



An Inquiry into the Introduction of Integrated Primary Schools for Girls in Saudi Arabia

Submitted by:

Dr. Salwa Mostafa Khusheim

(The National Centre for Educational Research & Development)

(Egypt, Cairo – July 2011)

ABSTRACT

This study concentrates on the integrated primary school for girls which allow children with a range of special needs to work with mainstream children. The study investigates and analyses the experience of integration in Saudi primary schools from the perspective of head teachers, classroom teachers, and special needs teachers as they attempted to improve the primary school as an effective place of learning for both handicapped and non-handicapped children. The fieldwork was conducted in Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia.

The study considered the following main issues in relation to the difficulties in achieving successful integration in Saudi Arabia: educational policy and the powers of head teachers; the school itself and its facilities; the attitude of society; the funds available; and the attitudes of the staff to innovation.

The study raises more precise issues related to the staff which seemed significant factors in the integrated primary schools. These issues are the age of staff; lack of experience; the level of training among the staff; and staff qualifications. Also, the study considered the necessity to improve staff morale and professionalism as one of the main criteria for successful integration. The study considered that the Ministry of Education and some other ministries in the country have a vital role in achieving successful integration. It was found that all of these aspects needed development.

The study ends by drawing conclusions from the literature and from the evidence collected in the form of data and makes recommendations to the education authorities for making appropriate policy decisions.

An Inquiry into the Introduction of Integrated Primary Schools for Girls in Saudi Arabia

Dr. Salwa Mostafa Khusheim (*)

Introduction :

The study took place among the special needs children who are different from norm negatively; they are the handicapped children. For each kind of handicap, there is a different kind of need, and accordingly, there are those children who are affected mildly, moderately, or who are severely affected (Al-Khashrami, 2000). The handicapped (or “special needs”) child is the child who cannot benefit from regular education because of the deficiency in his abilities, his skills, his behaviour and his physical aspects. Special education involves the organisation of services and educational programmes (which include special adjustments in the curriculum, teaching aids, or teaching methods), by those who are responsible for the special needs of those children who cannot benefit from regular education programmes. Special education services have been introduced in education systems round the world for pupils who face difficulties which impact negatively on their abilities to learn. Such pupils are known as

(*) ***English Language Center, Taif University, K.S.A.***

children with special educational needs. They often have one or more of the following handicaps:

- Mental retardation.
- Hearing impairment.
- Visual impairment.
- Physical and health impairment.
- Behavioural disorders, and communication disorders.
- Learning difficulties (involving literacy, numeracy, and speech skills).

Each handicap has a different level of need. That is, there are mildly handicapped, moderately handicapped, and profoundly or severely handicapped. The present study concentrates on the teaching of mildly handicapped special needs children alongside their mainstream peers in the ordinary schools; a process which is called, in this study, “Integration”. The place of the inquiry is Saudi Arabia.

These mildly handicapped children can be categorized under one of the headings:

- Educable mentally retarded children (or slow learners);
- Hard of hearing;
- Partially-sighted;
- Physically handicapped;
- Behaviourally disrupted; or
- Having disorders of language or speech skills.

Until recently, the idea of segregating these pupils in special institutions or schools to provide them with suitable educational programmes, was common in Europe and the UK to which reference is made in this study. More recently it has been

recognised that such a practice may affect them negatively. Recently, in the last twenty years, in Saudi Arabia, these special needs children have been gradually integrated into the educational process with their mainstream peers in schools.

Integration has been of interest to different education authorities in different ways and has been implemented widely in some countries and less so in others because of a country's economic situation, the educational policy for the country, and the view of society towards special needs. This makes integration more successful in some countries than others.

Significance of the Study

The present study is significant because it may assist in understanding the integration of mildly handicapped special needs pupils in primary schools for girls in Saudi Arabia, and help to improve the integration process in Saudi primary schools.

The results of this study may help educators improve primary education, and make the integrated school a suitable place for teaching all types of children together in the same school. The results may also help in the adoption of new methods which could be suitable for both special needs and non-special needs children in the integrated schools.

Objectives of the Study

The present study sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. To investigate the attitudes and opinions of the integrated primary school staff towards implementing integration as a general policy in primary schools for girls.
2. To investigate the integrated primary school staff's attitudes towards integration for mildly handicapped children in the mainstream primary school, and to identify which groups of mildly handicapped are more preferred, and which handicapped groups are more in preferred for integration.
3. To investigate the integrated primary school staff's attitudes towards the important difficulties which hindered successful integration in the mainstream primary schools, and to identify the lesser difficulties which hindered successful integration.
4. To explore the integrated primary schools staff opinions toward improving and developing the integrated primary school in its most important aspects, for achieving the integration process, and for making the primary school a suitable place for teaching both handicapped and ordinary children.

Aspects of the primary school, as they have been selected for exploration in this study are as follows:

- The school building;
- The classroom;

-
-
- The primary stage curriculum;
 - Teaching aids;
 - Teaching methods; and
 - School staff
 - Null Hypotheses of the Study

In relation to the above-stated research objectives, the following null hypotheses were posed:

1. There are no statistically significant differences among the responses of female staff of the integrated primary schools in Riyadh (where the research took place) with regard to integration as a general policy.
2. There are no statistically significant differences among the responses of female staff of the integrated primary schools in Riyadh with regard to integration for mildly handicapped children.
3. There are no statistically significant differences among the responses of female staff of the integrated primary schools in Riyadh with respect to the difficulties which hinder successful integration.

Limitations of the Study:

The present study was limited to thirty public integrated primary schools for girls in the city of Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The study deals with the integrated schools staff: head teachers, classroom teachers (who are in charge of special needs in their classrooms), and special needs teachers. Some classroom teachers are not included in the study because they teach subjects which are exempted from a special needs approach, such as: visually handicapped, hearing handicapped or some

physically handicapped children who do not have to attend the sessions of Maths, Writing, and Dictation in Arabic Language, Arts, and Home Economics.

Definition of Terms:

Behaviourally disruptive child (or behaviourally disordered): The child's behaviour is in some way unacceptable to parents, teachers, etc. This study involved those behaviourally disruptive children in the classroom.

Classroom teacher (or mainstream teacher): In this study refers to qualified teacher specialising in teaching non-special needs.

Educational policy: The educational concepts adopted by a country, which is usually affected by the country's religion, traditions, and its culture.

Formal education: Refers to compulsory education. In Saudi Arabia, the child begins his formal education from the age of six years.

Handicapped child: In the present study, it refers to the child who requires special educational facilities because of disability e.g. partially-sighted, hard of hearing, physically handicapped, etc.

Hard of hearing: Children with slight hearing loss and who require special arrangements or facilities for their education.

Hearing aids: Providing hearing-impaired children and adults with experiences of sound that they would otherwise miss.

Integrated school: An ordinary school where special needs and non-special needs are taught together.

Integrated school staff: In the present study, this refers to the integrated primary school head teachers, the classroom teachers who are in charge of special needs pupils in their classrooms, and the special needs teachers in the integrated primary school.

Integration as a general policy: In the present study, this means the existing integration in Saudi Arabia with other different educational stages (intermediate and secondary) and with different levels of handicaps such as moderate or severe handicaps.

Integration: This term in Saudi Arabia, and the present study, refers to educating special needs children with non-special needs or mainstream children together in the same school.

Mainstream school (state school, or public school): In the present study, this refers to an ordinary school which is for non-special needs children. Special needs are not accepted in this school, these schools are authorised and directed by the Ministry of Education, and the education is free. A term used in the UK for schools maintained by public funding by the local education authority, similar to the U.S.A.

Mainstreaming: An American term for the integration of children with special needs into the ordinary education system.

Mild mentally retarded (slightly mentally retarded, or educationally mentally retarded): In this study, this refers to the intellectual level when assessed through an individual intelligence test which involves IQ scores ranging from 55 to 70.

