

# Educational Attainment and Years of Teaching Children with Special Needs As Factors in Teachers' Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education in Thailand

Gemma L. Martinez<sup>1</sup>, Frederick Edward T. Fabella<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Far Eastern University, Manila, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>FEU Roosevelt, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines

## ABSTRACT

Due to the growing trend in education of mainstreaming children with special needs, it was learned that there are hardly any recent studies that have been conducted to ascertain the attitudes of teachers toward inclusive education in Thailand. It is believed that a teacher's attitudes may in fact play a significant impact upon students with special needs. This study focused on teachers handling inclusive education in Thailand. Through convenience sampling, 67 teachers of 10 different nationalities from private and government schools in Thailand volunteered to be the respondents of the study. The Kern Survey of Teacher Attitude Regarding Inclusive Education (KSUTAIE), a 42-item, 4-point Likert scale instrument was administered on the respondents. The instrument measures 5 subdomains namely, Student Variables, Peer Support, Administrative Support, Collaboration and Training. With respect to the respondents' scores in these five subdomains, Student Variables yielded a verbal interpretation of agree, Peer Support produced a verbal interpretation of strongly agree, Administrative Support yielded a verbal interpretation of agree, Collaboration produced a verbal interpretation of agree and Training yielded a verbal interpretation of agree. A significant low positive relationship was established between the respondents' years of handling children with special needs and the subdomain of Student Variables. When the respondents are grouped according to educational attainment, the analysis of variance revealed a significant difference with respect to the subdomain of Student Variables.

**Keywords:** Inclusive education, children with special needs, Thailand, Teacher attitudes, special education

## INTRODUCTION

A recent UNICEF research estimates that there are about 240 million children with disabilities worldwide. According to the survey, kids with impairments are less fortunate than kids without disabilities on the majority of child well-being metrics. The experience of impairment differs widely, though. Based on the type of handicap, the child's residence, and the assistance they can receive, the research shows that there is a range of risks and outcomes. The report covers more than 60 indicators of child well-being and contains globally comparable data from 42 nations. It is further asserted that it is impossible to regard

inclusive education as a luxury. Children with impairments have been socially marginalized for far too long—as no child ever should be<sup>1</sup>.

There are four main categories of children with special needs: (1) Physical: multiple sclerosis, persistent asthma, epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, etc. (2) Developmental: autism, dyslexia, down syndrome, and processing issues; (3) Behavioral/Emotional: oppositional defiance disorder, bipolar disorder, ADD, etc., and (4) Sensory Impaired: restricted hearing, blindness, visual impairment, and deafness<sup>2</sup>.

The most thorough prevalence estimates of disabilities in children and adolescents were provided by UNICEF and GBD. In 2006, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) established an operational definition for children with disabilities as "children 18 years or younger who have 'long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.'" Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia accounted for over half of the children with impairments in both datasets<sup>3</sup>.

The southeast Asian nation of Thailand shares borders with the northern point of Malaysia, the Andaman Sea, the Gulf of Thailand, Myanmar, Laos, and Cambodia. The formal name of the country is now the Kingdom of Thailand, but it was known as Siam until 1939. A constitutional monarchy governs the 76 provinces that make up Thailand. The only nation in Southeast Asia, Thailand, that has never been surpassed by a European power. Thailand's culture has long fostered conflicting attitudes about children with impairments. According to Thai Buddhism, good or ill luck in this incarnation is determined by the merits one has accrued via good deeds in a past existence. The government of Thailand has historically provided a limited number of educational opportunities for individuals with disabilities but has recently demonstrated movement toward a more comprehensive educational system. The educational policy has not only begun to expand the incorporation of services for children with disabilities but has also introduced efforts to include children with disabilities in regular education classrooms<sup>4</sup>.

