

# Schools Readiness to Accept 75% of Children with Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025

Abdul Rahim Razalli, Haniz Ibrahim, Manisah Mohd Ali, Nasir Masran, Grace Annamal A/P Gnana Piragasam, Noor Aini Ahmad, Noratiqah Satari

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Faculty of Human Development, Sultan Idris Education University, 35900 Tanjong Malim, Perak  
Email: rahim.r@fpm.upsi.edu.my

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v10-i1/9043>

DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v10-i1/9043

*Published Online:* 24 February 2021

## Abstract

This paper is a study on schools willingness to accept 75 percent of students with special needs in the mainstream learning environment by 2025 in the aspect of vision, incentives and rationale of implementation. The study uses survey method that involves 627 samples selected through purposive sampling, using questionnaire instrument adapted from Milteniene & Venclovate (2012) and Jennifer (2015) that will cover vision, incentives and rationale of implementation. Findings of the study are interpreted with descriptive analysis using percentage, mean score and standard deviation. The findings show that only rationale of implementation exceeds the 75 percent level of special-need students in the mainstream learning environment by 2025 while the vision and incentive aspects also surpass the level of readiness. The rationale of implementation exceeds the level of readiness to accept 75 percent of students in the mainstream learning environment by 2025 with a mean of 4.96 and a standard deviation of .603 with 82.3 percent agreed to accept, while the vision aspect with a mean of 3.93; standard deviation .53] with 65.3 percent and a mean value incentive of 4.01; a standard deviation of .630 with 66.6 percent are not ready with the implementation. The overall findings also indicate that the level of readiness of accepting 75 percent of students in the mainstream learning environment by 2025 is still unreachabele with a mean of 4.30; standard deviation of .603 and only 71.5 percent who accept the implementation. The implications of the study show that by 2025, the schools readiness to accept students with special needs can reach its targeted level of 75 percent provided that further improvement to be made in the aspect of vision and incentives.

**Keyword:** Vision, Incentives, Implementation Rationale, Special-Need Students, Learning and Mainstream.

**Introduction**

Special Education is a field associated with different pedagogical and assessment but eventually aims to see the special students to live in a normal environment. Special education is a form of education provided to meet the special needs of the children (Zainal & Suhaila, 2010). Students with special needs (SSN) in Malaysia are also given the opportunity to choose their direction of education from one of three schooling options: special education integration program (SEIP), special education school (SES) or inclusive education program (IEP). IEP is enacted in the Regulations of Education (Special Education) 2013, the Education Act 1996 which allows the SSN to attend the same classes in government schools or government-assisted schools. In addition to preparing IEP students for the learning and teaching process as well as preparing for exams such as UPSR, PMR and SPM. IEP also provides the opportunity for SSN to interact and socialize with mainstream students in a positive and effective manner.

Zalizan (2009) points out that IEP success depends on teachers' perceptions of their learning ability and their readiness to change to meet different individual needs. According to him, the success of IEP is determined by collaboration between special education teachers and the mainstream teachers. Simmi (2010) found that mainstream teachers were less prepared to accept special-need students in the regular classroom since they are incapable to serve the children and worried that they will downgrade the academic standards. The negative categorization and response to the SSN is also another obstacle to inclusive education. Their perception that students with special needs disrupt their learning and facilitating sessions (pdpc) led to negative perception to SSN. Malaysian Education Development Plan (MEDP) 2013-2025, the Ministry of Education Malaysia is committed to increase the number of special students in the Inclusive Education Program (IEP). This is based on international best practices and existing policies. "Enhancing Enrollment of Students with Special Needs in the Inclusive Education Program" is a charter under equity aspirations that became one of the 25 key initiatives in the Integrated Agenda under Ministry of Education in 2013. Inclusive education is a field where there is sharing between mainstream education teacher and special education teacher in teaching a diverse group of students, including those with special needs, in a general educational setting, and in a manner that is flexible and meets the learning needs (Friend., 2010). Teachers will be more prepared to teach if they gain information or knowledge on the subject being taught, their students cooperate, and there is sharing in thinking between mainstream and special education teachers (Melanie et al., 2008). As for teaching approach, collaborative teaching is best implemented in Inclusive education that combines skills of special education teachers and academic knowledge of mainstream teachers (Yehuda et al., 2010).