Mildly handicapped: Low attainment at school, usually managed by the school staff itself. The terminology used in this study to refer to pupils with the least learning problems and who generally are educated in regular school programmes such as, behaviourally disruptive, slight mentally retarded, hard of hearing, partially-sighted children, and children with language disorders and speech skills.

Partially-sighted children: In this research, it refers to children having imperfect sight, legally defined as being between 3/60 and 6/60 vision after correction.

Physical and health impairment (or physically handicapped): Children with disabilities limiting their mobility, but not necessarily associated with sensory impairments.

Physically handicapped: A term used in the present study to refer to a child who has a physical disability, which prevents him from walking so that he uses a wheel chair or assistance to move.

Primary school: The term refers to schools catering for children from the age of 6-11 years in Saudi Arabia, and of 5-11 years old in England.

School curriculum: A term which refers to the total structure of ideas and activities developed by an educational institution to meet the learning needs of pupils and to achieve desired educational aims. However, in this study, it refers simply to the content of what is taught. This involves the syllabus that is taught to children in the school, and what the teacher has to deal with in the classroom with the children. It includes almost all the textbooks that the Ministry has specified for each year of the educational stages.

School staff: In the present study refers to people who work in the school and those closely involved with the pupils and their education and the learning process such as: the head teachers, the classroom teachers and the special needs teachers, those who are involved in the present study.

Self-esteem: How a person judges and values himself. People who have little self-esteem are likely to be depressed and perhaps anti-social.

Socially separated: Refers to a child who tends to withdraw from his peers in the classroom or the school.

Special education: A kind of education which is designed for children with learning difficulties.

Special school (or special institution): In Saudi Arabia, and in the present study, this refers to an institution or a school

for children who need special educational help because of some mental or physical handicap, visual or hearing impairments.

Visual impairment: Damage to sight, up to and including blindness, resulting in special educational needs of varying severity.

Literature Review of the Study:

Teaching special needs pupils alongside mainstream pupils in the same school in Saudi Arabia, where this is a new approach which has been acquired from the West, particularly in the UK and USA before reference is made to the Arab world.

Teaching special needs in ordinary schools has become the norm in many educational systems. Dealing with special needs and also special needs teaching takes a different form from country to country and attitudes to it are affected by the country's religion, its culture, its economic situation, and its education policy.

In Saudi Arabia, the adopted integration policy is derived from the integration applied in the UK and the USA, but with differences to make the integration suitable for the educational policy and objectives in Saudi Arabia.

In the United Kingdom the policy on integration in Britain is defined in many statements but practice is more difficult to describe, not merely because of the usual gap between policy statements and reality but because practice is so varied from district to district and even within districts as the UK is not a strictly centralised system.

Hegarty (1987) argued that there are no significant new developments in integration processes in England, as like most countries, he argues, Britain had a traditional view of special education until the end of the seventies. This was based on a deficit model of handicap, where the education of pupils was defined in terms of their handicaps. As teachers and others came to realise that many pupils failed to learn because they were taught inappropriately - or badly - the deficit model of handicap has given way to an interactive model of special educational needs. This has followed changes in Britain's social and political life in the last years of the twentieth century. This has led to a radically different view of integration. If schools are 'creating' learning difficulties, school reform must happen before integration is possible. This modifies the entire school curriculum, academic organisation, staffing, in-service training, home-school relations.

The 1981 Education Act, stated that LEAs had a duty to educate special needs children alongside mainstream peers. As a result, the Report was and still is, regarded by many as not only asserting the integration of children with special needs but as making integrated provision the really acceptable way of educating them (Fairbairn & Fairbairn, 1992). The Education Act 1981 became the central law governing special education in England and Wales. The 1981 Act came fully into force in April 1983 when it was supplemented by a set of regulations that amplified the law on assessments and how they were to be conducted and recorded. In addition, a Circular of Guidance, Circular 1/83: *Assessments and Statements of Special Educational Needs* was issued in 1983; this was not part of the

law but its recommendations had considerable force (Hegarty, 1987).

The specific changes are most evident in relation to assessment and “statementing” procedures. “Statementing” is the common term to describe the process of identifying the special needs of any pupil and implementing remedial action. Circular 1/83 (DES/ HSS, 1983) sets out a very detailed framework within which the assessments laid down in Section 5 of the Act are to be carried out. An entire issue of *Special Education: Forward Trends* (December 1983) was given over to the implications of this assessment framework for the local authority, for the school as a whole, for parents, and for the various professionals involved, psychologists, speech therapists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, and teachers. The new legislation existed under four headings:

1. The concept of special educational needs.
2. Provision in ordinary schools for pupils with special educational needs.
3. Identification and assessment of pupils with special needs.
4. The use of statements to make a formal record of pupils’ special needs.

The general support for integration has not, however, led to sweeping changes. The proportion of pupils attending special schools has not varied much over the past decade. Hegarty (1987) attributed that to a number of factors such as; inertia and the problems inherent in changing a long-established pattern of provision; slow progress in remedying the deficiencies of ordinary schools; and the difficulty of modifying attitudes.

Progress toward classroom integration has been more evident for some groups than for others. Pupils with physical or visual impairments have benefited most from the integration movement. Pupils with moderate or severe learning difficulties have benefited less, and pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties are, in fact, in similar segregation to before.

However, The United States is regarded as one of the countries that has made a lot of progress in the integration of special needs pupils into mainstream education. The placement options available for handicapped children in the United States include self-contained classrooms, resource rooms, itinerant teachers and in-class support services. Handicapped students can be placed full-time in the self-contained classroom (a special classroom in an ordinary school), can go part-time to a resource room (also a special classroom in an ordinary school) or receive support from a special teacher, individually or within a group, inside or outside the ordinary classroom. Students are eligible for help, in any setting, as soon as placement decisions have been made on the basis of an assessment procedure (Will, 1986, in Pijl & Meijer, 1991, p.105).

In Arab Countries, as a result of increased population and a changing balance towards a larger proportion of younger people, there has been a rise in the number of special needs cases in Arab countries. Special education has, therefore, become a concern to the different governments and authorities in Arab countries. The United Nations' statistics have indicated that, as a result of various factors, it is a fact that the number of handicapped people in the recently developed countries (third world countries) greatly exceeds the percentage of handicapped

people in the developed countries. Arab governments have begun to identify the problems of handicapped people, create special programmes and design regulations to clarify the problems. This has come about as a result of an increase in awareness in this field, partly as a response to international recommendations from educational, health and humanitarian organisations all over the world (Ammar, 1982).

Ammar (1982) compared the cost of two educational situations; teaching special needs pupils in special institutions and; integration of special needs pupils alongside ordinary children in their ordinary schools in Tunisia. This study found that integration in an ordinary school costs considerably less than the building of special schools would cost. He found that the cost for special education is fifteen times greater than the ordinary education, whereas, integration costs were only five times that ordinary education for mainstream children. These results suggested that integration is a better alternative economically, quite apart from educational reasons, for children of special needs (Ammar, 1982, in Al-Khashrami, p.131).

In a study by the Arab Organisation for Culture Sciences and Education (1982), which dealt with the educational situations for children with special educational needs in the Arab regions, the study found that some handicapped children, physically handicapped, and visually handicapped, are taught in ordinary schools either because of the unavailability of educational provisions in special institutions, or because there are no places for them in the special needs institutions. The study showed that most handicapped children are taught in some kind of segregated educational institutions (Al-Khashrami, 2000, p.125).