The illnesses and disabilities that accompany learning difficulties are experienced by children with special educational needs (SEN). Learning impairments such as dyslexia, dyscalculia, and dyspraxia are frequently observed in youngsters. Learning difficulties often affect kids with physical conditions including autism and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Abnormalities, injuries, and disease-related impairments are the causes of learning disorders and disabilities. Schoolwork and personal organizing will provide challenges for children with special educational needs. Additionally, they could find it difficult to keep up friendships and ties with adults. Since Thailand's inclusive education laws were only passed in 2008, special needs education is still very new there. Students with learning difficulties can get special education at a number of foreign schools in Thailand. In addition, the Division of Special Education within the Ministry of Education has identified over 170 schools with provisions for children with SEN of Thai citizenship. A number of non-profit organizations in Thailand also run schools that assist students with SEN<sup>5</sup>.

According to one study, the Thai government has supported the right to education for people with disabilities since 1939. The reasons behind Thailand's inclusive education policy's inability to encourage school-age children to attend regular classrooms, however, are not well understood. The study makes the following arguments: (i) universal design is not well situated; (ii) school teachers are not properly equipped to cope with kids with disabilities; and (iii) the government does not implement policies coherently. The Thai government's efforts to empower people with disabilities via education have been hampered by these three main concerns<sup>6</sup>.

Thailand is working to advance inclusive education, but there are still obstacles that need to be removed, including information, physical, legislative, and attitude restrictions. All children in the community should receive an education in Thai schools, regardless of their preparation or ability. Instead of stating that students with disabilities must meet a specific level of ability in order to enroll in regular schools, the policy should state that schools will guarantee that children with disabilities can access learning opportunities in schools and are accepted as members of school communities. The transit from home to school is one of the physical barriers, in addition to the facilities and surroundings found in schools. While using public transit in a crowded city like Bangkok might be difficult for regular individuals, it can be even more difficult for those who have physical limitations. In Thailand, attitudes on disability are influenced by culture. The percentage of Thai students who said they felt "songsarn" for pupils with impairments was 91.7%. Songsarn can be used to express sympathy, pity, or compassion. Certain educators lacked the knowledge to adapt curricula for learners with disabilities, and they frequently employed identical methods and materials to instruct the entire class, disregarding the distinct requirements of each child. It was also discovered that a large number of Thai upper primary school children were unaware of the existence of distinct learning disorders<sup>7</sup>.

The work and perspectives of ordinary school teachers in inclusive classes in Indonesia and Thailand were compared in a study. These educators were selected from educational institutions taking part in an in-service training initiative aimed at improving the abilities of special needs children in mainstream classrooms. Based on Friedmen's theory of teacher burnout, 172 Thai and 165 Indonesian primary school teachers participated in a survey. Whereas 13 percent of Indonesian teachers held bachelor's degrees and 77 percent of Thai teachers had bachelor's degrees, just 1 percent of Thai teachers were in special education. The study looked into the opinions of teachers on four topics: work environment, fatigue, inclusion, and support from different sources. The level of fulfillment and exhaustion experienced by teachers did not correlate with background characteristics. At the .01 level, there was a relationship between a teacher's depersonalization and the number of students in the class. There was a .01 level of connection between social aspects and tiredness. At the .01 level, there was a relationship found between self-fulfillment and tiredness. The organizational, psychological, structural, and support components did not correlate with tiredness. Teachers generally reported receiving assistance from a variety of sources. The majority of them had favorable things to say about pupils who have special needs<sup>8</sup>.

The Malaysian government has passed and developed a few laws and policies pertaining to special education for children with special needs, but they are still insufficient to safeguard their right to an education. Since only a small portion of the laws address their entitlement to an education, all laws and policies created are overly broad. While discrimination against PwDs is not expressly prohibited by Article 12 of the Federal Constitution, it is mentioned in Article 8 with regard to their enrollment in special education programs. The Ministry of Education may refuse to enroll students with exceptional needs in the exceptional Education Program if they do not meet the requirements. However, Thailand's laws and regulations expressly guarantee the right to an education for children with special needs. Children with impairments are particularly granted the right to access facilities and free education under the National Education Act of 1999. Additionally, children with special needs have the right to obligatory education through suitable programs, techniques, help, and services thanks to the obligatory Education Act of 2002. The Education Provision for Persons with Disabilities Act is the main legislation in Thailand that safeguards the educational rights of kids with special needs. In addition, the government pays extra

compensation to special education teachers, and it will provide financial aid and subsidies to the school that offers special education<sup>9</sup>.

