Assessing inclusive education provision at a United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) elementary school in Lebanon

Ali Hussein El Ahmad, Ph.D.

School of Education, Lebanese International University (LIU), Lebanon

Abstract

Inclusive education (IE) has become one of the top issues on the international educational agenda over the past two decades. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) (2013a) developed an IE policy to cater for learning, health, and psychosocial needs for Palestine refugee students with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) across its five fields of operation; however, the implementation of this policy in UNRWA schools across Lebanon is still weak and inconsistent. The purpose of this study is to assess IE provision for Palestine refugee students with SEND at an UNRWA lower elementary school in Lebanon. The study employed quantitative approach and adopted descriptive design. Data were collected through questionnaire surveys and structured classroom observations from 142 purposefully and conveniently sampled participants, including teaching staff, parents of students with SEND, and their children in grades 2 and 3. The results showed that students with SEND receive an IE to a large extent, yet teachers' inclusive teaching practices are inconsistent, in addition to poor availability of assistive technologies (AT) and exclusion of students with SEND from classroom routines procedures. The large extent of IE provision for students with SEND reflects UNRWA's commitment to providing high-quality IE for all children, including students with SEND. Recommendations for policymakers and practitioners are provided, and suggestions for future research are presented.

Keywords: Inclusive education; inclusion; special educational needs; disabilities; UNRWA; Lebanon

Introduction

Inclusive education (IE) has dominated the international discourse on approaches to education of students with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) in the past two decades. It has become a key feature for education systems to be considered of high quality and equity. IE provision for students with SEND is neither a charity nor a service; it is a right affirmed in a number of international documents on human rights. They are Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 1994), Article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (United Nations [UN], 2007), and the Sustainable Development Goal 4 on education of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015).

As an umbrella for its five-year Education Reform Strategy (ERS) (UNRWA, 2011), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) (2013a) developed an IE policy based on the social model of disability to cater for learning, health, and psychosocial needs for Palestine refugee students with SEND. The IE policy was to be mainstreamed and implemented in all schools at UNRWA across the five fields of operation in the host countries: Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Gaza Strip, the West Bank, including East Jerusalem (UNRWA, 2013b). However, the implementation of the IE policy in UNRWA schools across Lebanon is still weak and inconsistent. In addition, a study of classroom practices conducted by UNRWA (2014) at its elementary schools across the five fields of operation revealed that no adapted or additional curriculum was provided for Palestine refugee students with SEND. It also recommended examining interactions of teachers with those students using focal sampling in future research. The purpose of this study is to assess IE provision for Palestine refugee students with SEND at an UNRWA lower elementary school in Lebanon that has implemented UNRWA's (2013a) IE policy.

The empirical studies on IE and SEND are still considerably limited (Barnard-Brak et al., 2014; Grima-Farrell, 2017; Parekh, 2013), especially in developing countries (Kuroda et al., 2017; Srivastava et al., 2015). Moreover, Alkhateeb et al. (2016) contends that relatively little research on IE (42 empirical studies) has been conducted in Arab countries. Thus, Alkhateeb et al. (2016) suggest that researchers conduct more empirical research on IE in Arab countries. The number of empirical research studies on IE in Arab countries is continuously increasing, yet the

studies on assessment of IE are still very limited. This study helps bridge the gap of limited empirical research on IE in Arab countries, especially IE assessment studies. It offers further understanding of the implementation of UNRWA's (2013a) IE policy at an UNRWA lower elementary school, located inside a camp for Palestine refugees in Lebanon (PRL). The results give insight into the extent of IE provision for Palestine refugee students with SEND at the respective school. The results also provide education administrators at UNRWA in Lebanon with feedback on the IE provision for Palestine refugee students with SEND; this feedback is fundamental for deciding and carrying out improvements, where needed.

Literature Review

Definition of IE

There is no internationally agreed-upon definition for IE despite its emergence three decades ago. Dovigo (2017) contends that there are many variations in the definition and motive of IE within and across national contexts. Similarly, Norwich (2014) states that "Inclusion as a concept and value is now recognized as complex with multiple meanings (p. 1)". For Percey and Mazurkiewicz (2013), inclusion in education means children have the right to attend schools for free and on an equal footing. Braunsteiner and Mariano-Lapidus (2014) criticize narrow conceptualization of IE. They declare that educational inclusion is still linked to a perspective of disability or deficit. However, Dovigo (2017) insists on expanding IE to include children subject to discrimination based on ethnicity, gender, age, socioeconomic status, level of attainment, and sexual orientation. Likewise, according to Ainscow and Miles (2008), IE encompasses education provision for all students and not just for students with disabilities. Braunsteiner and Mariano-Lapidus (2014) perceive inclusion as a human right to full participation and contribution to all aspects of society without marginalization or constraints. They add that inclusion in education is recognized by creating a welcoming and positive school culture and not just by placing students in schools. Similarly, UNRWA (2013a) defines IE as a right-based approach to education that acknowledges and respects the diversity of all learners and responds to their learning, health, and psychosocial needs, regardless of abilities, disabilities, gender, psychosocial and health needs, and socio-economic status. A simple and clear conceptualization for IE is provided by UNESCO (2017); UNESCO (2017) defines inclusion as a process aimed at promoting students' learning by identifying and removing barriers, which impede their access, participation, and achievement. It is a process that seeks to include all students in the education system through increasing its

competence (UNESCO, 2017). Therefore, an international agreed-upon definition for IE is highly needed today for more clarity and less confusion in its implementation in practice.

Assessment of IE Provision for Students with SEND

Assessment of IE is a comprehensive process which should touch upon both academic and social aspects for students with SEND. It should also involve all related IE stakeholders, including mainly school staff, parents, students, government education officials, non-governmental organizations, and local community. The assessment of IE aligns with a framework based on inputs, processes, and outcomes, developed by Loreman et al. (2014) for measuring indicators of IE. First, the assessment of inputs comprises assessing adequacy and appropriateness of resources and physical infrastructure of schools for accommodating students with SEND. Hajal and Al Chibani (2021), Hussein (2019), and Al Boukhari (2017) found that schools in Lebanon and Palestine were unequipped for accommodating students with SEND. Conversely, according to Pletser (2016), the conditions, space, and resources at an international inclusive school, located in a major European capital city, were supportive to the positive climate of the school. Second, the assessment of processes encompasses addressing one of the following three aspects: (1) implementation of an IE policy, (2) implementation of school or teachers' practices, and (3) the presence of inclusive schools criteria. Regarding the assessment of implementation of an IE policy, Dianingtyas et al. (2018), Rokhmaniyah and Chamdani (2018), Widiastuti et al. (2017), Awad (2016), Rodriguez (2013), and Fares (2009) revealed unsatisfactory or poor implementation of IE policies or programs. Nonetheless, two studies by Mhanna (2018) and Al Attal (2016) investigating the implementation of the inclusive approach among UNRWA school principals and teachers, respectively, in Gaza governorates in Palestine showed that the implementation of the inclusive approach was good. As for assessing the implementation of school or teachers' practices, two studies by Taiwo (2015) and Alborno (2013) examining the inclusive practices of schools and teachers in Nigeria and the United Arab Emirates, respectively, reported that schools and teachers' practices with experience in IE were inclusive. In contrast, Kofi (2015) concluded that teachers' instructional practices at inclusive basic schools in the Winneba Township of Ghana were not inclusive. Concerning the assessment of inclusive schools criteria, Ghandour (2017), Syamsi (2014), and Callan (2013) revealed availability of criteria of inclusive schools in Lebanon, Indonesia, and Ireland, respectively. Finally, the assessment of outcomes includes assessing the quality of IE provision or the degree