In Saudi Arabia, the most important and famous Decree was issued by the Ministry of Education in 1988, yet very few schools in the main regions of Saudi Arabia, such as Riyadh and Jeddah became integrated since that date. However, year by year, the number of integrated schools has increased in each region, and the regions which been implementing integration have increased. Integration in Saudi primary schools has become more accepted by society, and applied in more primary schools in the same major regions of the country. By 2000, integration had been further extended to some other regions of the country. In Riyadh in 2003, there were 30 integrated primary schools for girls. Integration in these schools has been achieved for the following groups of special needs:

Physically handicapped: Integration was achieved for physically handicapped accepted in regular education at all three stages - primary, intermediate, and secondary stages, by providing them with appropriate facilities around the school building; such as basing them on the ground level of the integrated school building, and enabling their families to assist them in moving around the school if they cannot be moved by wheelchair. Also, giving them permission to study in the ordinary schools by enrolling for part-time sessions in these schools, if they could not attend full-time school because of their disability (Al-Fouzan, 1999).

Learning difficulties: Integration for children with learning difficulties involving language disorders or speech skills was achieved in 1997. The integrated primary school provides a resources room for children with learning difficulties. Children spend the day in the ordinary classroom in

the integrated school, but with some assistance in the subjects with which they have learning difficulties. These are offered in the resources room. The programmes there are also linked with those in the ordinary classrooms. They have assistance by the special needs teachers in the resources room which is located in the integrated school (Al-Fouzan, 1999).

Mild mentally retarded: In Saudi Arabia, this group of children are taught in ordinary classrooms, but the school is recommended to give them more attention during the learning process, for example, by including them in classes with a smaller number of children. This can be more easily achieved in private schools where the pupils numbers in each classroom are not more than twenty. Teachers are recommended to give such pupils more attention through their teaching, and encourage their families to follow up their achievements and provide them with more time at home (Al-Fouzan, 1999).

Blind children: Integration was achieved for partially-sighted children of this group in 2000 (Al-Fouzan, 2002).

Hard of hearing and language disorders: Integration was introduced for children who are hard of hearing and who have speech disorders, in the ordinary schools in Riyadh in the year 2000 (Al-Fouzan, 2002).

Behaviourally disruptive children: They learn in the ordinary schools, but the school follows up their behavior through the school year. If they do not improve, the school may exclude them. However, this group have opportunities to enrol again in any ordinary private school, and also they have another opportunity to join one of the vocational schools around the

country when they are over twelve years of age. However, there are not many of this kind of special needs group in the primary (and the intermediate) schools for girls in Saudi Arabia, but there are more in the boys' schools. This is the positive effect on behavior of the country's religion, traditions, and culture, and the fact that Islamic education is the duty of each family in Saudi society.

The teaching methods used in the integrated schools are the same as in the mainstream schools, with the addition of a resources room. This has yet to be implemented in some areas.

Pupils, integrated in the ordinary school, use the same textbooks as non-handicapped children in the school but they are exempted from some subjects. For example, pupils who are visually, hearing or physically impaired do not have to attend Maths, Writing, and Dictation classes in the Arabic language, Arts, and Home Economics courses.

Methodology:

Population and Sample of the Study:

In Saudi Arabia, integration is a new approach, and it has been implemented only in the central regions such as in Riyadh, the capital city, where integration took place a few years ago. At the time of collecting the data for the present study, there were 30 integrated schools, so the researcher included all these in the sample for the present study. The population of the sample was 240. This includes all the 30 head teachers of the integrated primary schools for girls in Riyadh, 120 classroom teachers who are only in charge of special needs children in their classrooms in these integrated schools, and all the special

needs teachers in these integrated primary schools, who numbered 90 at the time of collecting this data. They all agreed to join in this investigation especially in the questionnaire. However, most of them did not agree to be interviewed. The researcher could only interview those who agreed.

Instruments:

The study is concerned with integration in primary schools for girls in Saudi Arabia. It was considered that the descriptive approach was best suited to the present study. In order to undertake this study, the researcher used the survey method, and the research instruments were self-completion structured questionnaire and structured interview. The methods used for the questionnaire data analysis was SPSS but not for the interview data.

For the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement or disagreement within these statements using a five-point scale

- Strongly Agree;
- Agree;
- Undecided;
- Disagree;
- Strongly Disagree.

The 26 statements in the questionnaire were divided into three sub-headings as follows;

- Integration as a general policy: 10 items;
- Integration for mildly handicapped children in the mainstream primary school: 6 items;

- Difficulties which hinder successful integration in the mainstream primary schools: 10 items.

The researcher asked some staff at the Faculty of Education in the King Saud University, to judge whether the instruments were appropriate for the research objectives and the research hypotheses and also if the construction of these instruments was appropriate and covered all the research issues clearly or not. All of the judges were Ph.D. holders in the King Saud University.

The structured interview schedule was used for the respondents (head teachers; classroom teachers; and special needs teachers) in the integrated primary school for girls in Riyadh in Saudi Arabia. The interview schedule was designed for the present study and aimed to generate data about the actual experience of the sample group, to obtain some information related to the objectives of the study, and to improve the information gathered from the questionnaire.

The interview schedule concentrated on the respondents' opinions and experiences on issues related to the mainstream primary school which had been integrated. These issues are the school building; the classrooms; the primary stage curriculum; teaching aids; teaching methods; and the staff.

The interviews were related to the questionnaire where further information was considered useful to cover some aspects of the study.

The interviews took place in the integrated primary schools for girls in Riyadh.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire Analysis

The statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyse the data in this study.

For the analysis of the data of this study; where the level of the significance is more than 0.05, the data will be not accepted (Clegg, 1990).

Results Concerning Chi-Square of the Questionnaire Items.

To identify any significant differences among all the responses to each item of the questionnaire, Chi-Squares were computed. The twenty-six questionnaire items were analysed and discussed according to the responses of the participants. Tabulation of percentages and distributions of frequencies for each item of the questionnaire are also given. The analysis of each component of integration in primary schools in Saudi Arabia was reported. These components include: integration as a general policy; integration for the mildly handicapped and successful integration and difficulties.

Results Concerning the Null Hypotheses of the Study

1. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration as a general policy among the female staff of head teachers, classroom teachers and the special needs teachers in the integrated primary schools was rejected at the 0.01 level. This finding might be attributed to their different duties and level of attachment to the learning

process and the children, and particularly to the special needs aspect, and to each group current experience about integration.

Table 1: The results of ANOVA integration as a general policy and the respondents' occupations

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	3.153	2	1.577	7.733	0.001*
Within Groups	48.326	237	0.204		
Total	51.480	239			

* $P < 0.01$

Table 2: The results of the Scheffé Test on integration as a general policy and the respondents' occupations

	Head Teacher (2.2467)	Classroom Teacher (2.5825)	Special Needs Teacher (2.6044)
Head Teacher (2.2467)			
Classroom Teacher (2.5825)	0.002*		
Special Needs Teacher (2.6044)	0.001*	0.941	

* $P < 0.01$

2. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration as a general policy among the female staff of age 20-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years, 41-50 years, and 51 years and above was rejected at the 0.001 level. This finding might be related to each group's social status which could affect their work either positively or negatively. Also, for conservative attitudes might come from their age and might be related to the culture of the community.

Table 3: The results of ANOVA integration as a general policy and the respondents' ages

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	5.665	3	1.888	9.728	0.000*
Within Groups	45.814	236	0.194		
Total	51.480	239			

* $P < 0.001$

Table 4: The results of the Scheffé Test on integration as a general policy and the respondents' ages

	20-30 Year (2.5544)	31-40 Year (2.3571)	41-50 Year (2.6469)	51 and above (3.1500)
20-30 Year (2.5544)				
31-40 Year (2.3571)	0.078			
41-50 Year (2.6469)	0.626	0.001**		
51 and above (3.1500)	0.020*	0.001**	0.064	

* $P < 0.05$

** $P < 0.01$

- The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration as a general policy among female staff of less than 5 years' experience, between 5-10 years' experience, and more than 10 years' experience, was rejected at the 0.001 level. This finding could be explained by their level of knowledge and experience primary school issues, which they had gained during their service in the primary school.