Preschool teachers are widely believed to have a vital everyday role in facilitating the inclusion of young children with disabilities in educational settings. Nonetheless, in many nations, there is insufficient data to support this kind of thinking. Examining Thai preschool teachers' perspectives on inclusive education for young Thai children with disabilities was the goal of the study presented here, which was a component of a larger investigation including 528 preschool teachers from northern Thailand. Five themes emerged from the analysis of the interviews with twenty preschool teachers who had varying opinions about including young children with disabilities. The existing state of affairs, teachers' knowledge and experience, their attitudes toward inclusion and disability, teamwork, and obstacles to future inclusion were among these themes<sup>10</sup>.

A diligent appraisal of recent studies revealed that there is a scarcity of research concerning attitudes of teachers involved in inclusive education in Thailand. It is for this reason that this study was conducted in order to ascertain such attitudes.

Specifically, this study sought to address the following research questions:

**1. What are the respondents KSUTAIE scores according to the subdomains of**

1.1 Student variables;

1.2 Peer support;

1.3 Administrative support;

1.4 Collaboration, and

1.5 Training?

**2. Are there significant relationships between the respondents' years of handling children with special needs and their KSUTAIE scores according to the subdomains of**

2.1 Student variables;

2.2 Peer support;

2.3 Administrative support;

2.4 Collaboration, and

2.5 Training?

**3. When the respondents are grouped according to educational attainment, are there significant differences in the KSUTAIE scores according to the subdomains of**

3.1 Student variables;

3.2 Peer support;

3.3 Administrative support;

3.4 Collaboration, and

3.5 Training?

## METHODOLOGY

Through convenience sampling, 67 teachers from private and government schools in Thailand volunteered to be the respondents of the study. 23 were males while 44 were females. Their ages ranged from 22 to 58 with a mean age of 34.61 years. There were 13 US citizens, 5 Australians, 2 Bhutanese, 1 British, 4 Canadians, 1 Japanese, 1 Malaysian, 1 South African, 16 Thai and 24 Filipinos. 18 had bachelor's degrees, 18 had bachelor's degrees with master's units, 22 had master's degrees and 9 had master's degrees with doctorate units. 7 had less than a year's experience handling children with special needs, 10 had 1-2 years'

experience handling children with special needs, 5 had 2-3 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 2 had 3-4 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 7 had 4-5 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 17 had 5-6 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 2 had 6-7 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 3 had 7-8 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 3 had 8-9 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 3 had 10-11 years’ experience handling children with special needs, 4 had 14-15 years’ experience handling children with special needs and 2 had over 20 years’ experience handling children with special needs. 1 taught pre-school, 5 taught kindergarten, 36 taught elementary, 17 taught high school, 6 taught senior high school while 1 was learning support and 1 was a principal. The Kern Survey of Teacher Attitude Regarding Inclusive Education (KSUTAIE)<sup>11</sup>, a 42-item, 4-point Likert scale instrument was administered on the respondents. The instrument measures 5 subdomains namely, Student Variables, Peer Support, Administrative Support, Collaboration and Training.

**RESULTS**

The following tables present the data gathered and statistical treatments employed on them.

**Table 1: Scale of Interpretation of the KSUTAIE Item Weighted Means**

Item weighted mean range	Verbal interpretation
1.000 – 1.750	Strongly disagree
1.751 – 2.500	Disagree
2.501 – 3.250	Agree
3.251 – 4.000	Strongly agree

**Table 2: Item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Student Variables**

Item	Male weighted mean N= 23	Female weighted mean N=44	Overall Weighted mean N=67	Overall Verbal Interpretation
7. Students who are 2 or more years below grade level should be in special education classes. (reverse)	2.435	2.500	2.478	Disagree
8. Students who are diagnosed with autism need to be in special education classrooms. (reverse)	1.913	2.455	2.269	Disagree
9. All efforts should be made to educate students who have special needs in the regular education classroom.	3.565	3.727	3.672	Strongly agree
10. Students who are diagnosed with learning disability should be in special education classes. (reverse)	1.783	2.068	1.970	Disagree
11. Students who are verbally aggressive towards others can be	2.391	2.182	2.254	Disagree