**Problem Statement**

Abbott (2006) stated that inclusive schooling is an effort undertaken towards normalizing disability by reducing the gap or divide between special education and mainstream education. Another opinion by Manisah (2006) mentioned that inclusive education is a concept that allows students with disabilities to be placed in the mainstream class and to be taught by the mainstream teachers. However, Barton & Tomlinson (2012) in her findings showed that the mainstream teachers are less likely to involve the special students in the teaching and learning process thus discouraging the students to join the inclusive class. In the same view, Najib and Sanisah (2006) also stated that current mainstream teachers are still ambiguous of their role in handling the special-need students. On top of that, there are also obstacles to implement

inclusive education such as time, additional tasks and lack of knowledge in inclusive education. Moreover, other barriers like limited resources, negative attitudes of mainstream teachers towards SSN and shortage of trained teachers in implementing the programs planned (Rosli, 2000). Insufficient knowledge in special education will influence teachers' understanding of SSN needs and the selection of appropriate teaching strategies (Chhabra, 2010). While Kristensen's (2003) study found that there are barriers to readiness from various aspects that hinder inclusive education such as the public examination system, the background of mainstream teachers and communication between mainstream teachers and special education teachers.

McLeskey (2010) defines inclusiveness as an educational philosophy. In addition to acceptance and participation of special-need students in the school community, emphasis is also given to the support provided for the learning of special-need students so they will have the opportunity to succeed and to equally participate in school community with other students. Additionally, all SNS and normal students have the same right for education. However, the low level of knowledge among mainstream teachers and even special education teachers on the basics and vision of inclusive education will impede the implementation of inclusive education in terms of its policy and vision. Ishartiwi (2010) remarks that there is a lot of hope in realizing inclusive education. However there are many challenges arise, namely teachers who lack the competence and ability to treat the SNS, the school staffs who are still unclear about inclusive education as well as lack of knowledge in treating the SNS. Nevertheless, it is now evident in Malaysia that special education field is gaining more attention and privileges. The effort can be seen from enactment of various laws and specific laws for individuals with special needs. It is also included in the national education system.

Johnstone (2010) argued that inclusive education mostly focuses on eliminating or reducing barriers to learning caused by inaccessible pedagogy, inappropriate expectations or physically challenged environments. However, students with learning disabilities who participated in the inclusive learning need to adapt to the environment that constraint their learning. Implementation of IEP in terms of vision, incentives and rationale implementation can be observed from a report released by the Inspectorate and Quality Assurance Committee, MOE (2013) on their inspection of inclusive education programs. It was found that inclusive education was not effectively implemented due to the clear misunderstanding of IEP and students needs (Khochen & Radford, 2012). In light of these issues, this study is important to ensure the success of IEP in line with the Malaysian Education Development Plan 2013-2025. Hence, aspects related to IEP vision, incentives and rationale should be further explored to know whether the three aspects show the level of readiness to accept 75 percent of students with special needs in the mainstream learning environment by 2025.

### **Study Objectives**

The purpose of this study was to examine the level of readiness to accept 75 percent of students with special needs in the mainstream learning environment by 2025 in terms of vision, incentives and implementation rationale.

### **Research Methodology**

The research uses the survey method with 627 research samples selected through purposive sampling and questionnaire instruments adapted from a set of questionnaires developed by

Lina & Indre (2012) and Bilal (2015) to examine visions of policy, utilization and culture. For the Incentive and Rational elements, the implementation focuses on schools, mainstream teachers, special education teachers and special-need students. The study findings were then interpreted with descriptive analysis using standard mean and standard deviation.

### Results and Discussion

The analysis was based on three aspects of readiness level to accept 75 percent of students with special needs in the mainstream learning environment by 2025, which encompasses the vision, incentives, and rational of implementation.

Table 1

#### Vision

No	Item	mean	sd	Level
B1	School staff have been exposed to Inclusive Education.	4.21	1.261	High
B2	Ensuring a successful inclusive education programs is not considered as one of important missions in school.	2.93	1.388	Moderate
B3	Documentation on the implementation of inclusive education program is restricted to certain school staff only.	3.69	1.345	Moderate
B4	Only certain school staff are asked to resolve issues related to implementation of inclusive education programs.	4.01	2.049	high
B5	Discussions on inclusive programs are encouraged among school staffs.	5.53	1.079	Very high
B6	The development of inclusive education programs is the main agenda in teacher meetings.	3.55	1.272	High
B7	The process of implementing inclusive program is an ongoing effort by the school to engage students with special needs in the mainstream setting.	4.63	1.046	High
B8	School encourage special students involvement in all mainstream activities.	4.65	1.210	High
B9	The school never made any announcements on achievement of students with special needs achievement during assembly.	2.14	1.446	Low
B10	Schools encourage social interaction between students with special needs and typical students.	4.88	0.924	Very High
Overall		4.022	1.302	High