of inclusion. Contrary to Ralić et al. (2020), Sánchez et al. (2019), McCall and McCall (2015), and Idol (2006) who showed good quality of IE provision or high degree of school inclusion, Engevik et al. (2018) and Al Shehhi (2016) found that moderate to poor IE provision was offered to students with SEND in Norway and the United Arab Emirates, respectively. Educational inclusion is not just offering equitable opportunities for learning to students with SEND. Rather, it also encompasses social dimensions by providing them ample opportunities for social belonging and participation, which both have received little attention from researchers in the research literature on IE, in general, and the assessment of IE, in specific. The study is guided by the following question:

To what extent are Palestine refugee students with SEND receiving an IE at an UNRWA lower elementary school and its mainstream classrooms in Lebanon?

Method

Research Context and Site

UNRWA (2020) operates 65 schools providing basic and secondary education for 37,586 Palestine refugee students in Lebanon for the 2020/2021 school year. Nevertheless, there is no updated estimation for students with SEND at UNRWA schools across the five fields of operation, including Lebanon. According to UNRWA (2016), out of 38,173 Palestine refugee students enrolled in UNRWA schools in Lebanon for the 2014/2015 school year, 1,503 students had disabilities. In their survey on the socioeconomic status of Palestine refugees in Lebanon 2015, Chaaban et al. (2016) report that 11% of Palestine refugees who are not enrolled in schools have functional disability. They add that 62% of Palestine refugee children with disabilities are enrolled in UNRWA schools; 8.9% are enrolled in special education programs; and 28.9% have no access to education.

The research site was an UNRWA lower elementary coeducational school, located inside a camp for PRL. The school provided basic education for 687 students in grades one through three for the 2017/2018 school year. Teachers informally identified 99 students out of the 687 as having SEND, using the 'Teacher's Toolkit for Identifying and Responding to Students' Diverse Needs' (UNRWA, 2013c). Special educational needs included learning needs, chronic health needs, and psychosocial needs, whereas disabilities included intellectual impairments, physical impairments, visual impairments, hearing impairments, and speech, language and

communication impairments. Two thirds of the school students' population were PRL, whereas one third were Palestine refugee students displaced from Syria (PRS) due to the Syrian conflict.

Research Design and Sample

The study employed quantitative approach. The researcher carried out questionnaire surveys and conducted structured classroom observations. Participants in questionnaire survey for teaching staff, including teachers and learning support teachers (LST), were 36 out of 36 and were purposefully recruited, as shown in table 1 below.

Table 1

Demographics of Participants in the Questionnaire Survey for Teaching Staff

#	Demographic Variable		N	%
1	Gender	Male	3	8
		Female	33	92
2	Age	25-30 years	13	36
		31-40 years	17	47
		41-50 years	2	6
		51-62 years	4	11
3	Functional Title	Teacher	20	56
		LST	16	44
4	Academic Qualification	Bachelor's	34	94
		High Graduate Diploma	1	3
		Master's	1	3
5	Experience	1-10 years	25	69
		11-20 years	7	20
		21-30 years	4	11

Participants in questionnaire survey for parents of students with SEND were 31 out of 99 and were conveniently recruited, as shown in table 2.

Table 2

Demographics of Participants in the Questionnaire Survey for Parents of Students with SEND

#	Demographic Variable		N	%
1	Gender	Female	31	100
2	Nationality	PRL	23	74
		PRS	8	26
3	Age	20-30 years	4	13
		31-40 years	10	32
		41-50 years	14	45
		51 years and above	3	10

Participants in questionnaire survey for students with SEND were recruited only from grade two and three, excluding students with intellectual impairments for their inability to make sound judgments. Participants were 64 out of 70 and were purposefully recruited, as shown in table 3.

Table 3

Demographics of Participants in the Questionnaire Survey for Students with SEND

#	Demographic Variable		N	%
1	Gender	Male	39	61
		Female	25	39
2	Grade	2	31	48
		3	33	52
3	Nationality	PRL	36	56
		PRS	28	44

Finally, participants in structured classroom observations were 11 teachers and were conveniently recruited, as shown in table 4.

Table 4

Demographics of Participants in Structured Classroom Observations

#	Demographic Variable		N	%
1	**Gender**	Male	3	27
		Female	8	73
2	**Grade They Teach**	1	5	46
		2	3	27
		3	3	27
3	**Subject They Teach**	Arabic	6	55
		English	3	27
		Mathematics	2	18

Research Instruments

The researcher used three parallel versions of self-completed questionnaires, developed by Alberta Education (2013) for teaching staff, parents of students with SEND, and their children in grades two and three. Participants were requested to rate the extent of IE provision for students with SEND. The five common dimensions across the three questionnaires were as follows: (1) establishing inclusive values and principles, (2) building inclusive learning environments, (3) providing support for success, (4) organizing learning and instruction, and (5) engaging with parents and the community.

Alberta Education's (2013) teaching staff questionnaire consisted of two sections: (1) demographic profile and (2) assessment of IE provision for students with SEND. The first section comprised five items, developed by the researcher to identify demographic background of participants: gender, age, functional title, academic qualification, and experience. The second section comprised 21 items rated on a *5-point Likert scale, with 1=to a very little extent; 2=to a little extent; 3=to a moderate extent; 4=to a large extent; and 5=to a very large extent.*

Alberta Education's (2013) parents questionnaire consisted of two sections: (1) demographic profile and (2) assessment of IE provision for students with SEND. The first section comprised three items, developed by the researcher to identify demographic background

of participants: gender, nationality, and age. The second section comprised 19 items rated on a *5-point Likert scale, with 1=to a very little extent; 2=to a little extent; 3=to a moderate extent; 4=to a large extent; and 5=to a very large extent.*

Alberta Education's (2013) students' questionnaire consisted of two sections: (1) demographic profile and (2) assessment of IE provision for students with SEND. The first section comprised three items, developed by the researcher to identify demographic background of participants: gender, grade, and nationality. The second section comprised 15 items rated on a *3-point Likert scale, with 1=to a little extent; 2=to a moderate extent; and 3=to a large extent.*