Table 5: The results of ANOVA integration as a general policy and the respondents' experiences

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	4.060	2	2.030	10.147	0.000*
Within Groups	47.419	237	0.200		
Total	51.480	239			

* $P < 0.001$

Table 6: The results of the Scheffé Test on integration as a general policy and the respondents' experiences

** $P < 0.05$

	Less than 5 Years (2.5544)	Between 5-10 Years (2.3419)	More than 10 Years (2.6618)
Less than 5 Years (2.5544)			
Between 5-10 Years (2.3419)	0.027*		
More than 10 Years (2.6618)	0.300	0.000**	

** $P < 0.001$

4. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration as a general policy among the female staff with a Diploma in Education qualification and a Bachelor in Education qualification was rejected at the 0.001 level. This might be attributed to their familiarity with special needs, which they had in their university study. As mentioned before, the teacher with a Diploma in Education qualification had no knowledge of special needs teaching in their studies, and also they have received no training courses during their study, or during their service in schools, even after integration took place in Saudi Arabia. However, those who have Bachelor in Education qualification, have only minimum knowledge in special needs. Their knowledge was gained in their theoretical studies in the universities, where there are only some compulsory modules which involved with special needs. This group of staff with little familiarity of special needs work also lacked practical knowledge in special needs treatment, except for those special needs teachers who are specialised in teaching special needs, and also they have Bachelor in Education qualification. The level of training in special needs makes each group of the staff in the integrated primary schools react differently towards the integration process. This suggests that for more effective integration in the primary schools, the staff in the primary schools (which are intended for integration) have to be trained for teaching special needs, as much as being made familiar with the integration process.

Table 7: The results of ANOVA integration as a general policy and the respondents' qualifications

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	11.153	1	11.153	65.823	0.000*
Within Groups	40.327	238	0.169		
Total	51.480	239			

* $P < 0.001$

5. The highest level of disagreement with integration as a general policy was found among the staff of age 51 years and above. This might be attributed to the social status of women of this age in Saudi Arabia. Moreover, as many are coming to the end of their professional life in the school, they almost all have their own future project (such as owning land or property to let which may be of benefit to them after their retirement). Thus, many of them come to their work without ambition, and with only the aim of earning a salary. This attitude might substantially affect their treatment of the children and their reception of new ideas. Also, they think that more integration of handicapped children means more responsibilities for them with more effort. Also coming from conservative communities makes them consider that integration is inappropriate for the special needs child who would be better served in special

schools or institutions away from the society's view, and protected from any negative effects.

6. The highest level of support for integration as a general policy was found among the head teachers. This might be attributed to their administrative roles in the integrated school and lack of daily involvement with the issues of dealing directly with special needs pupils.
7. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration for mildly handicapped children among the staff of head teachers, classroom teachers, and special needs teachers was rejected at the 0.01 level. This seems to be related to each group's duties and their level of contact with the children and the learning process in the school, and also to each group's current experience in integration for the mildly handicapped in Saudi Arabia.

Table 8: The results of ANOVA integration for the mildly handicapped and the respondents' occupations

	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	3.223	2	1.611	7.668	0.001*
Within Groups	49.810	237	0.210		
Total	53.033	239			

* $P < 0.01$

Table 9: Results of the Scheffé Test on integration for the mildly handicapped and the respondents' occupations

	Head Teacher (2.0889)	Classroom Teacher (1.9556)	Special Needs Teacher (1.7593)
Head Teacher (2.0889)			
Classroom Teacher (1.9556)	0.364		
Special Needs Teacher (1.7593)	0.003*	0.010**	

* $P < 0.01$

** $P < 0.05$

8. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration for the mildly handicapped among female staff of age 20-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years and above in the integrated primary schools was rejected at the 0.001 level. This may be attributed to the social status of the teacher which might affect their work positively or negatively, and also for a certain conservatism which might come from age and social and cultural background.

Table10: The results of ANOVA on integration for the mildly handicapped and the respondents' ages

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	18.273	3	6.091	41.356	0.000*
Within Groups	34.759	236	0.147		
Total	53.033	239			

* $P < 0.001$

Table 11: Results of the Scheffé Test on integration for the mildly handicapped and the respondents' ages

	20-30 Years (1.5931)	31-40 Years (1.9810)	41-50 Years (1.9705)	51 and Above (3.2500)
20-30 Years (1.5931)				
31-40 Years (1.9810)	0.000*			
41-50 Years (1.9705)	0.000*	0.999		
51 and Above (3.2500)	0.000*	0.000*	0.000*	

* $P < 0.001$

9. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration for mildly handicapped children among the staff of less than 5 years' experience, between 5-10 years' experience, or more than 10 years' experience was rejected at the 0.001 level. This finding might be attributed to their level of knowledge and experience about primary school issues, which they had gained during their service in the primary school.

Table 12: The results of ANOVA integration for the mildly handicapped and the respondents' experiences

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	9.016	2	4.508	24.27	0.000*
Within Groups	44.017	237	0.186	3	
Total	53.033	239			

* $P < 0.001$

Table 13: Results of the Scheffé Test on integration for the mildly and the respondents' experiences

	Less than 5 Years (1.5931)	Between 5-10 Years (1.9785)	More than 10 Years (2.0424)
Less than 5 Years (1.5931)			
Between 5-10 Years (1.9785)	0.000*		
More than 10 Years (2.0424)	0.000*	0.647	

* $P < 0.001$

10. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in integration for mildly handicapped children among staff with Diploma of Education and Bachelor in Education qualifications was rejected at the 0.001 level. This was attributed to their lack of experience in special needs or the minimum experience, which they had received in their university study, as mentioned above in finding 4.

Table 14: The results of ANOVA integration for the mildly handicapped and the respondents' qualifications

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	4.109	1	4.109	19.991	0.000*
Within Groups	48.924	238	0.206		
Total	53.033	239			

* $P < 0.001$

11. The highest level of support for integration for the mildly handicapped was found among staff aged 20-30 years, and among staff with less than five years experience. This might be attributed to their being young and inexperienced both professionally and socially. Some are unmarried, or married without children or with one or two children, so that their experience in treating children is not very great, but they were excited, bold, and felt interested in their work. Also, because they are at the beginning of their professional life, they want to confirm their position in their work, and as they are recent graduates, so they approach work with more ambition to apply what they learnt in their studies. They are more open in their approach to children than the older and more experienced women who represent the older generation.
12. The lowest level of support for integration of mildly handicapped children in the primary school was found

among staff with a Diploma in Education qualification. This is because they lack the experience or training for special needs and lack comprehension of the practical difficulties involved in teaching. They felt that this step might represent progress and steps on the route to the integration of other kinds of handicap of which they were fearful. They thought any positive criticism of the integration process may raise issues which would be investigated by educators, and lead to changes which may require them to put more effort into their job, or have more responsibilities on their shoulders.

13. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in the difficulties, which hinder successful integration among staff of different specialisms was rejected at the 0.001 level. This finding could be attributed to their different duties and contact with the children and particularly to their relationship to special needs in the school.

Table 15: The results of ANOVA difficulties which hinder successful integration and the respondents' occupations

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	4.213	2	2.107	23.594	0.000*
Within Groups	21.162	237	0.089		
Total	25.376	239			

* $P < 0.001$

Table 16: Results of the Scheffé Test on difficulties which hinder successful and the respondents' occupations

	Head Teacher (1.8467)	Classroom Teacher (1.4617)	Special Needs Teacher (1.6467)
Head Teacher (1.8467)			
Classroom Teacher (1.4617)	0.000**		
Special Needs Teacher (1.6467)	0.007*	0.0.000**	

* $P < 0.01$

** $P < 0.001$

14. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in the difficulties which hinder successful integration among staff of age 20-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years and above was rejected at the 0.001 level. This might be attributed to each group's social status which could affect their response to handicapped or non-handicapped children in the school. Also the conservative communities from which they come could make them regard integration as a disadvantage for the special needs child who they believe should be segregated in special schools or institutes away from the society's view and protected from any negative effects.