Findings from Table I show that B10, B5, B7 and B8 value of the highest mean scores and percentages that pass the Readiness Level of Accepting 75 Percent of Students with Special Needs in the Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 from the Vision Aspect in the range of 4.64 to 5.53 and the readiness percentage of 76.8% to 91.8%. The vision aspects being given priority are related to discussion of IEP encouraged among school staff, promoting social interaction between typical and special-need students, encouraging activities involving

special-need students with typical students and the implementation of IEP as an ongoing effort to engage special-need students in mainstream setting. Whereas B1, B2, B3, B4, B6, and B9 have not reached the readiness level of Receiving 75 Percent of Students with Special Needs in the Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 with a mean range of 2.14 to 4.21 and percentage of readiness from 35.5% to 68.9%. for the vision aspect that has not reached the level of readiness, is to announce the achievement of special-need students during school assemblies, documentation of IEP implementation, development of IEP program, ensuring success of IEP program, receiving IEP exposure and implementation of IEP in teacher meeting agenda. To sum it all, the vision aspect does not exceed the readiness level of accepting 75 percent students with Special Needs in the Mainstream Learning Environment By 2025 at a high level of 4.022 with standard deviation of 1.302 and only 66.8% agreed.

The study findings on aspects that pass the readiness level in accepting 75 Percent of Special-Need Students in Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 are IEP discussion is encouraged among school staff, encouraging social interaction between typical and special-needs students, encouraging activities that involve both special and typical students and continuous efforts in IEP implementation to engage students with special needs in the mainstream environment. The aspects mentioned are supported in a study carried out (Van der Bij et, al 2016) who confirmed that teachers involved in IEP are ready to teach SNS and are able to encourage active social interaction between typical and SNS students. The findings of this study is in line with another study by Kochen and Radford (2012) who explained that education that provides opportunity for SNS to learn with other normal students is an inclusive education model based on the principle that school services should be provided equally for all children regardless of differences, whether they are children with special needs, social, emotional, cultural or language differences. The findings are also supported with findings from Andrew and Frankel (2010) that indicates teachers are willing to teach SNS at their level best and do not hinder their students from attending public examinations. As such, it is clear that mainstream teachers are ready to teach SNS since they are confident with the students' abilities and capabilities to compete with mainstream students.

This finding is in line with a study carried out by Saad (2010) on education policy which stated that this group is under the jurisdiction and supervision of the School Division supervised by the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE). Capable SNS students can study together with their peers in the mainstream if they have normal cognitive and emotional abilities. The study is also supported by findings from Amin and Yasin (2016) who reported that the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) targets 30% of SNS participation in the mainstream education system to catch up with Wave 1 of the Malaysian Education Development Plan (MEDP) 2013-2015. Success in teaching and learning is ensured when there is interaction between teachers and students also, content in learning suits according to the needs of students. According to Vermeulan et, al (2012) inclusive education is considered successful with the collaboration and consultation of various stakeholders. Teaching collaboration is important in providing quality learning for special-need students (Lina & Indre, 2012). A study by Pancsofar and Petroff (2016) shows that teachers who are involved in inclusive classroom teaching are willing to collaborate using a one teacher teaches while another teacher assists. In other words, mainstream teachers are responsible for teaching and special education teachers provide more specific individual support to SNS students.