maintained in regular education classrooms.				
25. Students who are physically aggressive towards others can be maintained in regular education classrooms.	1.957	2.023	2.000	Disagree
26. All students who have special needs for any reason need to receive their education in a special education classroom. (reverse)	2.174	2.455	2.358	Disagree
27. Students who display speech and language difficulties should be in special education classes.	2.870	2.477	2.612	Agree
38. Students who are 1 year below grade level should be in special education classes. (reverse)	2.783	3.091	2.985	Agree
39. Students who are identified as depressed but do not display overt disruptive behavior should be in regular education classes.	3.044	2.886	2.940	Agree
Total overall weighted mean			2.554	Agree

**Table 3: Item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Peer Support**

Item	Male weighted mean N= 23	Female weighted mean N=44	Overall Weighted mean N=67	Overall Verbal Interpretation
4. My colleagues are willing to help me with issues which may arise when I have students with special needs in my classroom.	3.609	3.523	3.552	Strongly agree
22. can approach my colleagues for assistance when needed if I have students with special needs in my classroom.	3.522	3.523	3.522	Strongly agree
29. My colleagues are approachable when I ask for their advice when I teach students with special needs.	3.609	3.523	3.552	Strongly agree
37. I feel comfortable in approaching my colleagues for help when I teach students with special needs.	3.478	3.523	3.508	Strongly agree
41. My colleagues will try to place all of their special-needs students in my	2.478	2.568	2.537	Agree

classroom if I start including students with special needs in my regular classroom. (reverse)				
Total overall weighted mean			3.334	Strongly agree

**Table 4: Item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Administrative Support**

Item	Male weighted mean N= 23	Female weighted mean N=44	Overall Weighted mean N=67	Overall Verbal Interpretation
3. I am encouraged by my administrators to attend conferences/workshops on teaching students with special needs.	3.522	3.341	3.403	Strongly agree
14. I can approach my administrators with concerns regarding teaching students who have special needs.	3.522	3.477	3.493	Strongly agree
15. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges presented by students with behavioral difficulties in my classroom.	3.478	3.409	3.433	Strongly agree
20. My administrators provide me with sufficient support when I have students with special needs in my classroom.	3.261	3.182	3.209	Agree
21. I am provided with enough time in order to attend conferences/workshops on teaching students with special needs.	2.826	3.000	2.940	Agree
31. I am provided with sufficient materials in order to be able to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.	3.261	3.205	3.224	Agree
35. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges presented by students with learning difficulties in my classroom.	3.348	3.250	3.284	Strongly agree
36. I am provided with monetary support in order to attend conferences/workshops on teaching students with special needs.	2.217	2.455	2.373	Disagree
Total overall weighted mean			3.170	Agree

**Table 5: Item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Collaboration**

Item	Male weighted mean N= 23	Female weighted mean N=44	Overall Weighted mean N=67	Overall Verbal Interpretation
12. Collaborative teaching of children with special needs can be effective particularly when such children are placed in a regular classroom.	3.696	3.614	3.642	Strongly agree
13. Special education teachers should teach students with special needs. (reverse)	1.391	1.341	1.358	Strongly disagree
23. Regular education teachers should not be responsible for teaching children with special needs. (reverse)	2.783	2.977	2.911	Agree
28. I should only be responsible for teaching students who are not identified as having special need. (reverse)	2.739	2.750	2.746	Agree
30. Both regular education teachers and special education teachers should teach students with special needs.	3.391	3.182	3.254	Strongly agree
40. Special education teachers might lose their jobs if I teach children with special needs. (reverse)	3.130	3.136	3.134	Agree
Total overall weighted mean			2.841	Agree