Table 17: The Results of ANOVA difficulties which hinder successful integration and the respondents' ages

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	4.251	3	1.417	15.831	0.000*
Within Groups	21.125	236	0.090		
Total	25.376	239			

* $P < 0.001$

Table 18: Results of the Scheffé Test on the difficulties which hinder successful integration and the respondents' ages

	20-30 Year (1.6118)	31-40 Year (1.5371)	41-50 Year (1.5365)	51 and Above (2.3833)
20-30 Year (1.6118)				
31-40 Year (1.5371)	0.544			
41-50 Year (1.5365)	0.473	1.000		
51 and Above (2.3833)	0.000*	0.000*	0.000*	

* $P < 0.001$

15. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in the difficulties which hinder successful integration among staff of less than 5 years' experience, between 5-10 years' experience, or more than 10 years' experience, was confirmed at the 0.05 level. This might be related to their experience as teachers, and the amount of knowledge about primary school issues they have learnt during their service.

Table 19: The results of ANOVA difficulties which hinder successful integration and the respondents' experiences

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	0.103	2	0.052	0.484	0.617
Within Groups	25.273	237	0.107		
Total	25.376	239			

Table 20: Results of the Scheffé Test on difficulties which hinder successful integration and the respondents' experiences

	Less than 5 Years (1.6118)	Between 5-10 Years (1.5613)	More than 10 Years (1.5691)
Less than 5 Years (1.6118)			
Between 5-10 Years (1.5613)	0.679		
More than 10 Years (1.5691)	0.699	0.989	

16. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in the difficulties which hinder successful integration among staff of Diploma of Education and Bachelor in Education qualifications was rejected at the 0.05 level. This again might be attributed to their lack of experience in special needs or their minimum experience, as mentioned above in finding 4.

Table 21: The results of ANOVA difficulties which hinder successful integration and the respondents' qualifications

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Significant
Between Groups	0.461	1	0.461	4.405	0.037*
Within Groups	24.915	238	0.105		
Total	25.376	239			

* $P < 0.05$

17. The highest level of disagreement of the difficulties hindering successful integration was found among the staff of 51 years and above. There is a tendency for them to believe that more special needs integration in the primary schools, and more handicapped children in the schools where they work, would present more responsibilities for them and problems to overcome. Also, this might be attributed to their conservative viewpoint as explained above.

18. The highest level of agreement of the difficulties which hinder successful integration in the primary school was among the classroom teachers. This might be attributed to their direct contact and involvement with the children in the school, and their minimum experience in special needs, which made them more aware of the difficulties which made them more knowledgeable about the teaching problems.
19. Staff of all types were most concerned about the mobility of physically handicapped children. Other special needs children, partially-sighted, hard of hearing and behaviourally disruptive and those with such learning difficulties as language disorder or speech skills, were considered more of a problem for integration than the mobility handicapped children. This is understandable in buildings which were not purpose-built for special needs facilities.

It is worth noting that disruptive children in the primary school did not seem to arouse much concern for integration, maybe this is related to the nature of the society and the traditional relationships between the younger and older generations, which required the young to respect the old. Also this related to the Islamic culture, which requests the learner (whatever his age, and in any stage of his learning) to respect his teacher. Moreover, children's behaviour when they are young, especially at the primary stage, are almost always controlled by the staff who have that right according to Islamic cultural requirements.

Children who were mildly mentally retarded were not considered for integration in the primary schools. This can be attributed to the amount of effort which the staff would have to give and for which they had no training as well as the lack of school facilities for such handicaps in the current integrated schools in Saudi Arabia. Also, staff believed that the mentally retarded children needed so much effort and time of the staff that it is preferable for them to be segregated in special schools, where the proper facilities are available for them. The study revealed that even the most mild mentally retarded were almost completely unconsidered for integration by the staff. This result confirms results of two studies in boys' primary schools in Saudi Arabia by Abdul-Jabbar (1999), and Haroon (1995), who both indicated that mildly mentally retarded handicap was the least considered handicap for integration in the primary schools. In both two studies the mobility handicapped were outside the case for integration, because they are mentally as other mainstream children.

In the present study, the staff approved for inclusion the handicapped child who is mentally in as good condition as the mobility handicapped. A result also found by Abdul-Ghafour (1999).

Staff from all four background were all aware of school-based problems hindering successful integration- all had knowledge of the situation. However, the difficulties which derived from society in implementing a policy of integration were less noticed by all the staff. This may be due to the staff's unawareness of society's vital role in improving the education in the country. This result is also a finding in the study by Abdul-Ghafour (1999).

The interview data analysis

The interviews took place with 24 respondents (who had already answered the questionnaire); six of them were head teachers; nine were classroom teachers; and nine were special needs teachers.

It is useful to conclude each integrated primary school aspect dealt with in the interview questions by pointing out the particular features of each set of responses. The researcher presents the results of the interview responses for each aspect and analyses them and the comments.

The Integrated Primary School Building

The researcher raised some issues related to this aspect among the integrated primary school staff, these are:

- The size of the integrated primary school building;
- The design of the integrated primary school building;
- The rented primary school buildings which have been integrated; and Special needs facilities in the integrated primary school building.
- The Classroom in the Integrated Primary School.

This aspect dealt with a number of issues relating to the classroom in the integrated primary school. These were as follows:

- The numbers of children in the integrated primary school classroom;
- Organisation of children for learning in the primary school classroom;

- The classroom size in the integrated primary school;
- The classroom furniture in the integrated primary school and;
- The general atmosphere in the integrated primary school classroom.
- The above five issues dealt with here were linked to questions in the interview.

The Curriculum in the Integrated Primary School

This aspect deals with some issues relating to the school curriculum:

- The appropriateness of the primary stage curriculum for both mainstream and special needs children;
- The importance of the teacher's role in delivering the primary stage curriculum;
- The role of memorisation and homework and their appropriateness for both mainstream and special needs children;
- Introducing information through the primary school textbooks for both mainstream and special needs children;
- The importance of textbooks for each subject in the primary stage curriculum.
- The importance of the provision of a teacher's manual for each subject in the primary stage;

Teaching Methods in the Integrated Primary School

This aspect dealt with number of issues relating to teaching methods in the integrated primary school, which were covered by six related questions in the interview:

-
-
- Satisfaction with the 45-minute session in the integrated primary school for teacher to vary the usual teaching methods;
 - Suitability of organization of children in the integrated primary school classroom for allowing a teacher to vary the usual teaching methods;
 - The time children spend in the classroom;
 - The most suitable number of children in the integrated primary school classroom to enable the teacher to vary teaching methods;
 - Child movement through the three upper levels of the primary stage.
 - The use of oral examinations for children in the lower three levels in the primary stage.

The Staff in the Integrated Primary School:

This aspect dealt with a number of issues relating to the school staff in the integrated primary school:

- The staff number in the integrated primary school;
- Staff understanding of integration and special needs in order to treat them effectively;
- The staff ages in the integrated primary school;
- The staff qualifications in the integrated primary school.

Head teachers appeared uninvolved with the process of integration in all its aspects and its problems because of their mainly administrative roles in their schools, in spite of the fact that they had all been class teachers before promotion, but they had only learnt about special needs in their university study.