While the findings on vision have not reached the readiness level of accepting 75 Percent of Special-Need Students (SNS) in the Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025. The vision aspects include the implementation of IEP in schools including announcements on achievement of students with special needs during school assemblies, documentation of IEP implementation, IEP program development, executing IEP programs, receiving IEP exposure and implementing IEP in teacher meeting agenda. The findings of this study are supported by Saad (2003) who stated that there is a labeling effect on SNS in the implementation of inclusive education and teachers' ignorant attitude towards SNS due to their lack of knowledge which hinders their acceptance of SNS in the mainstream classroom. Moreover, the low level of knowledge of both mainstream teachers and special education teachers about inclusive education makes it difficult to implement inclusive education. Ishartiwi (2010) noted that there are still challenges in implementing inclusive education. In particular, the teachers who involved in IEP lack the competence and ability to treat SNS, school staff are lacking sufficient knowledge of inclusive education and providing services for the special students. In another study by Ahmad and Abu Hanifah (2015) found that although teachers have high level of knowledge in behavior management nevertheless it can be further improved by developing courses in services, module development and conducting workshops on behavior management among special education teachers. What is more, such measures need to be considered by relevant authorities. The high collaboration gap between special education teachers and mainstream teachers in the implementation of IEP requires major changes in education with collaboration of different groups of expertise (Slee,2013). This statement is supported by Stuart (2010) who argued that inclusiveness is unsuccessful if collaboration between special education teacher and mainstream teacher fails. Hence, these issues need to be taken seriously. Without collaboration, they still consider the task of IEP to be burdensome (Terzi,2014). Lack of support from administrators, parents, teachers and students will hinder success of IEP in schools. Administrator involvement is critical to support IEP (Manisah & Noorfaziha, 2014). Collaboration requires thought-sharing between mainstream and special education teachers. Teachers involved in IEP have their own strengths and weaknesses in ensuring success of inclusive education (Ahmad et, al 2011).

Table II

*Incentive Aspect*

No	Item	mean	sd	Level
D1	Schools are given incentives to pursue inclusive education.	3.60	1.491	High
D2	Mainstream teachers will accept students with special needs if given support.	4.54	0.977	High
D3	Mainstream teachers accept inclusive implementation if they are assisted by special education teachers in resolving arising issues.	4.71	1.803	High
D4	Mainstream teachers are <b>not assisted</b> by student management assistants in implementing inclusive education.	3.73	2.578	high
D5	Schools <b>do not recognize</b> those involved in inclusive education programs.	2.68	1.406	Low
D6	Involvement of students with special needs in mainstream classroom activities is considered in teacher's annual performance assessment.	4.13	1.759	High
D7	Mainstream teachers will accept inclusive education if the number of typical students are reduced in the classroom.	3.60	1.365	High
D8	The work of special-need students is always on display in the classroom as well as in the school area.	4.17	1.267	High
D9	Students with special needs who are weak in academic achievement are given the opportunity to showcase their natural talents.	4.74	0.972	Very High
D10	Typical student support is organized to help students with special needs in an inclusive classroom.	4.24	0.591	Very High
D11	There is no assistance provided by the school to students with special needs to adapt in inclusive classroom learning.	2.98	1.444	Low
Overall		3.921	1.423	High

Findings from Table II show the D2, D3 and D9 and B8 values of the highest mean scores and percentages above the Readiness Level of Accepting 75 Percent Students of Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 from Incentive Aspects in the range of 4.54 to 4.1 and standard deviation .972- 1,803 with a 75.4% readiness percentage to 78.7%. Aspects of incentives for academic achievement and talent, accepting special students and IEP with the help of special education teachers. Whereas D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D10, and D11 have not reached the readiness level of accepting 75 Percent of Students with Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 with a mean range of 2.68 to 4.28 and readiness percentage of 44.5% to 71.1% . In terms of vision that has not reached the level of readiness is the school's incentives for IEP, the mainstream teachers are not assisted by student management assistants, no recognition, the annual performance assessment of mainstream teachers involved in IEP, accepting special-need students only when there is shortage of

typical student, works of students with special needs, peer support in helping students with special needs and no assistance to students with special needs to adapt in IEP. Overall, the incentive aspect has not yet surpassed the level of readiness of accepting 75 percent of Students with Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment By 2025 at a high level of 3.921 and the standard deviation of 1.423 and only 65.1% agreed. The finding is supported by the study of Bashan and Holsblat (2012) who emphasized that collaborative teaching is difficult especially for teachers who are firm in planning and doing work despite the fact that they need to work with other teachers in the Inclusive classroom. Collaborative teaching occurs when teachers plan together, implement teaching together, and evaluate student achievement together (Freeth, 2017). When teachers collaborate, they will share experiences, knowledge that will help reinforce learning and ultimately improve students' achievement.