The revised Classroom Observation Scale (COS), developed by Jordan and McGhie-Richmond (2014), was used in structured classroom observations. It consisted of two sections: (1) demographic and class profile, and (2) measurement of frequency of inclusive teaching practices. The first section comprised five items, developed by the researcher: gender, grade, subject, class size and the distribution of students by gender, and number of students with SEND. The second section comprised 36 items divided into four dimensions: (1) classroom management, (2) time management, (3) lesson presentation, and (4) adaptive instruction. Frequency of participants' inclusive teaching practices was measured on a *3-point Likert scale, with 1=not in evidence; 2=inconsistent (exhibited once by teacher); and 3=consistent (exhibited twice or more by teacher).*

Validity and Reliability of the Research Instruments

A pilot study was conducted by the researcher at an UNRWA elementary girls school, located inside a different camp for PRL but within the same area of the research site to ensure validity and reliability of research instruments. Concurrent validity of the research instruments was assessed by determining Spearman's correlation coefficients as validity coefficients between scores of participants in pilot study on these instruments and their scores on criterion instruments. Criterion instruments were the following: Teacher Perceptions of Inclusion in Rural Canada (TPIRC) scale (McGhie-Richmond et al., 2009), Parent Perceptions of Inclusion in Rural Canada (PPIRC) scale (Loreman et al., 2009), Student Perceptions of Inclusion in Rural Canada (SPIRC) scale (Loreman et al., 2008), and Effective Teaching Practices Checklist (ETPC) in inclusive classrooms (Kuyini & Desai, 2008). The research instruments and criterion instruments were all translated from English into Arabic by a professional translator with good educational background since the mother tongue of the research population was Arabic. Internal consistency

reliability of the instruments was estimated by calculating Cronbach's alpha. Table 5 displays validity and reliability coefficients for the research instruments.

Table 5

Validity and Reliability Coefficients of the Research Instruments

#	Instrument	Criterion	Spearman's Correlation Coefficients (Validity Coefficients)	N	*P*-Value	Cronbach's Alpha (Reliability Coefficients)
1	Alberta Education's Teaching Staff Questionnaire	TPIRC	.459	20	.042	.883
2	Alberta Education's Parents Questionnaire	PPIRC	.477	22	.025	.851
3	Alberta Education's Students Questionnaire	SPIRC	.428	22	.047	.840
4	Revised COS	ETPC	.587	12	.045	.874

Table 5 shows that there are high to very high positive correlations between the research instruments and the criterion instruments which are all statistically significant ($p<.05$). The above correlation coefficients are interpreted in accordance with Drummond et al.'s (2016) interpretation guidelines of magnitude of correlation coefficients as validity coefficients. According to Drummond et al. (2016), a correlation less than .20 is low and unacceptable; a correlation between .21 and .40 is moderate or acceptable; a correlation between .41 and .49 is a high correlation; and a correlation greater than .50 is a very high correlation. Thus, the research instruments have high validity. Table 5 also shows that the research instruments have good reliability since all Cronbach's alpha coefficients are above .80 (George & Mallery, 2020).

Data Collection Procedures

After obtaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from the Doctoral School of Literature, Humanities, and Social Sciences at the Lebanese University, the researcher obtained permission from Chief of Education Program at UNRWA in Lebanon for conducting the study at UNRWA schools. Questionnaires, along with informed consents, were administered to teaching staff and parents and were completed by them at the school. The Questionnaire for grade two and

three students with SEND was administered to them at the school library, with logistic assistance from the school clerk after obtaining their parents' consent. The researcher explained each item of the questionnaire, along with the Likert scale, to students in a simple language. Finally, as for structured classroom observations, each teacher was continuously observed over two consecutive teaching sessions of 50 minutes each. Data collection lasted for five months and a half, from 12 December 2017 to 26 April 2018.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20. Frequencies and percentages were used for describing demographics of participants. Descriptive statistics (*Mean and SD*) were used for answering the research question.

Results

RQ: To what extent are students with SEND receiving an IE at an UNRWA lower elementary school and its mainstream classrooms in Lebanon?

Table 6 shows mean score and *SD* for each item of Alberta Education's teaching staff questionnaire, each dimension as a whole, and all dimensions combined.

Table 6

Mean and SD of Teaching Staff's Responses to Alberta Education's Teaching Staff Questionnaire

Dimension	#	Item	N	Mean	SD	Overall Mean	Overall SD
Establishing Inclusive Values and Principles	1	Share a commitment with families and students to create inclusive learning experiences.	36	4.22	.59	3.72	.57
	2	Take responsibility for the success of all students in our school.	36	3.11	1.09		
	3	Have high expectations for all our students.	36	3.19	1.03		
	4	Take action to counter all forms of racism and discrimination.	36	4.39	.64		

Building Inclusive Learning Environments	5	Welcome and take responsibility for all students from the neighbourhood/local area.	36	3.72	1.11	3.87	.54
	6	Believe that families and students have a sense of belonging to the school community.	36	3.56	.77		
	7	Treat our students respectfully and our students treat us respectfully.	36	4.22	.42		
	8	Ensure that students support each other.	36	3.64	.89		
	9	Believe that the school building is physically accessible to all people.	36	4.25	.84		
Providing Support for Success	10	Use differentiated instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students.	36	4.19	.52	3.91	.41
	11	Use ongoing assessments to identify where students need additional supports, interventions and services.	36	4.14	.42		
	12	Have access to consultation and support from specialists that will help us meet the diverse needs of all students.	36	4.00	.63		
	13	Use assistive technologies, including communication devices, to support individual students.	36	3.17	1.05		
	14	Ensure supports and interventions are in place to reduce problem behaviours, including bullying.	36	4.06	.79		
Organizing Learning and Instruction	15	Design learning experiences to tap into the strengths and interests of all students.	36	4.22	.42	4.20	.37
	16	Provide explicit strategy instruction so that students develop a repertoire of learning strategies.	36	4.22	.48		
	17	Provide students with opportunities to interact with a variety of peers and benefit from multiple perspectives.	36	4.14	.48		
	18	Provide students with multiple ways to demonstrate their learning and growth.	36	4.25	.60		
Engaging with Parents and the Community	19	Value and encourage parent engagement in the school.	36	4.39	.49	4.21	.54
	20	Collaborate with parents to support student success.	36	4.36	.63		

21	Provide meaningful opportunities for community involvement in the school.	36	3.89	.82
	All Dimensions		3.96	.36

The dimension 'engaging with parents and the community' received the highest rating (Mean=4.21, *SD* = .54), followed by 'organizing learning and instruction' dimension (Mean=4.20, SD=.37), 'providing support for success' dimension (Mean=3.91, *SD* =.41), 'building inclusive learning environments' dimension (Mean = 3.87, *SD* = .54), and 'establishing inclusive values and principles' dimension (Mean=3.72, *SD* =.57). The overall mean score for the five dimensions combined is 3.96, with a *SD* of .36.

