added together and the marks of students without disabilities were also added in two pairs (SW1 & SW2, SW3 & SW4 and SW5 & SW6). The total scores obtainable for each group/category is 18000 total marks. The findings established that, SW1 & SW2 students appeared the best and were seconded by students with SW5 & SW6 followed by SW3 & SW4, PD1 & PD2, HI1 & HI2 and lastly students with VI & VI. This therefore indicated that, SW (students without disabilities 1-6) performed outstandingly beyond the three categories of disabilities (PD 1&2, HI1 & HI2 & VII & 2) in an inclusive classroom. The study also found that students with PD (physical disability) performed brightly than the two other categories of disability (VI & HI) under the study. This study also
confirmed that students with HI (hearing impairment) performed better than students with VI (visual impairment) academically in an inclusive classroom. Lastly this research established that students with VI performed below average compared to all students (SW1, 2, 3, PD & HI) in an inclusive classroom. A number of researches have confirmed that, including students with disabilities in regular education classrooms do not in any way harm non-disabled students and may even fetch them various academic and social benefits. Ruijs & Peetsma (2009) conducted a study on the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in an inclusive setting, their study found that, the academic outcomes for non-disabled students in an inclusive classroom was generally associated with either positive or neutral effects (Hehir & Grinder, 2016). In another research conducted in United States, Australia, Canada, and Ireland, by University of Manchester in 2007, 26 studies that focused on what happens to non-disabled students in inclusive classrooms were systematically reviewed. The researchers found that eighty one percent of the findings from the study indicated that non-disabled students experienced either no effects or positive effect on their academic development due to their being taught together with students with disabilities in the same classroom (Hehir & Grinder, 2016).
Using 18 as degree of freedom (df) and 0.05 as a level of significance, the critical ‘r’ value is .3783 (1-tailed pearson’s table of critical value). The obtained ‘r’ is 0.89 which is less than the critical ‘r’ value in the table of significance. Therefore, this study indicates that the relationship between the academic performance of students with and without disabilities in inclusive classrooms was insignificant. The findings showed that students without disabilities out-performed students with disabilities in regular school settings.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the summary of the study findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

5.2 Summary

This section summarizes the findings according to the objectives of the study in the following subheadings.

5.2.1 Summary of Finding on Regular Teachers Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

ATIAS was used to collect the respondents’ views and perceptions about teachers’ attitudes towards students with disabilities in inclusive settings. The 20 items were divided according to the four factors which ought to be considered when including students with disabilities, namely: Behavioral Issues, Students’ Needs, Resource Issues, and Professional Competency of the teachers. The summary was therefore made based on each of the mentioned factors.

i. Behavior Issues. This factor relates to the kind of behavior the learners with disabilities display in inclusive classrooms. Under this factor, the attitudes of regular teachers in the selected secondary schools was found to be negative towards the inclusion of learners with disabilities.
ii. Students’ Needs. This addresses curricular and extra-curricular needs of such students in inclusive classrooms. The attitudes of the respondents of this study was found to be negative towards the students’ needs.

iii. Resource Issues. This implies the kind of resources that are required in facilitation of the inclusive education in a school. The teachers indicated negative attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities based on resource issue.

iv. Professional Competency. This has to do with teachers’ readiness in handling students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. The respondents of this study showcased negative attitudes on their professional competency.

5.2.2 Summary of Findings on the Instructional Strategies used by Regular Teachers

Findings from chapter four show some of the instructional strategies used by regular teachers while teaching. Out of the 75 general education teachers of this study only 22.7% of them used strategy instruction while teaching in inclusive classrooms. The study also established that only 18.7% of the teachers used co-teaching, 21.3% teachers used parallel instruction, 12% teachers used community-based instruction, 44% used small group instruction, 24% used cooperative teaching, 30.7% employed the use of peer tutoring, 62.7% used large group instruction and lastly, 92% used other strategies in teaching in inclusive classrooms. This study found that only 34% of the regular education teachers in the schools under study were using instructional strategies.
5.2.3 Summary of Finding on the Regular Teachers’ Work Experience

The findings from chapter four show level of regular teachers’ working experience. The study affirmed that 61.3% had 4-9 years working experience, 21.3% worked for 0-4 years. Lastly 17.3% of the respondents had a work experience of 10 and above years.