Findings on incentive aspect that pass above the Readiness Level of Accepting 75 Percent Students of Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 are only academic achievement and talent, accept special-need students and IEP with the help of special education teachers. The study findings support the concept of inclusive education that is based on acceptance, place, and school environment in which all disadvantaged children can be assessed equally, treated with respect, and given equal opportunities (Boyle et, al 2011). In fact, the studies supported the solution of issues related to participation, in particular all children need to learn together and cooperate with each other in sharing learning experiences (Atkinson, 2015). It is unconditional, and it does not talk about half inclusiveness (Sauro, 2012). Every child needs to reach the maximum benefit of their attendance at school. The results of the study are also supported by the work of Irish Department of Education and Science (2007) which explains the integrated environment, as stated, the burden of adapting to what may be a largely unmodified environment often placed on children who learn differently. To ensure inclusive education is accepted and practiced by all students in mainstream education, it requires cooperation between special education schools, partners or agencies such as social workers; youth care professionals, school officials, police (Hansen, 2012; Mitchell, 2014).

While the incentive aspect has not yet reached the Readiness Level of Accepting 75 Percent Students of Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 that involve the implementation of IEP in schools including school incentives for IEP, mainstream teachers are not assisted by student management assistant, no recognition, annual assessment of mainstream teacher performance who are involved in IEP, accepting special-need students only when there is shortage of typical student, works of students with special needs, peer support in helping students with special needs and no assistance to students with special needs to adapt in IEP. This study supports Mikyung's (2016) work that found special education teachers have less knowledge of the subject matter to be taught to mainstream and SNS students. What's more, mainstream teachers need more training on IEP. Collaborative teaching occurs when teachers plan together, implement joint teaching, and evaluate student achievement together (Murawski, 2008; Takala & Uusitalo-Malmivaara, 2012). The construct on absence of school support for IEP items shows the lowest mean. The finding indicates that the school does not provide assistance and the school does not recognize teachers involved with IEP. This study is in line with Howard and Potts's (2009) study that address meetings are



important for discussing standards setting, assessment, facilities, modifications, instructional strategies and classroom preparation so that they need to be recognized in IEP.

As a result, it is observed that teachers are more in need of knowledge on teaching methods in inclusive classes than their need to participate in IEP meetings. Support from students involved in IEP is also given the real attention in particular the mainstream students. The only form of support available to support students with special needs is peer support. Mainstream students can play their role in guiding and creating a friendly learning environment for the special students. The approach begins with a shared activity that encourages students to identify similarities and differences from their peers (Memisevic & Hodzic, 2011). The role played by peers in the mainstream class can help students with special needs in IEP. The issue of mainstream teachers not assisted in the IEP implementation however conflicts with the study of Lempinen, (2016) which stated that new regulation in Finland introduces a new ideology in the practice of inclusive education programs which is the importance of having an assistant to help if children are suffering from hyperactivity disorder in IEP.

Whereas the Department of Education and Science Ireland (2007) notes the differences in intellectual ability between special students and mainstream students require qualified student management assistants. To ensure that IEP is recognized, accepted and practiced by all students and teachers in mainstream education, hence there is a need for cooperation among special education schools, partners or agencies such as social workers and professionals (Nadya & Petroff, 2016).

Table III  
Rationale of Implementation

No	Item	mean	sd	Level
G1	Directions for implementation by Ministry of Education Malaysia	4.90	0.911	Very High
G2	Allows students with special needs to sit in public examinations.	4.90	0.869	Very High
G3	Increase the academic achievement of students with special needs.	4.77	0.889	Very High
G4	Enables typical pupils to be models for students with special needs.	4.93	0.821	Very High
G5	Boost motivation of students with special needs to learn.	5.05	0.743	Very High
G6	Ensuring students with special needs have the same rights to study in an environment without any hindrance.	5.05	0.725	Very High
G7	Build students' self-confidence to meet their full potential.	5.05	0.733	Very High
G8	Make sure students with special needs can adapt with typical students to improve their daily life skills.	5.08	0.728	Very High
G9	Increase awareness and acceptance of schools and communities on diverse needs of students with special needs.	4.90	0.911	Very High
Overall		4.95	0.814	High

Findings from Table III show that G1 to G9 have high mean scores and percentages above the Readiness Level of Accepting 75 Percent of Students with Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment by 2025 from the Rational Aspects of IEP implementation in the range of 4.90 to 5.05 and standard deviation of .725 to .911 with 81.3 percent to 84.3 percent of readiness level. Overall for the rationale of implementation above the level of readiness accepting 75 per cent students with Special Needs in Mainstream Learning Environment By 2025 at a very high level with a mean of 4.40 and standard deviation of .814 and 82.2 percent agreed. The agreed rational components of implementation are (a) IEP implementation guidelines by the Ministry of Education (b) Enabling special-need students to take public examinations (c) Enhancing special-need students achievement (d) Enabling typical students to become model to special-need students (e) Boost motivation of students with special needs to learn (f) Ensure that special-need students have the same right to study in an environment without hindrance (g) Build self-confidence of special-need students to achieve optimum potential (h) Typical students to enhance their daily life skills (i) Increase awareness and acceptance of school and community members on diverse needs of students with special needs.