**Table 6: Item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Training**

Item	Male weighted mean N= 23	Female weighted mean N=44	Overall Weighted mean N=67	Overall Verbal Interpretation
1. My educational background has prepared me to effectively teach students with cognitive delays and deficits in daily living skills.	3.174	3.296	3.254	Strongly agree
2. I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with special needs for learning problems. (reverse)	1.217	1.296	1.269	Strongly disagree
16. My district provides me with sufficient outside training opportunities	3.174	3.000	3.060	Agree



in order for me to appropriately teach students with disabilities.				
17. My educational background has prepared me to effectively teach students with behavioral difficulties.	3.000	3.091	3.060	Agree
18. My educational background has prepared me to teach students with special needs.	3.304	3.364	3.343	Strongly agree
19. I am provided with sufficient in-service training through my school which allows me the ability to teach students with special needs.	3.044	3.023	3.030	Agree
32. My educational background has prepared me to effectively teach students who are 1 year below level.	3.348	3.409	3.388	Strongly agree
33. My educational background has prepared me to effectively teach students with speech impairments	2.739	2.864	2.821	Agree
34. I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with special needs for behavioral problems. (reverse)	1.087	1.318	1.239	Strongly disagree
42. My educational background has prepared me to effectively teach students who are 2 or more years below level.	3.174	3.205	3.194	Agree
Total overall weighted mean			2.766	Agree

**Table 7: Relationships between years of handling children with special needs and KSUTAIE subdomains**

Pearson r computations			
	r value	P value	Verbal interpretation
Years of handling children with special needs and Student Variables	r = 0.2787	The P-Value is .022384.	The result is <b>significant</b> at p < .05. A low positive relationship exists.
Years of handling children with special needs and Peer Support	r = 0.1237	The P-Value is .318614.	The result is not significant at p < .05.
Years of handling children with special needs and Administrative Support	r = -0.157	The P-Value is .204512.	The result is not significant at p < .05.

Years of handling children with special needs and Collaboration	r = 0.174	The P-Value is .159067.	The result is not significant at p < .05.
Years of handling children with special needs and Training	r = 0.1676	The P-Value is .175208.	The result is not significant at p < .05.

**Table 8: Difference in Student Variables scores when respondents are grouped according to educational attainment**

Analysis of Variance					
Treatments					
	Bachelor's degree	With master's units	Master's degree	With doctorate units	Total
N	18	18	22	9	67
∑X	430	475	583	223	1711
Mean	23.8889	26.3889	26.5	24.7778	25.537
∑X <sup>2</sup>	10420	12717	15557	5589	44283
Std. Dev.	2.9484	3.2745	2.2625	2.8186	2.9865
Result Details					
Source	SS	df	MS		
Between-treatments	87.5456	3	29.1819	F = 3.66876	
Within-treatments	501.1111	63	7.9541		
Total	588.6567	66			
The f-ratio value is 3.66876. The p-value is .016764. The result is <b>significant</b> at p < .05.					

**Table 9: Difference in Peer Support scores when respondents are grouped according to educational attainment**

Analysis of Variance					
Treatments					
	Bachelor's degree	With master's units	Master's degree	With doctorate units	Total
N	18	18	22	9	67
∑X	301	296	370	150	1117
Mean	16.7222	16.4444	16.8182	16.6667	16.672
∑X <sup>2</sup>	5121	4944	6326	2530	18921
Std. Dev.	2.2702	2.1205	2.2176	1.9365	2.1277
Result Details					
Source	SS	df	MS		

Between-treatments	1.4478	3	0.4826	F = 0.10226	
Within-treatments	297.3283	63	4.7195		
Total	298.7761	66			
The f-ratio value is 0.10226. The p-value is .958432. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .					

**Table 10: Difference in Administrative Support scores when respondents are grouped according to educational attainment**

Analysis of Variance					
Treatments					
	Bachelor's degree	With master's units	Master's degree	With doctorate units	Total
N	18	18	22	9	67
$\sum X$	457	459	544	239	1699
Mean	25.3889	25.5	24.7273	26.5556	25.358
$\sum X^2$	11757	11965	14508	6441	44671
Std. Dev.	3.0125	3.9145	7.0925	3.4319	4.9042
Result Details					
Source	SS	df	MS		
Between-treatments	22.0393	3	7.3464	F = 0.29567	
Within-treatments	1565.364	63	24.847		
Total	1587.403	66			
The f-ratio value is 0.29567. The p-value is .828383. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .					