5.2.4 Summary of Finding on the Supports and Provision given to Regular Teachers by the Administrators

Results in chapter four show the support and provisions given by administrators to the regular teachers in the schools under the study. The study established that majority (59.9%) of the respondents indicated that their principals effectively support them in dealing with students with disabilities in an inclusive classroom, whereas 40.1% percent of the respondents reported that they did not get the required support needed from the administrators. Principals of all the schools also affirmed that they receive additional teachers, classes as well as materials and equipment of inclusive education from government even though not adequately sufficient.

5.2.5 Summary of Findings on the Differences between the Academic Performance of Students with and without Disabilities

Results in chapter four present the cumulative academic performance of all students with and without disabilities. The finding established that students without disability performed better than students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms.
5.3 Conclusion

This study has resulted in five main conclusions as follows:

Firstly, the study concluded that the attitudes of teachers towards inclusion of learners with disabilities in the selected secondary schools of this study was negative.

Secondly, this study concluded that regular teachers do not use effective (inclusive) instructional strategies in educating persons with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Majority of the teachers concentrate on traditional teaching methodologies which do not address most of the educational needs of all students in inclusive settings.

Thirdly, most of the teachers teaching in the schools under study, have 4-9 years of work experience and teachers with more years of working experience (10 and above) showcased more positive attitudes towards inclusion of individuals with disabilities than teachers with fewer years of work experience.

Fourthly, this study concluded that additional support and provision is needed from government, while principals’ support towards teachers’ work was satisfactory.

Fifthly, this study concludes that the relationship between academic performance of students with and without disabilities was insignificant. The study found that students without disabilities performed better than students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms.

This study therefore, contributed to the body of knowledge by finding out that: most of the regular teachers held negative attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities; teachers used non-inclusive instructional strategies; teachers with more years of work experience held more positive attitudes than those with few years; students without disabilities performed better that students without disabilities in regular secondary schools.
5.4 Recommendations

This section is divided into two: the policy recommendations and recommendations for further study.

5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

i. This study established that the regular teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of learners with special needs was negative, based on this therefore, it is recommended that, government of Bauchi state through its ministry of education should provide inclusive education training and re-training programs to all regular education teachers in the state.

ii. The study established that majority of the respondents in this study do not use effective instructional strategies while teaching in an inclusive classrooms. it is recommended the that, teachers should be trained and educated on the importance and benefits of using inclusive instructional strategies to all students.

iii. The findings revealed that teachers who have more years of work experience appeared to display more favorable attitudes than those with few years of working experience. Therefore, more workshops, seminars and public enlightenment should be put in place for all the teachers working with persons with disabilities.

iv. The current study revealed that students without disabilities performed better than individuals with disabilities. It is recommended that more special need materials and equipment should be provided in abundance at any school practicing inclusive education to give a chance to every student to fully participate in classroom activities.
v. Trained supportive personnel should be available in all regular schools such as Braille instructors, Sign Language interpreters, orientation and mobility instructors, special educators and guidance counselors.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Future Research

The present research found that the respondents of this study held negative attitudes towards inclusion of individuals with disabilities; regular teachers do not use effective (inclusive) instructional strategies in teaching; teachers with more years of service held more positive attitudes towards inclusion than teachers with fewer years of service; students without disabilities performed better than students with disabilities in the selected regular secondary schools of Bauchi state.

It is therefore recommended that, this study can be replicated in other States of Nigeria; other studies should be conducted in primary schools to find out the attitudes of teachers towards the inclusion of learners with disabilities. Another area of investigation may include how attitudes of some professionals such as speech pathologists, guidance and counselors, social workers, school clinicians and psychologists affect students with disabilities.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: Map of Nigeria is showing all the thirty-six states with the study state.