The results of this study found that compliance with the rationale for implementation of the Ministry of Education Malaysia is in line with studies by Mohd. Amin and Mohd Yasin (2016) who stated that IEP is enacted in the Education Regulations (Special Education) 2013, Education Act 1996 which allows the SNS to attend the same classes in government schools or government-assisted schools. In terms of assessment and academic achievement, the

findings of this study are contrary to Jones (2012) work which found that there are constraints on inclusive education such as the public examination system, mainstream teacher background and communication between mainstream teachers and special education teacher.

However, the findings are in line with the works of Terzi (2014) that address special-need students showed higher academic and social performance when they were able to study in a similar environment and Elisa (2013) study noted that inclusive education in general is considered as multi-dimensional concepts including diversity in terms of response and assessment, human rights considerations, social justice and equity issues, as well as social models of disability and socio-political education models. Moreover, it also includes the school's transformation process that focuses on eligibility and access of children to receive education. In the context of equality and rights, the study findings are in line with the findings of Smith et,al (2015) who observed that as children entering formal education, teachers may begin to realize that some children may left behind their classmates in reading such as reading or mathematics, or behavior that may be indicated as production, violence, or lack of compliance. Most children with moderate disabilities cannot be identified with potential disabilities until they begin their formal education. The same thing is said about the impetus in providing education for children with special needs is the desire of whole society and the government to assert the children's rights to get the education that they need. The educational approach should avoid finding difficulties or deficits in the child but instead should focus on the educational institution's capacity in understanding and responding to the children's needs (Van der Bij et,al 2016 ). In many developing countries, educating the children is not only focused on economic and social development, but also on potential workforce training (Simmi et, al 2010). Therefore, the educational goals for special-need children should also reflect the mainstream children.

In terms of assessment, it was found in this study that De Boer et,al (2011) stated that Curriculum-Based Assessment (CBA) is an assessment to measure the level of students achievement based on the national curriculum. In other words, teachers evaluate skills acquisition by monitoring children's progress based on the curriculum being used. Curriculum-based assessments have been submitted and found to be most appropriate. The findings also mirror Forlin (2012) study, which aims to measure progress and what needs to be done is to develop their educational potential. The principle of assessment for these children is to maximize their learning potential and to be able to move forward for independent living in the future. The findings also suggest that the rationale for implementation is in line with Meijer's study (201 which emphasizes the features needed in inclusive education, school and classroom levels, pedagogical features such as cooperative learning, effective teaching methods, feedback, frequent assessment, flexible assessments and high expectations of what students can achieve need to be considered in implementing IEP. The importance of IEP can be assessed from the academic, emotional and social aspects of special education students when they become more inclusive. Although this initiative seems to show success in inclusive education, majority of teachers who are already trained are very limited in numbers to support the students with special needs (Poon et al., 2013).

Table IV

*Overall aspects*

Aspect	Mean	SD	Level	Percentage of acceptance
Vision	3.93	.531	High	65.3
Incentive	4.01	.630	High	66.6
Implementation Rationale	4.96	.649	Very High	82.3
Overall	4.30	.603	High	71.5