**Table 11: Difference in Collaboration scores when respondents are grouped according to educational attainment**

Analysis of Variance					
Treatments					
	Bachelor's degree	With master's units	Master's degree	With doctorate units	Total
N	18	18	22	9	67
$\sum X$	303	315	370	154	1142
Mean	16.8333	17.5	16.8182	17.1111	17.045
$\sum X^2$	5249	5605	6320	2690	19864
Std. Dev.	2.9556	2.3326	2.1522	2.6194	2.4583

Result Details					
Source	SS	df	MS		
Between-treatments	5.7041	3	1.9014	F = 0.30467	
Within-treatments	393.1616	63	6.2407		
Total	398.8657	66			
The f-ratio value is 0.30467. The p-value is .821905. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .					

**Table 12: Difference in Training scores when respondents are grouped according to educational attainment**

Analysis of Variance					
Treatments					
	Bachelor's degree	With master's units	Master's degree	With doctorate units	Total
N	18	18	22	9	67
$\sum X$	468	509	614	262	1853
Mean	26	28.2778	27.9091	29.1111	27.657
$\sum X^2$	12348	14669	17578	7874	52469
Std. Dev.	3.254	4.0265	4.5868	5.5553	4.3013
Result Details					
Source	SS	df	MS		
Between-treatments	76.7863	3	25.5954	F = 1.40915	
Within-treatments	1144.318	63	18.1638		
Total	1221.105	66			
The f-ratio value is 1.40915. The p-value is .24841. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .					

**DISCUSSION**

With respect to the KSUTAIE subdomain of Student Variables, Table 2 presents the item weighted means of the responses. Item 9 "All efforts should be made to educate students who have special needs in the regular education classroom," obtained the highest overall item weighted mean with a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree* while Item 25 "Students who are physically aggressive towards others can be maintained in regular education classrooms," obtained the lowest overall item weighted mean with a verbal interpretation of *disagree*. The total overall weighted mean for Student Variables produced a verbal interpretation of *agree*.

Regarding the KSUTAIE subdomain of Peer Support, Table 3 presents the item weighted means of the responses. Items 4, 22 and 29 obtained the overall item weighted means with a verbal interpretation of

*strongly agree* while Item 41 “My colleagues will try to place all of their special-needs students in my classroom if I start including students with special needs in my regular classroom. (reverse),” obtained the lowest overall item weighted mean with a verbal interpretation of *agree*. The total overall weighted mean for Peer Support produced a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*.

Table 4 presents the item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Administrative Support. Item 14 “I can approach my administrators with concerns regarding teaching students who have special needs,” obtained the highest overall item weighted means with a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree* while Item 36 “I am provided with monetary support in order to attend conferences/workshops on teaching students with special needs,” obtained the lowest overall item weighted with a verbal interpretation of *disagree*. The total overall weighted mean for Administrative Support produced a verbal interpretation of *agree*.

Table 5 shows the item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Collaboration. Item 12 “Collaborative teaching of children with special needs can be effective particularly when such children are placed in a regular classroom,” obtained the highest overall item weighted mean with a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree* while Item 13 “Special education teachers should teach students with special needs (reverse),” obtained the lowest overall item weighted with a verbal interpretation of *strongly disagree*. The total overall weighted mean for Collaboration produced a verbal interpretation of *agree*.

Table 6 presents the item weighted means of the KSUTAIE subdomain of Training. Item 32 “My educational background has prepared me to effectively teach students who are 1 year below level,” obtained the highest overall item weighted mean with a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree* while Item 34 “I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with special needs for behavioral problems (reverse),” obtained the lowest overall item weighted mean with a verbal interpretation of *strongly disagree*. The total overall weighted mean for Training produced a verbal interpretation of *agree*. Based on the Pearson r computations, it can be observed in Table 7 that the respondents’ years of handling children with special needs produced a significant low positive relationship with Student Variables. No other relationships were established.

When the respondents are grouped according to educational attainment, the analysis of variance presented in Table 8 revealed a significant difference with respect to the KSUTAIE subdomain of Student Variables. The analysis of variance in tables 9, 10, 11 and 12 showed no significant differences with regard to the KSUTAIE subdomains of Peer Support, Administrative Support, Collaboration and Training, respectively.