To interpret the mean scores for the five dimensions and the overall mean score, the 5-point Likert scale on the extent of IE provision was corrected, according to Algahtany et al. (2011), which resulted in a new scale with equal intervals, as shown in table 7.

Table 7

Correction of the 5-point Likert Scale of the Teaching Staff Questionnaire

#	Interval	Point on Scale
1	1.00-1.80	To a very little extent
2	1.81-2.60	To a little extent
3	2.61-3.40	To a moderate extent
4	3.41-4.20	To a large extent
5	4.21-5.00	To a very large extent

As the overall mean score of the teaching staff's responses is 3.96 (*SD* = .36), which falls within the fourth interval (3.41-4.20), this indicates that students with SEND receive an IE to a large extent. Nevertheless, item 13 (Use assistive technologies, including communication devices, to support individual students.) yielded the second lowest mean (3.17). This mean score falls within the third interval (2.61-3.40) and indicates moderate use of assistive technologies (AT) by teachers for supporting individual students.

Table 8 shows mean score and *SD* for each item of Alberta Education's parents' questionnaire, each dimension as a whole, and all dimensions combined.

Table 8

Mean and SD of Parents' Responses to Alberta Education's Parents Questionnaire

Dimension	#	Item	N	Mean	SD	Overall Mean	Overall SD
Establishing Inclusive Values and Principles	1	Everyone works together to make sure all students feel included.	31	4.35	.98		
	2	Staff care about the success of all students.	31	4.06	1.31		
	3	Teachers have high expectations for all students.	31	4.16	.93	4.14	.79
	4	Staff take action to counter all forms of racism and discrimination.	31	4.00	1.50		
Building Inclusive Learning Environments	5	All students from the neighbourhood are welcome.	31	4.71	.52		
	6	Families feel like they belong to the school community.	31	4.71	.52		
	7	Staff and student interactions are respectful.	31	4.48	.92	4.32	.49
	8	Students support each other.	31	3.48	1.43		
	9	The building is physically accessible to everyone.	31	4.26	1.26		
Providing Support for Success	10	Teachers use differentiated instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students.	31	4.26	1.12		
	11	Assistive technologies are available to help students who need them.	31	2.45	1.54	3.54	.99
	12	There are supports in place to reduce problem behaviors.	31	3.94	1.23		
Organizing Learning and Instruction	13	Learning experiences tap into the strengths and interests of all students.	31	4.03	1.11	3.95	.79
	14	Students develop strategies to help them learn.	31	3.77	1.30		

	15	Students get to work with different groups of their peers and learn from their ideas.	31	3.65	1.27		
	16	Students can show their learning and growth in multiple ways.	31	4.35	.95		
Engaging with Parents and the Community	17	Parent involvement is encouraged and valued by staff.	31	4.58	.72		
	18	Parents and staff work together to support student success.	31	4.77	.49	4.69	.47
	19	The community is involved.	31	4.74	.44		
All Dimensions						4.13	.46

The dimension 'engaging with parents and the community' received the highest rating (Mean = 4.69, *SD*=.47), followed by 'building inclusive learning environments' dimension (Mean = 4.32, *SD* =.49), 'establishing inclusive values and principles' dimension (Mean=4.14, *SD*=.79), 'organizing learning and instruction' dimension (Mean=3.95, *SD*=.79), and 'providing support for success' dimension (Mean=3.54, *SD* =.99). The overall mean score for the five dimensions combined is 4.13, with a *SD* of .46.

To interpret the mean scores for the five dimensions and the overall mean score, the 5-point Likert scale on the extent of IE provision was corrected, according to Algahtany et al. (2011), which resulted in a new scale with equal intervals, as shown in table 7 above.

As the overall mean score of the parents' responses is 4.13 (*SD*=.46), which falls within the fourth interval (3.41-4.20), this indicates that students with SEND receive an IE to a large extent. Nonetheless, item 11 (Assistive technologies are available to help students who need them) yielded the lowest mean (2.45). This mean score falls within the second interval (1.81-2.60) and indicates poor availability of AT for supporting individual students.

Table 9 shows mean score and *SD* for each item of Alberta Education's students' questionnaire, each dimension as a whole, and all dimensions combined.

Table 9

Mean and SD of Students' Responses to Alberta Education's Students Questionnaire

Dimension	#	Item	N	Mean	SD	Overall Mean	Overall SD
Establishing Inclusive	1	All teachers want me to do well.	64	2.92	.32	2.82	.29
	2	Teachers expect me to always try my best.	64	2.80	.44		

Values and Principles	3	Teachers treat all students equally.	64	2.77	.52		
Building Inclusive Learning Environments	4	I feel like I am part of school.	64	2.86	.50		
	5	Teachers and students treat each other respectfully.	64	2.77	.46	2.81	.33
	6	Students support each other.	64	2.83	.42		
Providing Support for Success	7	Teachers make sure they teach all students.	64	2.95	.21		
	8	I get to use computers and tablets to help me learn.	64	1.08	.27	2.30	.14
	9	Teachers try to help students who have problems.	64	2.89	.36		
Organizing Learning and Instruction	10	The activities we do in class are interesting.	64	2.80	.54		
	11	Teachers teach me different ways to do my work.	64	2.80	.47	2.76	.35
	12	I get to work with lots of other students.	64	2.69	.53		
Engaging with Parents and the Community	13	My parents come to school.	64	2.41	.58		
	14	My parents and teachers work together to help me succeed.	64	2.80	.44	2.57	.35
	15	People from the camp/community come to school.	64	2.52	.50		
All Dimensions						2.65	.19

The dimension 'establishing inclusive values and principles' dimension received the highest rating (Mean=2.82, *SD* =.29), followed by 'building inclusive learning environments' dimension (Mean=2.81, *SD* =.33), 'organizing learning and instruction' dimension (Mean = 2.76, *SD* =.35), 'engaging with parents and the community' dimension (Mean=2.57, *SD*=.35), and 'providing support for success' dimension (Mean = 2.30, *SD* =.14). The overall mean score for the five dimensions combined is 2.65, with a *SD* of .19.

To interpret the mean scores for the five dimensions and the overall mean score, the 3-point Likert scale on extent of IE provision was corrected, according to Algahtany et al. (2011), which resulted in a new scale with equal intervals, as shown in table 10.

Table 10

Correction of the 3-point Likert Scale of Students Questionnaire

#	Interval	Point on Scale
1	1.00-1.66	To a little extent
2	1.67-2.33	To a moderate extent
3	2.34-3.00	To a large extent

As the overall mean score of the students' responses is 2.65 (*SD*=.19), which falls within the third interval (2.34-3.00), this indicates that students with SEND receive an IE to a large extent. However, item 8 (I get to use computers and tablets to help me learn) yielded the lowest mean (1.08). This item is pertinent to the indicator of using AT for supporting individual students. This mean score indicates unavailability of AT for supporting individual students.