Table IV shows that the analysis was based on three aspects of level of readiness of accepting 75 percent of students with special needs in the mainstream learning environment by 2025, which covers aspects of vision, incentives, and implementation rationale. The findings show that only rationale of implementation surpass the level of readiness with a mean of 4.96 and a standard deviation of .603 with 82.3 percent agreed, while the vision aspect with a mean of 3.93; standard deviation .53] with 65.3 percent and a mean value incentive of 4.01; standard deviation of .630 with 66.6 percent are not yet ready to accept the situation. The overall findings also indicate that the level of readiness to accept 75 percent of students in the mainstream learning environment by 2025 is still unacceptable with a mean of 4.30; standard deviation of .603 and only 71.5 percent. The findings on rationale of implementation are in line with another study by Amin and Yasin (2016) who evaluated the implementation of IEP in Wave 1 of the Malaysian Education Development Plan (MEDP) 2013-2015 following a policy set by the Ministry of Education (MOE) to target 30% of SNS participation in the mainstream education system. Additionally, with the initiative taken by Malaysian Education Development Plan (PPPM) 2013-2025, the Ministry of Education Malaysia is committed to increase the number of special-need students (MBKs) in the Inclusive Education Program (IEP). The implementation is based on international best practices and existing policies. "Enhancing Students with Special Needs Enrollment in the Inclusive Education Program" is a charter under the aspiration of equity that became one of the 25 key initiatives in the Integrated Agenda of the Ministry of Education in 2013.

**Conclusion**

The effectiveness of a program in practice requires cooperation of all parties. The same is true with IEP that are carried out for students with special needs in regular daily schools. The purpose of the program is planned with the ultimate goal for special students to get the same education opportunities as normal students in an unlimited environment. However in making IEP program a success require cooperation of all parties. This is because aspects of vision, incentives and rationale of implementation that involve policy, cooperation, culture, students with special needs, typical students and special education teachers are considered as the key factors that influence the success of IEP. Collaboration between mainstream and special education teachers in all three areas will provide the best education for students with special needs, hence achieve the readiness level of accepting 75 percent of students with special needs in the mainstream learning environment by 2025.

**Acknowledgement**

This research has been carried out under Fundamental Research Grants Scheme (FRGS/1/2016/SSI09/UPSI/02/4) provided by Ministry of Education of Malaysia. The Authors

would like to extend their gratitude to Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI) that helped manage the grants.

## References

- Abbott, L. (2006). Northern Ireland head teachers' perceptions of inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10, 627–643. doi: 10.1080/13603110500274379.
- Barton, L., & Tomlinson, S. (2012). *Special education and social interests*. London: Routledge
- Ali, M. M., Mustapha, R., & Jelas, Z. M. (2006). An Empirical Study on Teachers' Perceptions towards Inclusive Education in Malaysia. *International journal of special education*, 21(3), 36-44.
- Ghafar, M. N., & Jahaya, S. (2006). *Bias Pengajaran Guru dalam Pelajaran Khas dan Pelajaran Normal, Sabah* : Annual Conference on Teacher Education.
- Othman, M. R. (2000). *Hubungan kepimpinan instruksional dengan iklim sekolah*. Tesis Sarjana. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Chhabra, S., Strivasta, R., and Strivasta, I. (2010). Inclusive education in Botswana: The perceptions of school teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 20 (4), 219-228.
- Zalizan M. J. (2009). *Pendidikan Inklusif dan Pelajar Berkeperluan Khas*. Penerbit: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Forlin, C. (2012). *Future Directions for Inclusive Education. An International Perspective*. United Kingdom. Routledge.
- Ministry of Education. (2012). *Support for children with disabilities*. Retrieved from <http://www.moe.gov.sg/education/programmes/support-for-children-special-needs/>
- David, R., & Kuyini, A.B. (2012). Social inclusion: teachers' as facilitators in peer acceptance of students with disabilities in regular classrooms in Tamil Nadu, India. *International Journal of Special Education*. 27(2), 1-12.
- Manisah, Ramli & Zalizan. (2006). An empirical study on teachers' perception towards inclusive education in Malaysia. *International Journal of Special Education*. 21(3), 36-44.
- Friend, M. (2010). *Special Education: Contemporary Perspectives for School Professionals*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Hamdan, A. R., & Hussin, A. M. K. (2013). Challenges of Co-teaching in Malaysian Inclusive Classroom: Administrators', Teachers' and Parents' Overview. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.02.019>.
- Saad, S. (2010). *Komitmen dan Peranan Guru dalam Pelaksanaan Pendekatan Pendidikan Inklusif di Malaysia*. Jabatan Pendidikan Khas, Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- Florian, L. (2008). Special or inclusive education: future trends. *British Journal of Special Education*. Vol 35(4), 202-209.
- Hick, P., & Thomas, G. (2009). *Inclusion and Diversity in Education*. Vol. 1: Inclusive Education as Social Justice. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Mohd, A. N., & Yasin, M. H. (2016). Pelaksanaan Program Pendidikan Inklusif Murid Berkeperluan Khas dalam Pelan Pembangunan Pendidikan Malaysia 2013 – 2015. *Proceeding International Conference on Special Education in Southeast Asia Region* (6), 29-35.
- Saad, S. (2003). *Malaysian Preschool Children with ADHD in Inclusive Settings*. PhD thesis. University of Warwick.