Classroom teachers' evidence appeared to show dissatisfaction with integration in the primary stage. This dissatisfaction, however, came from their experience with special needs for which they did not feel themselves competent to be involved. Some of the class teachers in the primary stage did not have a university degree in education and so were unfamiliar with special needs. Indeed, most of the classroom teachers, even those who have a university degree in education, were dissatisfied with integration because they did not want the responsibility of special needs. Moreover, some of them came from uneducated or conservative environments, which made them resistant to change, so that they did not understand either integration or special needs. Such matters were noticed also in the questionnaire data collected.

The special needs teachers' replies showed extreme concern about the integrated primary school. This appeared to arise from their experience in dealing with special needs, which started with their studying in the university. Their concern about the integration in the primary schools also reveals their willingness to improve the special needs education in Saudi Arabia. This matter, again, was noticed in the data collected from the questionnaire of the present study.

In general, all the interview respondents appeared to show dissatisfaction with integration in its current situation in one way or another and for different motives. There appeared to be a certain willingness to consider integration if appropriate planning took place and the primary school in general was prepared for the change.

Conclusion:

The results of the study are summarized as follows:

The head teachers appeared uninvolved with the process of integration in all its aspects and its problems in their schools, in spite of the fact that they had all been class teachers before promotion, but they only had minimum experience in special needs through their university study. This result was also supported from the questionnaire and interview data in this study.

The classroom teachers' evidence appeared to show dissatisfaction with integration in the primary stage. Their dissatisfaction, however, came from their practical experience with special needs for which they did not feel themselves qualified. Some of the class teachers in the primary stage did not have a university degree in education and so were unfamiliar with the teaching of special needs. Indeed, most of the classroom teachers, even those who have a university degree in education, were dissatisfied with integration. Moreover, some of them came from an uneducated or conservative environment, which made them resistant to change, so that they did not understand either integration or special needs. Such matters were noted also in the questionnaire and interview data collected.

The special needs teachers' showed extreme concern about the integrated primary school. This appeared to arise from their experience in dealing with special needs, both theoretical and practical, and revealed their willingness to improve the special needs education in Saudi Arabia. This matter was noted

in the data collected from the questionnaire and interview of the present study.

Staff of age 20 to 30 years were highly involved with integration for mildly handicapped so that they well understood the difficulties which hinder successful integration. This was attributed to their young age, their low professional and their social status. They were almost all unmarried, or just married without children, which had a positive effect on their work. Also, normally at this age staff in the integrated school would be in their first years of practical work, and so their experience of working in such a school is new. All those matters affected the staff of age 20 to 30 years towards integration positively.

The staff of age 31 to 40 years old were highly involved with integration as a general policy. This resulted by the fact of the social status of women in Saudi Arabia, who were almost all married with two or three children, and was influenced by other reasons mentioned above in the previous section regarding to the staff of age 20-30 years, which might affect their attitudes towards integration as a general policy positively.

The staff of age 41-50 years old were more involved with the difficulties which hinder successful integration in the primary school. At this age, normally the staff in the integrated school have not less than 10 years' experience in their work, which helped them to recognize the problems in the primary school, and also the difficulties in creating an integrated school.

The staff of age 51 years and over showed no enthusiasm for integration as a general policy, not even for mildly handicapped children in the primary school. They also

had not considered the difficulties which hinder successful integration in the primary school. This could be because they were unwilling to even consider such educational innovation. Such a lack of involvement was predictable and runs throughout the research.

The staff of less than five years' experience were interested in integration for mildly handicapped, but did not appreciate the difficulties which hinder successful integration in the primary school, and therefore were not involved with such difficulties. Their new and short experience in the primary school had not made them yet familiar with such teaching issues, but their short their work what they had studied.

The staff of five to ten years' experience were highly supportive of integration as a general policy. Their experiences had made them interested in integration for different sorts of handicaps, and also made them familiar with primary school problems, so that they understood the difficulties which face successful integration.

The staff of more than ten years' experience seem to have begun to resist integration or at least to accept it for only the simplest forms of learning difficulty. It is perhaps the case that they became more familiar with the difficulties of teaching as they became more expert and that this deterred them from being more ambitious. On the other hand, other professional or social factors might have been connected to their attitudes.

The staff with a Diploma in Education qualification continued to resist integration in every aspect under review. This reflects their dissatisfaction with integration as a policy

and their fear of such process since all of them are untrained to treat special needs.

The staff with a Bachelor in Education qualification were supportive of integration. They were not involved in the difficulties which hinder successful integration; they might think that there are some more major difficulties which should be investigated.

The physically handicapped pupils with mild handicaps were the most accepted for integration; more than the partially-sighted, those children who were hard of hearing, behaviourally disruptive, and with learning difficulties involving disorders of language or speech skills all of whom were rather reluctantly accepted for integration. Those children who the staff absolutely did not accept for integration were the mildly mentally retarded. This reflected the amount of effort which the staff would have to spend with such handicapped children. They almost all approved of integration for the physically handicapped children because physically handicapped children are almost all in a good mental state, so that, for learning, they do not need much special effort to be paid them by the staff.

It was suggested that some development might take place when integration had settled down to mildly handicapped children in Saudi Arabia and was better understood. Janny *et al.* (1995) argued that the response to integration is always sceptical in a community at first, then approval grows as integration is applied and people become interested and willing to accept the idea. The implication for Saudi Arabia is that in time the mildly mentally retarded children could be introduced

and if the child did not benefit from its integration, she could be moved to a specialist school. There has been research in two studies in boys' primary schools in Saudi Arabia by Abdul-Jabbar (1999) and Haroon (1995), they both indicated in their studies that the mildly mentally retarded child was the most unwanted handicapped child for integration in the primary school. The physically handicapped child was the most acceptable category for integration. Their two studies also revealed that the staff accepted handicaps where the handicapped child was mentally in a good condition, and did not need much effort for teaching. In the present study, the staff tended to approve integration where the handicapped child is mentally in a good condition, and the handicapped child does not require much greater effort for learning than other non-handicapped children. This is also equivalent to the finding in a study by Abdul-Ghfour (1999).

The difficulties which hinder successful integration in the primary school, the staff were more involved with the difficulties which related to the Ministry of Education, more than with the difficulties which related to society. They confirmed that the primary school in Saudi Arabia is not prepared yet for accepting handicapped children without some important adaptations and innovation. These are: medical services, curriculum flexibility, teachers' qualification and experience, teaching aids, and teachers' morale. These were the difficulties which greatly criticised by the staff in the integrated schools.

Despite special education being considered as part of regular education and concerned with seeking to develop

personal abilities as much as possible to make pupils of all kinds able to serve society efficiently, by providing them all the suitable circumstances, special education has to be individualised with some features which make it appropriate for the individual personality involved. This was also confirmed by Al-Roosan (1989), who indicated that there are some objectives of special education which can be added to the targeted regular education objectives, for benefiting special needs children in the mainstream school. These are, for instance, getting to know the special needs children by both objective and subjective methods, then preparing the teaching methods for these special needs children which are different from the regular teaching methods, such as gesturing language for deaf to be used in the ordinary school, in addition to that, adopting suitable teaching aids for each kind of handicap in the ordinary school, such as model objects for visual impairment, and speech equipment for deaf. The use of this variety of teaching methods in the integrated school will compensate the handicapped children for any impairment they may have (Al-Roosan, 1989).

The advantage of getting to know the special needs children as indicated by Al-Roosan (1989) may help to identify more special needs children in the mainstream schools, who were previously categorised as non-special needs, especially in the early years of the child's life in the school. This may help early involvement in the child's education.

All the respondents appeared to show dissatisfaction with integration in its current situation (to be extended either at different education stages or with different levels of handicap) in one way or another and for different motives. There appeared to be a certain willingness to consider integration if appropriate

planning took place and the primary school in general was prepared for the change. It is believed, however, that some serious issues can be identified which deserve discussion, such as the educational policy in the country.