Source: Map of Nigeria (@www.waado.org/maps/Nigeria-states)
APPENDIX II:

Study locale showing the map of Bauchi state’s three zones

Source: Map of Nigeria (@ www.waado.org/maps/Nigeria-states)
Appendix III: Attitudes Towards Inclusion in Africa Scale (ATIAS)

I am doing a research study on a topic “Evaluating regular teachers’ attitudes on the inclusion of students with special needs in some selected regular secondary schools of Bauchi state, Nigeria.” This information was important to the government in the implementation and improvement of the inclusive education program. Your responses were used for academic purpose.

Please, kindly complete the following scale. Since you need not provide your name, there was no way in which your answer can be identified. There is no right or wrong answer to any of the statements. An answer is “right” if it describes what you know or feel about what is being asked. So please be honest and do not choose an answer because it seems the right thing to say. Just answer truthfully and independently.

I thank you sincerely for your time and willingness to participate in this research.

SECTION “A” Demographic Data of the participants

1. **Sex:**
   - Male .............
   - Female ........

2. **Marital Status:**
   - Married ..........
   - Single ............

3. **Qualification:**
   - NCE..... Degree..... Masters....... Others (specify)........

4. **Years of working experience**
   - 0-4 year ....
   - 5-9years....
   - 10 and above years....

5. **Name of school**
   - ........................................................

6. **Do you have any disability?**
   - Yes ........
   - No.........
7. If yes, please specify…………………………………………

8. Do you have a family member with a disability?
   Yes……….. No…………...

9. Have you ever attended training on inclusive education
   Yes……No……

SECTION “B”

Instruction

KEY: - 1(SA) = Strongly Agree
     2 (A) = Agree
     3 (NS) = Not sure
     4 (D) = Disagree
     5 (SD) = Strongly Disagree

Please tick (□) in the appropriate box for your response below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students with difficulty following school rules should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students who are physically aggressive towards their peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in school should be regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students who need help to move about should be in regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students whose speech is difficult to understand should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students who cannot read standard print and acquire Braille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students who are verbally aggressive towards their peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students who persistently experience difficulty in expressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their thoughts should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students who lack daily living skills and need training in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing themselves should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Students with speech problem should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Students who need sign language as a medium of communication should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Students who have difficulty in controlling their behavior should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Students who are often absent from school should be in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Working with students with special needs was difficult for me because I have never worked with before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Giving equal attention to all students in inclusive classrooms was difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I will not be able to cope with students with special needs in regular school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Inappropriate teacher/student ratio in inclusive class will lead to stress and anxiety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I do not have knowledge and skills to teach students with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Lack of adequate resource and special materials will make inclusion difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Inappropriate infrastructure will make inclusion impossible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Class size will make inclusion difficult to operate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV: Administrative (principal’s) Support and Provision

(Littrells’ Survey of Administrators’ towards Support)

I am doing a research study on a topic “effects of regular teachers’ attitudes on the performance of students with disabilities in some selected regular secondary schools of Bauchi state, Nigeria.” This information is important to the government in improving inclusive education programs. Your responses are used for academic purpose.

Please, complete the following scale. Since you need not provide your name, there is no way in which your answer be identified. There is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions. An answer is “right” if it describes what you know or feels about what is being asked. So please be honest and do not choose an answer because it seems the right thing to say. Just answer truthfully and independently.

I thank you sincerely for your time and willingness to participate in this research.

SECTION “A” Demographic Data of the participants

1. Sex:

   Male .............   Female ........

2. Marital Status:

   Married ............   Single ............

3. Qualification:

   NCE..... Degree..... Masters....... Others (specify)........

4. Years of working experience

   0-4 year .... 5-9years.... 10 and above years
5. Name of school


6. Type of school

Mixed school......... Boy’s school......... Girl’s school......

7. Mode of study

Day........... Boarding ...........