- Stuart, S. K., & Rinaldi, C. (2009). Framework for teachers implementing tiered Instruction. *Teaching Exceptional Children* 42(2): 52-57.
- Ali, M., & Hassan, N. (2014). Perspektif Guru terhadap Keterlibatan Akademik dalam Kalangan Murid dengan Ketidakupayaan Penglihatan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia* 39(2), 109-114.
- Ahmad, A. R., Zainal, A. N., Jelas, Z. M, & Saleha, A. (2011). Teachers' perspectives towards schools diversity in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 2 (4), 178-189.
- Department of Education and Science (Ireland) (2007): *Inclusion of Students with Special Educational Needs Post-Primary Guidelines*. Dublin. Government Publication
- Khochen, M., & Radford. (2012). Attitudes of teachers and headteachers towards inclusion in Lebanon. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 16(2), 139-153.
- Simmi, C., Rama, S., and Ishaan, S. (2010). Inclusive education in Botswana: The perceptions of school teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 20: 195-204.
- Memisevic, H., & Hodzic, S. (2011). Teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of students with intellectual disability in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 15(1), 699-710.
- Khochen, M., & Radford. (2012). Attitudes of teachers and headteachers towards inclusion in Lebanon. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 16(2), 139-153.
- Andrew, A. A., Frankel, E. (2010). Inclusive education in Guyana: A call for change. *International Journal of Special Education*. 25(1), 126-144
- Freeth, S. B. (2017): *Managing Complex Change, again*. Adaptive Allternatives LLC. <https://adaptiveallternativeconsulting.com>
- Boyle, C., Scriven, B., Durning, S., & Downes, C. (2011). Facilitating the learning of all students: *The 'professional positive' of inclusive practice in Australian primary schools*. *Support for Learning*, 26, 72-78.
- Sauro, J., & Lewis, J.R (2012) .*Quantifying the user experience: Practical statistics for user research*. Waltham, MA: Morgan Kaufman.
- Atkinson, R (2015): *Organizational Change Management: An Essential Part of the Service Management Journey*. UBM Tech LLC. [https:// www. Thinkhdi.com/media/Hdi Corp](https://www.Thinkhdi.com/media/Hdi_Corp) (Julai 19, 2018: 1.00 am)
- Vermeulen, J. A., Denessen, E., & Knoors, H. (2012). *Mainstream teachers about including deaf or hard of hearing students*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 174–181. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.09.007.
- Kuyuni, A. B., Yeboah, K. A., Das, A. K., Alhasan, A. M., & Mangope, B. (2016). Ghanaian teachers: competencies perceived as important for inclusive education, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2016.1145261
- Terzi, L. (2014) Reframing inclusive education: educational equality as capability equality, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 44:4, 479-493, DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2014.960911
- Liasidou, A. (2012). *Inclusive education, politics and policy making*. London: Continuum. [https://books.google.com.my/books?id=6fU2pu4M7tkC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.my/books?id=6fU2pu4M7tkC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Slee, R. (2013). How do we make inclusive education happen when exclusion is a political predisposition? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17, 895–907.
- De Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary school teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15, 331–353. doi: 10.1080/13603110903030089.

- Elisa, S., & Wrastari, A. T. (2013). *Sikap Guru Terhadap Pendidikan Inklusi Ditinjau Dari Faktor Pembentuk Sikap*. Jurnal Psikologi Perkembangan Dan Pendidikan,2 (01).
- Jones, B.A. (2012). Fostering collaboration in inclusive settings: The special education students at a glance approach. *Intervention in School and Clinic* 47(5): 297– 306.
- Pancsofar, N., & Petroff, G. J. (2016). Teacher's experience with co teaching as a model for inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 20:10,1043-1053.
- Smith, T. E. C., Polloway, E. A, Doughty, T., Patton, J. R., & Dowdy, C. A. (2015). Special education teachers' perceptions and instructional practices in response to intervention implementation. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 35. 115-126.
- Milteniene, R., & Venclovate, I. (2012). *Teacher collaboration in the context of inclusive education*. *Specialusis Ugdmas Special Education* No 2(27, 111-123