Table 11 displays mean and *SD* for teachers' scores on each item of the revised COS, each dimension as a whole, and all dimensions combined.

Table 11

Mean and SD of Teachers' Scores on the Revised COS

Dimension	#	Inclusive Teaching Practices	N	Mean	SD	Overall Mean	Overall SD
Classroom Management	1	Arranges physical space to maintain minimally disruptive traffic patterns and procedures.	11	3.00	.00	2.75	.11
	2	Rules and procedures exist for non-instructional events.	11	3.00	.00		
	3	Consequences rule noncompliance quickly.	11	3.00	.00		
	4	Positions self in room to provide high degree of visibility.	11	3.00	.00		
	5	Scans class frequently.	11	3.00	.00		
	6	Uses nonverbal signals whenever possible to direct students in a non-disruptive manner when teaching other groups of students.	11	1.36	.67		
	7	Administers praise contingently using specific praise statements.	11	2.91	.30		
Time Management	8	Allocates generous amounts of time for instruction.	11	3.00	.00	2.68	.10
	9	States expectations for seatwork and transitions in advance.	11	2.00	.00		

	10	Establishes clear lesson routines that signal a beginning and end.	11	2.00	.00		
	11	In large group expository portions, gains students' attention at the beginning of the lesson and maintains attention during instruction at 90% level.	11	2.91	.30		
	12	Monitors transition by scanning and circulating among students.	11	2.91	.30		
	13	Maintains students' attention during seatwork at 86% or higher.	11	3.00	.00		
	14	Circulates frequently during seatwork to assist students and to monitor progress.	11	2.82	.40		
	15	Provides active forms of seatwork practice clearly related to academic goals.	11	2.82	.40		

I. Opening the Lesson:						
	16	Provides review of previous day's concepts at beginning of lesson.	11	2.82	.60		
	17	Provides a clear overview of the lesson.	11	2.45	.82		
II. Closing the Lesson:						
Lesson Presentation	18	Provides error drill on missed concepts or review of difficult concepts during and at the end of each lesson.	11	1.36	.80	1.60	.23
	19	Gives summary of the lesson content integrating lesson content with content of other lessons or experiences.	11	1.00	.00		
	20	Summarizes the lesson accomplishments of individuals and group.	11	1.00	.00		
	21	Forecasts upcoming lesson content.	11	1.00	.00		

I. Large Group & Whole Class Instruction- Scaffolding						
Adaptive Instruction	22	Actively models and demonstrates new concepts, learning strategies, and procedures related to effective problem solving in the content area.	11	1.91	.83	2.06	.12
II. Small Group & Individual Instruction- Calibrating Instruction to Individual Learners						
	23	Maintains high accurate responding rate (70-90%) in teacher-led activities.	11	2.91	.30		

24	Provides frequent questions to evaluate students' mastery of lesson concepts.	11	2.18	.75
25	Evaluates students' understanding of seatwork tasks and cognitive processes.	11	1.55	.52
III.	**Predominant Teaching Style (During Seatwork & Group Work)**			
26	Teacher & students overall	11	2.27	.46
27	Teacher & student with disability	11	2.09	.30
28	Teacher & student at-risk (Learning Difficulties)	11	2.36	.50
29	Teacher & typically achieving student	11	2.00	.00
IV.	**Classroom Tone**			
30	Delivers differentiated curriculum to the students with disabilities and SEN.	11	1.27	.64
31	Calls included students on to answer questions in teacher-led activities.	11	2.73	.64
32	Utilizes assistive technology to mediate student learning for those experiencing difficulty.	11	1.00	.00
33	Arranges seating of included students in the classroom effectively.	11	2.73	.46
34	Includes students with disabilities regularly in classroom routines procedures.	11	1.00	.00
35	Models for other students' acceptance and warmth with students with disabilities and SEN.	11	2.91	.30
36	Provides verbal reminders to students about how to treat each other.	11	2.09	.70
All Dimensions			2.27	.11

The dimension 'classroom management' dimension received the highest rating (Mean = 2.75, *SD* =.11), followed by 'time management' dimension (Mean = 2.68, *SD* =.10), 'adaptive instruction' dimension (Mean = 2.06, *SD* =.12), and 'lesson presentation' dimension (Mean = 1.60, *SD* =.23). The overall mean score for the four dimensions combined is 2.27, with a *SD* of .11.

To interpret the mean scores for the four dimensions and the overall mean score, the 3-point Likert scale on frequency of inclusive teaching practices was corrected, according to Algahtany et al. (2011), generating a new scale with equal intervals, as shown in table 12.

Table 12

Correction of the 3-point Likert Scale of the Revised COS

#	Interval	Point on Scale
1	1.00-1.66	Not in evidence
2	1.67-2.33	Inconsistent
3	2.34-3.00	Consistent

As the overall mean of teachers' scores is 2.27 (*SD*=.11), which falls within the second interval (1.67-2.33), this indicates that teachers' implementation of inclusive teaching practices is inconsistent, i.e., they exhibit inclusive teaching practices once. In addition, the four items (18-21) belonging to the sub-dimension 'closing the lesson' under the dimension 'lesson presentation' yielded mean scores ranging between 1.00 and 1.36, which all fall within the first interval (1.00-1.66); this indicates that teachers do not close the lessons. Furthermore, item 30 (Delivers differentiated curriculum to the students with disabilities and SEN) yielded a mean score of 1.27, which falls within the first interval (1.00-1.66); this means that teachers do not deliver differentiated curriculum to students with SEND. Moreover, item 32 (Utilizes assistive technology to mediate student learning for those experiencing difficulty) yielded the lowest mean score (1.00). This mean score indicates that teachers do not use AT for supporting students with SEND, particularly students with learning difficulties. Finally, item 34 (Includes students with disabilities regularly in classroom routines procedures) also yielded the lowest mean (1.00), which falls within the first interval (1.00-1.66); this indicates that teachers do not include students with SEND regularly in classroom routines procedures.

In general, students with SEND receive an IE to a large extent, yet teachers' inclusive teaching practices are inconsistent, in addition to poor availability of AT and exclusion of students with SEND from classroom routines procedures.

Discussion

This study aimed to assess IE provision for Palestine refugee students with SEND at an UNRWA lower elementary school in Lebanon that has implemented UNRWA's (2013a) IE policy. It employed quantitative approach and adopted descriptive design. The researcher carried out questionnaire surveys and conducted structured classroom observations. The results revealed that students with SEND receive an IE to a large extent, yet teachers' inclusive teaching practices

are inconsistent, in addition to poor availability of AT for supporting students with SEND. They also showed that teachers do not close the lessons; do not deliver differentiated curriculum to students with SEND; and do not include them regularly in classroom routines procedures.