SECTION “B”

Please indicate to what extent the following statements occur between you and your principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent: 1 = no extent to 4 = great extent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acts friendly towards me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is easy to approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gives me undivided attention when I am talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is honest and straightforward with the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shows genuine concern for my program and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shows appreciation for my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Offers constructive feedback after observing my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides frequent feedback about my performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provides helpful information for improving personal coping skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides information on up-to-date instructional techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assists with proper identification of special education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Is available to help when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Establishes channels of communication between general and special education teaching and other professionals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Helps me during parent confrontations when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Provides time for various nonteaching responsibilities (e.g., IEPs, conferences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Provides adequate planning time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Provides material, space, and resource needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Participates in child study/eligibility/IEP meetings/parent conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Works for me to plan specific goals and objectives for my program and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Provides extra assistance when I become overloaded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V: Interview Guide for Principal

Gender: Male: ☐ Female: ☐

Name of school________________________________________________________

Educational qualifications:

________________________________________________________

Years of working experience:

____________________________________________________________________

Years served as principal at the current school:

____________________________________________________________________

1. What support did you receive from the government regarding including students with disabilities in your school?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

2. What type of professional development or training did your staff received before being in the inclusive classroom?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

3. How competent are your staffs in facilitating inclusive education?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
4. What is the most important factor you would attribute to the success of the inclusive education in your school?

5. What challenges have you encountered in the process of including students with disabilities in your school?

6. What ways do you suggest the government will follow to improve the success of inclusive education in your school?
APPENDIX VI

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGY USED BY TEACHERS

Please indicate which of the instructional strategy/strategies or methods listed below do you ever used in teaching in an inclusive classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Which Strategy (is) /Method do you use in teaching?</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>REMARK (Reason for using the strategy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategy instruction</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Co-teaching</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parallel instruction</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community-based instruction</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Small group instruction</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cooperative teaching/learning</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Large group instruction</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other strategies/methods</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other strategies/methods: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Appendix VII: Observation Checklist: School and Classroom Observation

Checklist

Name of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Not available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sign language interpreters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Notetakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staff conversant with sign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hearing devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Special resource room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Slate, style, and abacus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Staff conversant with Braille and abacus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Orientation and mobility personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wide corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Low toilets for students in wheelchairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GOVERNMENT OF BAUCHI STATE
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Our Ref: ____________________________ Your Ref: ____________________________ Date: 7/03/2016

Muhammad Hamma
C/O Special Needs Education
Kenyatta University

APPROVAL FOR THE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

Your letter dated 20th February, 2016, titled “Application for Permission to conduct Research,” refers.

2. I am directed to convey approval of the Honourable Commissioner Bauchi State Ministry of Education for you to conduct the research as requested, please.

3. Thank you

Binta A. Sambo (Mrs)
For: Honourable Commissioner
APPENDIX X: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PARTICIPANTS’ INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Introduction
My name is Muhammad Hamma. I am a lecturer with the Bauchi State University, Gadau and currently pursuing a PhD degree at Kenyatta University, Nairobi Kenya. The area of my research is “Evaluation of regular teachers’ attitudes towards academic performance of students with disabilities in selected secondary schools in Bauchi State, Nigeria”. The main purpose of this consent form is to explain to you the aims of the research and provide you with the information that may help you decide whether to participate in the study or not. You are free to ask any question concerning the research before participating and have right to withdraw at any time of your interest. This study has already been approved by the Bauchi State ministry of education (see attached copy of the approval letter).

What is my contribution to the research?
Your contribution to this study is to honestly express your opinion concerning the questions and statements that may be presented to you in scales, questionnaire or interview (as the case may be). The purpose of the scales, questionnaires and interview is to find out the teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities into regular classrooms, the instructional strategies used in teaching, principals’ support towards teachers work and support and provisions by government towards education of students with disabilities in the selected secondary schools respectively.

Participant’s statement
I have read the content of this consent form. I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw at my convenience.

I agree to participate in this research study: Yes [ ] No [ ]

Participant’s name ------------------------------------------------- Date ------------------------------