Evidence suggested that as the level of integration became more complex, for example, involving partially-sighted and hard of hearing pupils, the staff believed that considerable adaptation in almost all aspects of the school were necessary: the school building; the classroom; teaching methods; teaching aids; the curriculum; and the staff itself. This would also require special funds, which may complicate the integration in its first phases in Saudi Arabia. The significance of individual items in the list would vary according to the kind of handicap. For example, evidence suggested that for integrating behaviourally disruptive children and children with learning difficulties involving disorder of language or speech skills, development in teaching methods, and teaching aids was most needed.

However, the introduction of children who were mildly mentally retarded was strongly resisted for integration, since such a kind of handicap requires more improvement in many areas, including the attitude of society, the school organization, and, basically, the educational policy in Saudi Arabia. This shows that integration will be difficult to achieve for such a kind of handicap.

In relation to individual staff, the study revealed that the integrated primary school is proving to be difficult to achieve successfully because often either head teacher or deputy head

teacher, or both, are not experienced or have minimum experience in special needs. This will prove to be a serious obstacle against successful integration in the primary school. Many times age seemed to be a significant factor. It was clear that the older staff were the most resistant to change and created a significant problem in developing and extending integration. Integration in Saudi Arabia will prove to be a contentious issue for some years until the new generation of staff have entered the profession and it is made worse currently by the present lack of experienced and well-trained staff until the policy of special needs is better understood in Saudi Arabia. As in other countries with experience of integration, this is costly and raises difficult questions about support services, such as psychological and medical links with schools, also the role of parents and lack of development of new teaching ideas. The involvement of the Ministry of Education incorporated with some other ministries of the country is vital as it sets the policies for education in Saudi Arabia. There was little evidence in the research that staff were aware of what national policy was but this may have been due to the interviewees reluctance to discuss something which they did not believe to be their business.

Recommendations

The Integrated Primary School Building

- Situating the integrated primary school building in a quiet area, away from traffic, and providing them with all possible facilities for effective special needs teaching.

In the future, designing the special school buildings to an equivalent standard as integrated schools in developed countries. This would involve the careful provision of ramps,

specialised rooms, appropriate furniture and a range of built-in teaching support systems.

For more suggested recommendations read Brennan, 1985; Wade & Moore, 1987; Leadbetter & Leadbetter, 1993; Ainscow, 1994; Dean, 1996.

The Integrated Primary School Classrooms

- Reducing the children number in the integrated primary school classroom, providing them with facilities for storing the most important special need teaching aids, and paying consideration to the classroom furniture.
- In the future, designing the integrated primary school classrooms to be an equivalent standard as those in the developed countries.

The Primary Stage Curriculum in the Integrated School

- Modifying the tests that assess different levels of ability and to indicate progress in specific learning areas which are defined for the age group.
- Bringing all different subjects taught under the Arabic Language Syllabus, under one syllabus, and the same should be the case for all subjects taught under the Religious Syllabus.
- Considering the teachers and parents' attitudes about the primary stage curriculum.

Teaching Aids:

- Providing the integrated primary school with all possible modern teaching aids for both special and mainstream pupils. In many cases the same aids are valuable for both.
- Providing the teachers with the most essential basic teaching aids, which teachers use all the time in the classroom, such as posters, flash cards, pencils, crayons, paper, paint, etc.
- Providing the classroom with convenient teaching aids, a storage place in or out of the classroom to be used by all the teachers, and to protect these aids from any damage caused by children.
- Providing the school with a library to be used by all children with books at varying levels of difficulty.
- Providing the school with computers to be used by all the children.

Teaching Methods:

- Changing the way of using oral tests or written tests in the primary stage, especially in the first three lower levels, and finding an alternative method of assessing the children in these three levels.
- The teacher should be authorised to use all possible ways to monitor the child's progress in the classroom, for example by using her own observation and experience.
- Minimising the use of memorisation (rote learning) in the primary stage.

- Creating other teaching methods for delivering the lessons in whole class teaching for teaching special needs and non-special needs in one classroom.
- Re-arranging the daily school programme, to be both in and out the classroom, by giving the teachers a flexible schedule for the class sessions with sufficient time for different activities, instead of 45-minute lessons.
- The use of coherent units of teaching is suggested. For example, a whole week could be devoted to one subject such as Science or Maths.
- Providing the integrated primary school teachers with a teacher's manual for teaching each subject to both handicapped and mainstream children. This is especially important until teacher training for special needs is greatly improved.

For more suggested recommendations read Dean, 1996; Lyons, 1986; Evans & Wilson, 1980; and Jamieson *et al.*, 1977.

The Staff in the Integrated Primary School

- All the staff in the integrated primary school should attend in-service courses regularly to upgrade their skills, and be paid according to their experience and qualifications.
- Improving the staff attitudes towards working in an integrated school. This would be a major management role for the head teacher to ensure that morale is high.
- All the staff in the integrated primary school should be subject to evaluation and supervision by the Ministry of Education, particularly the Department of Special Needs.

- Authorising the staff to select the best strategy to follow with all children in the integrated primary school.
- Equality of responsibility among all the staff in the integrated primary school.
- All the staff in the integrated primary school should be trained for teaching special needs pupils.
- Parents should be given the opportunity to take part in the learning process in the integrated primary school.
- The staff-pupil ratio in the integrated primary school should be increased.

The Head Teachers:

- Head teachers of the integrated primary schools should be trained or qualified by experience for organising a school with special needs and mainstream pupils.
- Head teachers should attend in-service courses for administrating the integrated school and study integration policies around the world, and become familiar with new techniques for treating special needs children in the integrated school.
- It would be an advantage if one at least of the head teachers or deputy head teachers in each integrated school were a specialist in special needs. To have a senior teacher co-ordinating the work would ensure that it was done properly.
- Head teachers need some freedom to make decisions without bureaucratic control such as authorising them to identify and exploit any facilities available to support special needs pupils either in or out of the school. This

would include close contact with parents and trying to inform everybody of the aims of the policy.

The Classroom Teachers:

- All classroom teachers in the integrated primary school should attend in-service free courses to improve their teaching skills.
- All classroom teachers in the integrated primary schools should have a Bachelor in Education qualification, and trained so that they are aware of the need for supporting special needs in the integrated school.

The Special Needs Teachers:

- The special needs teachers should attend in-service courses, to upgrade their professional knowledge about suitable ways of treating special needs children. But their original training, should be, if possible for a specialist kind of handicap.
- Increasing the numbers of special needs teachers in the integrated primary schools is essential if this demanding type of organisation and teaching is to be successful. This is particularly the case if the level of integration becomes complicated and includes a variety of special needs. This obviously has resource implications.
- The special needs teachers should be required to provide the Educational Directorate Office with regular reports about the special needs pupils and regularly discuss their progress with other teachers to find whether they have progressed or not.

- The special needs teacher should work beside the classroom teachers in the classroom to assist and inform her.

For more suggested recommendations read Brennan, 1985; Wade and Moore, 1987; and Alcott, 1994.

The Ministry of Education

- Encourage work with special needs by informing people around the country about special needs by means of the media, and raising the status and morale among the staff who work with special needs.
- The Ministry of Education should link all the integrated primary schools with special schools, hospitals, and support groups.
- The role of the Ministry of Education and the Department of Special Needs should be confirmed by removing all the difficulties which hinder successful integration, such as, providing medical services, introducing flexibility in the school organisation, and preparing classroom teachers for treating both special and non-special needs children.
- Legislation should be introduced which guarantees and protects the rights of special needs pupils.
- Preparing the integrated primary schools and the staff for integration by informing them about the process in order to make integration acceptable and successful.
- Mainstream pupils in the primary schools which are intended for integration, should also be informed about

integration, and be prepared for accepting their special needs peers.