The large extent of IE provision for students with SEND is supported by high mean scores for each of the five common dimensions across the results of the questionnaire surveys for the teaching staff, parents of students with SEND, and their children in grades two and three. It is consistent with previous studies (Al Attal, 2016; Alborno, 2013; Callan, 2013; Ghandour, 2017; Idol, 2006; McCall & McCall, 2015; Mhanna, 2018; Ralić et al., 2020; Sánchez et al., 2019; Syamsi, 2014; Taiwo, 2015); these studies found good implementation and manifestation of IE practices and experiences in schools, as well. The large extent of IE provision for students with SEND is, however, inconsistent with past studies (Al Shehhi, 2016; Awad, 2016; Dianingtyas et al., 2018; Engevik et al., 2018; Fares, 2009; Kofi, 2015; Rodriguez, 2013; Rokhmaniyah & Chamdani, 2018; Widiastuti et al., 2017); these studies showed poor implementation and manifestation of IE practices and experiences in schools, as well. The large extent of IE provision for students with SEND may be attributed to the following reasons: professional commitment of the teaching staff at the school to the implementation of the IE policy; ongoing monitoring and follow-up on the teaching staff's implementation of IE by the school management; availability of support cadres at the school, such as LST, psychosocial support school counselor, and health tutor; and constant coordination and collaboration among the school staff, especially between teachers and LST, to meet students' needs.

However, the inconsistent implementation of teachers' inclusive teaching practices is reflected in low mean scores for the instructional dimensions of teachers' inclusive practices, namely 'lesson presentation' and 'adaptive instruction', on the revised COS (Jordan & McGhie-Richmond, 2014). It is in accordance with a study by Mooney and Lashewicz (2015) which found inconsistencies in educator IE beliefs and practices for a student with severe disability in Alberta, Canada. The inconsistent implementation of teachers' inclusive teaching practices may be attributed to the heavy teaching load, where teachers at the elementary cycle had to teach 27 periods per week, in addition to carrying out non-teaching duties. It may also be explained by the busy educational agenda of teachers since they were required to integrate and embed many initiatives and programs of the ERS into their daily classroom practices. Another possible explanation could be the large class sizes of 45-50 students each. It may additionally be justified

by the large number of students with SEND identified at the school and the diversity of their SEND. Finally, it could be due to the teachers' busyness with managing and handling students' behavioral problems, especially those with intellectual impairments and psychosocial needs.

The poor availability of AT is evident in low mean scores across the results of the questionnaire surveys and the structured classroom observations for the item pertaining to the availability of AT for supporting individual students. It ties well with previous studies (Al Boukhari, 2017; El Ahmad & Kawtharani, 2022; Hajal & Al Chibani, 2021; Hussein, 2019); these studies revealed that schools were unequipped for accommodating students with SEND and meeting their individual needs. Nonetheless, it contradicts the findings of a study by Pletser (2016) which reported good availability of resources. The poor availability of AT could be due to lack of funding at UNRWA. Another possible explanation may be poor coordination among Education Department, Health Department, and Relief and Social Services Department at UNRWA for providing AT for students with SEND. It could also be interpreted as a result of UNRWA's reliance on local community institutions for providing some AT for those students in line with their external partnerships with these institutions, along with lateness or failure of these institutions to provide them for those students.

The non-closure of lessons by teachers is supported by low mean score for the sub-dimension 'closing the lesson' under the dimension 'lesson presentation' on the revised COS (Jordan & McGhie-Richmond, 2014). It may be attributed to their busy educational agenda since they were required to integrate and embed many initiatives and programs of the ERS into their daily classroom practices. It could additionally be justified by the big curriculum of the school.

The non-delivery of differentiated curriculum to students with SEND is reflected in low mean score for item 30 on the revised COS (Jordan & McGhie-Richmond, 2014) which pertains to the delivery of differentiated curriculum. It is in line with past studies (Pozas et al., 2019; Siam & Al-Natour, 2016; Suprayogi et al., 2017); these studies revealed poor and occasional implementation of differentiated instruction. The non-delivery of differentiated curriculum to students with SEND may be due to the large class sizes of 45-50 students each. It may also be explained by the large number of students with SEND identified at the school and the diversity of their SEND.

Finally, the exclusion of students with SEND regularly from classroom routines procedures is evident in low mean score for item 34 on the revised COS (Jordan & McGhie-

Richmond, 2014) which pertains to their inclusion regularly in classroom routines procedures. It could be attributed to teachers' fear of losing control over their classrooms. Another possible explanation may be teachers' focus on academic aspects of inclusion over its social aspects.

Recommendations

The researcher provides the following recommendations for policymakers and practitioners at UNRWA for better implementation of the IE policy and high-quality IE provision for students with SEND at the school.

For Policymakers:

- Raising teachers' awareness on the instructional importance of closing lessons and supporting them on this issue, where needed
- Providing the school with adequate AT to help the teachers cater for the needs of students with SEND, particularly those with learning difficulties

For Practitioners:

- Delivering differentiated curriculum to students with SEND to meet their learning needs
- Including students with SEND regularly in classroom routines procedures to promote their social belonging and inclusion

Limitations of the Study

There are three limitations concerning the results of this study. First, students with SEND were not formally assessed. Rather, they were informally discovered and identified by their teachers which might have affected the accuracy of diagnosis and identification. Second, the mother tongue of the research population was Arabic. As a result, all informed consents and questionnaires were translated from English into Arabic for effective utilization in using the mother tongue to understand the questionnaires. Third, the response rate of parents of students with SEND in responding to the survey during data collection was low (31%) although the researcher addressed them twice to invite them to participate in the survey. Finally, and most important of all, as the research site was only one purposefully-selected UNRWA lower elementary school, the results cannot be generalized to all UNRWA schools in Lebanon.

Suggestions for Future Research

In terms of future research, it would be useful to extend the current results by assessing IE provision for students with SEND at other lower elementary schools and upper elementary schools (grade four to six), as well; UNRWA does not operate learning support program and

does not appoint LST in the upper elementary grades. The researcher also suggests including students without SEND, their parents, and representatives of local community in future research; they are key IE stakeholders, and their role is important for successful and sustainable implementation of the IE policy, as well.

Conclusion

While UNRWA developed and mainstreamed its IE policy across its five fields of operation, this policy is still being weakly and inconsistently implemented across Lebanon. By assessing IE provision for students with SEND at an UNRWA lower elementary school in Lebanon, this study established that an IE to a large extent has been provided for those students. However, teachers' implementation of inclusive teaching practices is inconsistent, in addition to poor availability of AT and exclusion of students with SEND from classroom routines procedures at the school. The large extent of IE provision for students with SEND at the school

References

Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2008). Making education for all inclusive: Where next? *Prospects*, *38*(1), 15-34.