## Conclusions

With respect to the respondents’ scores in the KSUTAIE subdomains, Student Variables yielded a verbal interpretation of *agree*, Peer Support produced a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*, Administrative Support yielded a verbal interpretation of *agree*, Collaboration produced a verbal interpretation of *agree* and Training yielded a verbal interpretation of *agree*.

A significant low positive relationship was established between the respondents’ years of handling children with special needs and the subdomain of Student Variables.

When the respondents are grouped according to educational attainment, the analysis of variance revealed a significant difference with respect to the subdomain of Student Variables.

### Recommendations

Overall, it can be inferred that for the respondents of the study, their attitudes toward inclusive education is positive. And since years of handling children with special needs has a significant low positive relationship with the respondents' scores in the subdomain of Student Variables, it may be implied that the more experience teachers gain in inclusive education the more positive their attitudes will become with respect to this subdomain.

Since this study is limited by the sample size and sampling method utilized, research can be conducted using a bigger and more representative sample in the future. Other factors should also be investigated that may affect teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education in a positive way.

### Ethical Declaration

The researchers declare that this study strictly adhered to the ethics of research. Informed consent was obtained, freedom to withdraw at any time from the study was made known to the participants, their identities were anonymized, the participants were not exposed to any physical, psychological or social harm and the results were used for research purposes only. The researcher further ensured steps to prevent bias in the interpretation of the data. This research was self-funded and there was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the study.

### Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their deepest gratitude to the respondents of this study and to the author of the Kern Survey of Teacher Attitude Regarding Inclusive Education (KSUTAIE) instrument.

### REFERENCES

1. Nearly 240 million children with disabilities around the world, UNICEF's most comprehensive statistical analysis finds [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/nearly-240-million-children-disabilities-around-world-unicefs-most-comprehensive>
2. Special needs children - know the types and know your rights - PBWS - Albuquerque & Santa Fe Law Firm - Trust, probate, estate, elder law [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 20]. Available from: <https://pbwslaw.com/special-needs-children-rights/>
3. Olusanya BO, Kancherla V, Shaheen A, Ogbo FA, Davis AC. Global and regional prevalence of disabilities among children and adolescents: Analysis of findings from Global Health Databases. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2023 Sept 23;10. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.977453
4. Carter SL. THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES IN THAILAND [Internet]. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION* Vol 21 No. 2 ; 2006. Available from: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/THE-DEVELOPMENT-OF-SPECIAL-EDUCATION-SERVICES-IN-Carter/125a3c9f9c8f7d73f6069be952bec8f082fdc3ee>
5. Education Destination Asia. Special education needs (SEN) in Thailand [Internet]. Education Destination Asia; [cited 2023 Nov 20]. Available from: <https://educationdestinationasia.com/essential-guide/thailand/special-education-needs-sen-thailand>
6. Bualar T. What has gone wrong with Inclusive Education in Thailand? *Journal of Public Affairs*. 2015;16(2):156–61. doi:10.1002/pa.1563

7. Vibulpatanavong K. Inclusive Education in Thailand. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*. 2018;169. doi:10.2991/icece-17.2018.16
8. Kantavong P, Sujarwanto, Rerkjaree S, Budiyo. A comparative study of teacher's opinions relating to inclusive classrooms in Indonesia and Thailand. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*. 2017 Sept;38(3):291–6. doi:10.1016/j.kjss.2016.05.005
9. Othman MF, Rahmat NE, Aziz NA, Sukbunpant S. Educational Right for Children with Special Needs: A comparison between Malaysia and Thailand [Internet]. 16-17 Mar 2022; 2022. Available from: <https://ebpj.e-iph.co.uk/index.php/EBProceedings/article/view/2451/1841>
10. Sukbunpant S, Arthur-Kelly M, Dempsey I. Thai preschool teachers' views about inclusive education for young children with disabilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2013;17(10):1106–18. doi:10.1080/13603116.2012.741146
11. Kern, Evangeline, "Survey of Teacher Attitude Regarding Inclusive Education Within an Urban School District" (2006). PCOM Psychology Dissertations. Paper 70