- Preparing educational programmes to inform the parents of handicapped pupils and help them to take care of their handicapped children in their own homes.
- The possibility should be considered of transferring all staff over 40 years of age in integrated schools to mainstream schools, and also those who have less than a Bachelor in Education qualification, or are completely untrained for treating special needs. This would be a temporary policy.
- The Ministry of Education should find all possible methods to inform all the staff in the integrated primary schools about special needs, and enhance the status of the work.
- An effort should be made to improve primary education in general by a revolution in some particular aspects, such as: including the nursery and reception stages in the primary school, which may enable the staff to identify special needs children very early and treat them earlier.
- Improving the public religious attitudes, by improving the school curriculum.
- Introducing integration from the pre-school stages, the nursery and the reception stages with the same children, to enable them to accept each other from early learning years.
- Providing the integrated primary school with all possible teaching aids which the teacher needs in delivering the curriculum.

- A decision should be made to improve or remove aspects of the primary stage curriculum which have become inconvenient and unsuitable for use in modern education such as: rote learning; the limitation of time for each class session; unsuitable and inflexible arranged classroom furniture and a school which children do not like because it is not attractive.
- Providing the integrated primary school with sufficient assistants to help the handicapped children in moving around the school.
- An adequate budget should be specified for the integrated primary school sector.

Recommendations for Future Research :

The results of the present study suggest the following topics for further research:

- Similar studies should be conducted over a wide range of education problems in other regions of Saudi Arabia.
- An investigation should be made to find out if there are differences between male and female staff attitudes towards integration in the integrated primary school.
- Research should investigate the views about integration among the female pupils in the integrated primary schools, with different research methods such as; the experimental methods.
- This study should also be replicated with different research instruments such as self-reports, teachers' diaries, observation sheet lists and rating scales.

Parents of the integrated children, the integrated children in the primary schools of both handicapped and non-handicapped children, the integrated children who graduated from the integrated primary schools, the undergraduates in the Special Needs Department in the universities, the Ministry of Education employees, all these could be a source of data for future research.

References

1. Abdul-Ghafour, M. (1999), An Investigation into Teachers' and Administrators' Attitudes in Public Education about Integrating Handicapped Children in the Mainstream Primary Schools in Kuwait, **Educational Research Centre Magazine**, Qatar University, No. 15, (Arabic).
2. Abdul-Jabbar, A. (1999) The Factorial Validity of the Attitudes Towards a Mainstreaming Scale, **Journal of King Saud University**, Vol. 11, Part.2, (Arabic Journal).
3. Ainscow, M. (1994) **Special Needs in the Classroom: A Teacher Education Guide**, UNESCO Publishing, USA.
4. Alcott, M. (1994) **An Introduction to Children with Special Educational Needs**, Hodder and Stoughton. England.
5. Al-Fouzan, I. (1999) **Educating and Teaching Special Needs for Girls**, Ministry of Education, the General Administration for Special Needs, Al-Wataniyah Publications, Riyadh (Arabic).
6. Al-Fouzan, I. (2002) **Educating and Teaching Special Needs for Girls**, Ministry of Education, the General Administration for Special Needs, Al-Wataniyah Al-Hadithah Publications, Riyadh (Arabic).
7. Al-Khashrami, S. (2000) **The School For All: Integrating Special Needs in Ordinary Schools**, Al-Madrasah Liljame, Arabic Source), Golden Publisher, Riyadh.

8. Al-Roosan, F. (1989) **Special needs Psychology: An introduction in special education**, Al-Arab Publisher, Oman (Arabic).
9. Al-Saratawi, A. *et al.* (2002) **Special Needs Dictionary**, Dar Al-Qalam, UAE (Arabic).
10. Ammar, A. (1982) Hinders of Special Needs, in Al-Khashrami, S. (2000) **The School For All: Integrating Special Needs in Ordinary Schools** (Al-Madrasah Liljame), Golden Publisher, Riyadh, (Arabic).
11. Brennan, W. (1985) **Curriculum For Special Needs, Children With Special Needs Series**, Open University Press, England.
12. Clegg, F. (1990) **Simple Statistics: A Course Book for the Social Sciences**, Cambridge University Press, UK.
13. Dean, J. (1996) **Managing Special Needs in the Primary School**, Routledge, London.
14. Department of Education and Science (DES) and Department of Health and Social Security (DHSS) (1983) **Assessments and Statements of Special Needs, Circular 1/83**, London.
15. Drever, J. (1956) **A Dictionary of Psychology**, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
16. El-Ashwal, A. (1987) **Encyclopaedia of Special Education**, Anglo Bookshop, Cairo.
17. **Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences (1934)** Vol.13, Macmillan, New York.
18. Evans, M. & Wilson, M. (1980) Education of Disturbed Pupils, School Council, **Working Paper 65**, Methuen Educational, London.

19. Fairbairn, G. & Fairbairn, S. (1992) **Integrating Special Children: Some Ethical Issues**, Avebury, England.
20. Haroon, S. (1995) Ordinary Classroom Teachers' Expectations Towards the Teaching of Educable Mentally Retarded Children in the Ordinary Schools in Riyadh, **New Education**, No. 35, Part.1, (Arabic).
21. Hegarty, S. (1987) **Meeting Special Needs in Ordinary Schools: An Overview**, Cassell, Great Britain.
22. **Htm (2002)** Website Pages, Academic Assessment in Saudi Arabian Schools.
23. **Htm (2002)** Website Pages, Types and Stages of Education.
24. **Htm (2004)** Website Pages, Sure Start.
25. Jamieson, M. *et al.* (1977) **Towards Integration: A Study of Blind and Partially-Sighted Children in Ordinary School**, Slough: NFER, England.
26. Janny, R. *et al.* (1995) **Integrating Students with Moderate and Severe Disabilities into General Education Classes**, **Exceptional Children Journal**, No.61, Part 5.
27. Khusheim, S. (2005) An Inquiry into the Introduction of Integrated Primary Schools for Girls in Saudi Arabia, **Unpublished PhD Thesis**, Manchester University, England.
28. Lawton, D. & Gordon, P. (1996) **Dictionary of Education**, Hodder & Stoughton, London.
29. Leadbetter, J. and Leadbetter, P. (1993) **Special Needs Children Meeting the Challenge in the Primary School**, Cassell, London.

30. Lyons, W. (1986) Integrating the Handicapped in Ordinary Schools, in Dean, J (1996) **Managing Special Needs in the Primary School**, Routledge, London.
31. Ministry of Education (2003) **An official document obtained by the researcher from the Ministry of Education in Riyadh.**
32. Ministry of Education (2004) **An official document obtained by the researcher from the Ministry of the Education in Riyadh.**
33. Ministry of Education (2004) **The General Organisational Structure for Ministry of Education, An official document obtained by the researcher from the Ministry of Education in Riyadh, 05/June/ 2004.**
34. Ministry of Education, Primary Stage Curriculum for Girls (1996-1997) **A handbook obtained by the researcher fro the Ministry of Education in Riyadh.**
35. Pijl, S. & Meijer, C. (1991) Does Integration Count for Much? An Analysis of the Practices of Integration in Eight Countries, **European Journal of Special Needs Education**, Vol.6, No.2.
36. Verma, G. & Beard, R. (1981) **What is Educational Research? Perspectives on Techniques of Research**, Gower, UK.
37. Verma, G. & Mallick, K. (1999) **Researching Education: Perspectives and Techniques**, Falmer Press, London.
38. Wade, B. and Moore, M. (1987) **Special Children: Special Needs Provision in Ordinary Classroom**, Robert Royce, United Kingdom.

39. Will, M. (1986) Educating Students with Learning Problems: A Shared Responsibility, in Pijl, S. & Meijer, C. (1991) Does Integration Count for Much? An Analysis of the Practices of Integration in Eight Countries, **European Journal of Special Needs Education**, Vol.6, No.2.
-