Al Attal, M. (2016). *Darajat momarasat moaallimee madaris wakalit el ghawth el dawliyya bi mohafathat Ghaza lil manha el jamih lel taaleem wa el taaallom wa sobol tatweeriha* [The degree of practicing inclusive education approach by teachers at UNRWA schools in the governorates of Gaza and ways to develop it] [Master's thesis, The Islamic University of Gaza]. Central Library. https://library.iugaza.edu.ps/thesis/119035.pdf

Al Boukhari, R. S. (2017). *Towards rehabilitation tools for the Lebanese public schools in respect to the visually impaired students' needs: The case of Beirut governorate* [Master's thesis, Beirut Arab University]. BAU Digital Repository (DSpace). http://repository.bau.edu.lb:8080/xmlui/handle/1080/8813

Al Shehhi, K. (2016). *Implementing the inclusive education policy in three RAK primary government schools: An investigation study* [Master's thesis, The British University in Dubai]. The British University in Dubai (BUiD) Digital Repository- BSpace. http://bspace.buid.ac.ae/handle/1234/860

Alberta Education. (2013). *Indicators of inclusive schools: Continuing the conversation*. https://education.alberta.ca/media/482253/indicators_of_inclusive_schools.pdf

Alborno, E. (2013). *The journey into inclusive education: A case study of three Emirati government primary schools* [Doctoral dissertation, The British University in Dubai]. The British University in Dubai (BUiD) Digital Repository- BSpace. http://bspace.buid.ac.ae/handle/1234/512

Algahtany, S., Almethheb, A., & Alomar, B. (2011). *Research methods of behavior science with SPSS applications*. Alobecan Library.

Alkhateeb, J., Hadidi, M., & Alkhateeb, A. (2016). Inclusion of children with developmental disabilities in Arab countries: A review of the research literature from 1990 to 2014. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 49-50*(1), 60-75.

Awad, N. (2016). *Students with disability and the quest for inclusive education: A case study of private schools in Greater Cairo* [Master's thesis, The American University in Cairo]. Digital Archive and Research Repository. http://dar.aucegypt.edu/handle/10526/4837

Barnard-Brak, L, Wei, T., Schmidt, M, & Sheffield, R. (2014). Inclusivity in the classroom and international achievement in mathematics and science: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 23*(2), 116-132.

Braunsteiner, M-L., & Mariano-Lapidus, S. (2014). A perspective on inclusion: Challenges for the future. *Global Education Review, 1*(1). 32-43. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1055217.pdf

Callan, L. (2013). *A case study examining the inclusion of children with special educational needs in a mainstream primary school* [Master's thesis, Trinity College]. Lenus. http://www.lenus.ie/hse/handle/10147/316207

Chaaban, J., Salti, N., Ghattas, H., Irani, A., Ismail, T., & Batlouni, L. (2016). *Survey on the socioeconomic status of Palestine refugees in Lebanon 2015*. Report published by the American University of Beirut (AUB) and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

Dianingtyas, C., Supena, A., & Bintoroi, T. (2018). The evaluation of inclusive education implementation for students with intellectual disability in Victory Plus Primary School. *European Journal of Education Studies, 4*(12), 231-244. https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1400148

Dovigo, F. (Ed.). (2017). Introduction. In F. Dovigo (Ed.), *Special educational needs and inclusive practices: An international perspective* (Vol. 33, pp. vii-xiii). Sense Publishers.

Drummond, R. J., Sheperis, C. J., & Jones, K. D. (2016). *Assessment procedures for counselors and helping professionals,* (8th ed.). Pearson.

El Ahmad, A. H., & Kawtharani, A. M. (2022). Inclusive education at UNRWA in Lebanon: A case study of a lower elementary school. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies, 9*(1), 18-52. https://ijsses.tiu.edu.iq/index.php/volume-9-issue-1-article-2/

Engevik, L. I., Næss, K-A. B., & Berntsen, L. (2018). Quality of inclusion and related predictors: Teachers' reports of educational provisions offered to students with Down syndrome. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 62*(1), 34-51. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2016.1212252

Fares, L. (2009). *Elements of social justice and perceptions of their influence on student learning: A case study* [Master's thesis, Lebanese American University]. Lebanese American University Repository (LAUR). https://doi.org/10.26756/th.2009.22

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2020). *IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference,* (16th ed.). Routledge.

Ghandour, A. (2017). *Inclusion of students with learning difficulties in a mainstream primary school: A case study* [Master's thesis, Lebanese American University]. Lebanese American University Repository (LAUR). https://doi.org/10.26756/th.2017.1

Grima-Farrell, C. (2017). *What matters in a research to practice cycle? Teachers as researchers.* Springer.

Hajal, P., & Al Chibani, W. (2021). Criteria for resources facilities for inclusive school to meet the needs of students with special needs in Lebanon. *International Journal of Social Sciences, 10*(3), 215-223. https://ndpublisher.in/admin/issues/IJSSv10n3c.pdf

Hussein, S. (2019). *Wakih tatbeek manha el taaleem el jamih fee madaris wakalit el ghawth fee Filasteen fee dawaa el namothaj el mantikee* [Current application of the inclusive education approach being implemented in UNRWA schools in Palestine in light of the logical model] [Master's thesis, Birzeit University]. Yusuf Ahmed Alghanim Library. http://library.birzeit.edu/librarya/bzu-ths/show_ths_category2.php?catid=23&src=0&catnameالتربية=

Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education: A program evaluation of eight schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 27*(2), 77-94.

Jordan, A., & McGhie-Richmond, D. (2014). Identifying effective teaching practices in inclusive classrooms. In C. Forlin, & T. Loreman (Eds.), *Measuring inclusive education: International perspectives on inclusive education* (Vol. 3, pp. 133-162). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kofi, D. K. (2015). *Evaluation of inclusive education practices in selected pilot inclusive basic schools in the Winneba Township* [Master's thesis, University of Education, Winneba]. Institutional Repository. http://ir.uew.edu.gh/handle/123456789/1631

Kuroda, K., Kartika, D., & Kitamura, Y. (2017). *Implications for teacher training and support for inclusive education in Cambodia: An empirical case study in a developing country.*

Working paper No. 148. JICA Research Institute. https://www.jica.go.jp/jica-ri/publication/workingpaper/l75nbg000006u18l-att/JICA-RI_WP_No.148.pdf

Kuyini, A. B., & Desai, I. (2008). Providing instruction to students with special needs in inclusive classrooms in Ghana: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, *4*(1), 22-39. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ834291.pdf

Loreman, T., Forlin, C., & Sharma, U. (2014). Measuring indicators of inclusive education: A systematic review of the literature. In C. Forlin, & T. Loreman (Eds.), *Measuring inclusive education: International perspectives on inclusive education* (Vol. 3, pp. 165-187). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Loreman, T., Lupart, J., McGhie-Richmond, D., & Barber, J. (2008). The development of a Canadian instrument for measuring student views of their inclusive school environment in a rural context: The student perceptions of inclusion in rural Canada (SPIRC) scale. *International Journal of Special Education*, *23*(3), 78-89. http://www.internationalsped.com/documents/Loreman%20et%20al%20student%20scale%20development.doc

Loreman, T., McGhie-Richmond, D., Barber, J., & Lupart, J. (2009). Parent perspectives on inclusive education in rural Alberta, Canada. *Exceptionality Education International*, *19*(2), 21-36. http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/eei/vol19/iss2/3

McCall, S., & McCall, J. (2015). *Strategic evaluation Zambia inclusive education program (ZIEP)*. McCall Education Consultancy Ltd. https://www.sightsavers.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/34020_ZIEP_2015_Final_Evaluation_Report.pdf

McGhie-Richmond, D., Barber, J., Lupart, J., & Loreman, T. (2009). The development of a Canadian instrument for measuring teacher views of their inclusive school environment in a rural context: The teacher perceptions of inclusion in rural Canada (TPIRC) scale. *International Journal of Special Education, 24*(2), 103-108. http://www.internationalsped.com/documents/2009%20No2%20McGhie%20Cannadian%20Instrument%2012.doc

Mhanna, T. (2018). *Tawtheef istrateejiyyat el taaleem el jamih lada modeeree madaris wakalit el ghawth el dawliyya bimohafathat Ghaza wa aalakatoho bi rafaa mostawa el kafaaa el mihaniyya lil moaallimeen* [Employing inclusive education strategy among UNRWA school principals in Gaza governorates and its relation with raising teachers'

professionalism level] [Master's thesis, The Islamic University of Gaza]. Central Library. https://library.iugaza.edu.ps/thesis/124272.pdf

Mooney, L. R., & Lashewicz, B. (2015). For the love of the child: Bestowing value amidst inconsistent inclusive education beliefs and practices for one Student with severe disabilities. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne de l'éducation*, *38*(4), 1-28. http://www.jstor.org/stable/canajeducrevucan.38.4.09

Norwich, B. (2014). How does the capability approach address current issues in special educational needs, disability and inclusive education field? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 14*(1), 16-21.

Parekh, G. (2013). *A Case for inclusive education* (Report No. 12/13-9). Toronto District School Board.
http://www.tdsb.on.ca/Portals/0/AboutUs/Research/ACaseforInclusiveEducation.pdf

Percey, R., & Mazurkiewicz, G. (2013). Leadership for inclusion: An overview. In G. Mac Ruairc, E. Otteson, & R. Percey (Eds.), *Leadership for inclusive education: Values, visions, and voices*, *studies in inclusive education* (Vol. 18, pp. 105-119). Sense Publishers.

Pletser, J. (2016). *Removing barriers to learning, enabling international schools to respond to diverse needs: Identifying the climate and conditions* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Bath]. Student Theses. http://opus.bath.ac.uk/50312/

Pozas, M., Letzel, V., & Schneider, C. (2019). Teachers and differentiated instruction: Exploring differentiation practices to address student diversity. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 20*(3), 217-230. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12481

Ralić, A. Z., Cvitković, D., Żyta, A., & Ćwirynkało, K. (2020). The quality of inclusive education from the perspective of teachers in Poland and Croatia. *Croatian Review of Rehabilitation Research, 56*(2), 105-120. https://doi.org/10.31299/hrri.56.2.6

Rodriguez, J. (2013*). An examination of inclusive education in schools operated by the Jordanian field of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida]. Showcase of Text, Archives, Research, & Scholarship- STARS. http://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/2684/

Rokhmaniyah, R., & Chamdani, C. (2018). Evaluation of implementation of inclusive education at primary school. In K. B. Sangka, I. Widiastuti, P. N. Y. Indriyanti, N. M. Nordin, R. Mustapha, S. A. Hung, & K. Konsoongnoen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Teacher Training and Education 2018 (ICTTE 2018)* (Vol. 262, pp. 160-164). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/ictte-18.2018.28

Sánchez, S., Rodríguez, H., & Sandoval, M. (2019). Descriptive analysis of school inclusion through index for inclusion. *Psychology, Society, & Education, 11*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.25115/psye.v11i1.653

Siam, K., & Al-Natour, M. (2016). Teacher's differentiated instruction practices and implementation challenges for learning disabilities in Jordan. *International Education Studies, 9*(12), 167-181. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n12p167

Srivastava, M., de Boer, A., & Pijl, S. J. (2015). Inclusive education in developing countries: A closer look at its implementation in the last 10 years. *Educational Review, 67*(2), 179-195.

Suprayogi, M. N., Valcke, M., & Godwin, R. (2017). Teachers and their implementation of differentiated instruction in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 291-301. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.020

Syamsi, I. (2014). Self-evaluation model management inclusive education in primary school district Bantul Yogyakarta. *Dewantara International Journal of Education, 2*(1), 53-68. https://jurnal.fkip.uns.ac.id/index.php/dewantara/article/view/5189/3662

Taiwo, M. M. (2015). *Teachers' negotiation of inclusive practice in Nigerian classrooms* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Edinburgh]. Edinburgh Research Archive. https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/21055

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education.* http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization- UNESCO. (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education.* http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002482/248254e.pdf

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East- UNRWA. (2013a). *Inclusive education policy*. https://www.unrwa.org/sites/default/files/unrwa_inclusive_education_policy_2013.pdf

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East- UNRWA. (2013b). *Inclusive education strategy*. https://www.unrwa.org/sites/default/files/unrwa_inclusive_education_strategy_2013.pdf

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East- UNRWA. (2014). *Baseline study of classroom practices in UNRWA elementary schools- final report*. https://www.unrwa.org/sites/default/files/unrwa_classroom_practices_baseline_study_english.pdf

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East- UNRWA. (2020). *UNRWA in figures*. https://www.unrwa.org/sites/default/files/content/resources/unrwa_in_figures_2021_eng.pdf

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East- UNRWA. (2016). *UNRWA disability program fact sheet*. http://www.unrwa.org/sites/default/files/content/resources/disability_programme_fact_sheet.pdf

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East- UNRWA. (2013c). *Teacher's toolkit for identifying and responding to students' diverse needs*.

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East- UNRWA. (2011). *UNRWA education reform strategy 2011-2015*. http://www.unrwa.org/userfiles/2012042913344.pdf

United Nations. (2007). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities.* Adopted by the General Assembly, 24 January 2007, A/RES/61/106. http://www.refworld.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/rwmain?docid=45f973632

United Nations. (2015). *The 2030 agenda for sustainable development.* https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld

Widiastuti, S., Suwitri, S., Warella, Y., & Haryono (2017). Evaluation of the implementation of the educational inclusion of Junior High School level in Central Java Constructs. *Journal of Social Science Studies, 4*(2), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.5296/jsss.v4i2.10694