Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Pedagogická fakulta

Diplomová práce 2008

THE USE OF APPROPRIATE DISABILITY TERMINOLOGIES IN
RELATION TO INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

This dissertation is hereby submitted in part-fulfilling of the joint degree of
MA/Mgr. Special Education Needs SEN – Erasmus Mundus, Charles
University and Roehampton University

ERM030L003Y

Student Number: 07206394(Roehampton University)

Student Number: 86702863 (Charles University)

<table>
<tr><td>**SUPERVISOR**</td><td>**AUTHOR**</td></tr>
<tr><td>**PhDr. Jan Siska PhD.**</td><td>**Donna Patronia Mailil**</td></tr>
</table>

i

PRAGUE 2008

DECLARATION

I, Donna Patronia Mailil hereby declare that I developed this dissertation independently with the use of the resources listed in the bibliography. This work has never been presented before and can be used for reference by other researchers.

Signature   **Signature**

Date   **Dean of Faculty**

ABSTRACT

Why is the brilliant concept of inclusion so complex and is failing?. What has gone wrong or rather what is not right in practice? Maybe, one of the answers could be found in the way the inclusive practitioners in practice use disability terminologies in educational settings. In this view, the study seeks to sensitize education professionals practicing inclusion in all educational settings to pay attention to the terminologies that they use in their day to day language communication with others to describe people with disabilities. In writing and speaking about, and with people with disabilities, whether they are young or old, it is most important to use appropriate terminology. Firstly, it demonstrates to all that we value people with disabilities as members of our society. Secondly, it educates those who read and hear what we say, about appropriate terminology, and therefore gives them an opportunity too, to help develop and promote, inclusive and equitable values. The main aim of this study is to identify the effects of using appropriate disability terminologies by inclusive professionals in interacting and communicating with students with special educational needs. Ultimately, education professionals are viewed as agents of change and appeared to play a vital role in enhancing inclusive practices.

Key words: Disability terminology, inclusive education, educational professionals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

TO GOD BE THE GLORY

This thesis is especially dedicated to ALL the children and students
with disabilities and with special educational needs.

There is only one child in the world and that child's name is ALL children. (Carl
Sandbury, cited in Falvey and Givner)

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE   PAGE

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

PROLOGUE

World News Headline: GLOBAL WARNING; SPECIAL EDUCATION EPIDEMIC

It is a deadly disease spreading like the wild bush fire. Doctors, Researchers and other Professionals searching for the cure. Finally, found the right drug called INCLUSION DRUG. It seems to be the most effective drug. No side effects, perfect medicine, comes in different shapes and sizes and coated with colors of rainbow that sparkle like the diamond. Sick people were desperate for the drug to be healed. They closed their eyes and nose to swallow the pills. Yuck! Yuck!, it smells, and taste bitter and nasty. Some spit it out, others vomit, others have severe headache and sleepless nights, irregular blood pressures. Others feel the pains in their flesh and bones. After all these are the true side effects of INCLUSIVE DRUG that was meant to be the best, effective and curing drug in all times. **(Mailil D, 2008)**

What has gone wrong, or rather what is not right with this brilliant idea of inclusion?

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

_____

1.0 Overview of the Chapter

This thesis opens with an aspiration on a made up news article on inclusion as prologue provided at the beginning of the piece of this study to give meaning and focus throughout the context of this research study (*see page x*). The first chapter presents the context of the study together with the background to the study, Followed by the definition of what the researcher thinks as appropriate and inappropriate disability terminologies. Then the reflection on the researcher's experiences and the justification of the interest in this research study. Next the rationale for the study and the research questions that guided the study are presented. Finally, the significance, and the scope and limitations of the study are explained. In so doing, a scene is set to show the basis and vitality of the study in schools in Prague in the Czech Republic.

1.1 Context of the Study

1.1.1 Background to the Study

Disability terminologies used in the past educational practices were based on medical model which, focused on health conditions and differences and often discriminate and exclude children and people from equal opportunities for social, economic and political development. People with disabilities (PWD) no longer see their disabilities describe in medical terms but to think about their lives in terms of social model. It is about full participation and equality and social justice. The current inclusive education practice developed from social model in terms of social life means changing of words that define, describe and naming PWD to realize their true identity than living with terms imposed upon them. It denies their rights to be treated as active individual citizens thus, discriminate and exclude them from the

social realities. Foucault (1973 cited in Oliver,1994: 25) suggests that "the way we talk about the world and the way we experience it are inextricably linked - the names we give to things shapes our experience of them and our experience of things in the world influences the names we give to them". In this view, education professionals as agents of change in inclusive education practice play an important role in making these changes happen through good practices in which, care is taken in the use of appropriate terminologies to describe students with different disabilities and learning difficulties. Words in language we use for interacting and communicating with each other have the power to change perceptions of PWD. By using certain terminologies to describe PWD and especially students in an inclusive educational setting we are infact discriminating and excluding them in what we think is an inclusion practice. "The first and most important thing to remember about discussions of language and disability is that they arise because disabled people experience discrimination daily and are denied the same rights and opportunities as the rest of the population" (Barnes 1993: 8). If we are to include these people and students in all aspects of developments in the society, and be valued as individual human beings, we must stop using negative and disempowering terms. Slee (2000: 40) agues that ... "it is the problem of language and meaning that lies at the heart of the inclusive education project". Nevertheless, Oliver (1994) maintains that "if we believe that we can improve the quality of all our lives through better policy and changed practice, then we have to recognise that language has a central role to play in this improvement" (p.8). Over the years, we have heard and seen documents about the change of policy and practice. Many countries have accepted the changes however, some of the practices especially in the inclusive educational settings have not been changed. In particular, the past practiced disability terminologies are still being widely used by practicing education professionals.

Inclusive education is based on social model philosophy to include all students in learning process and thus demands for a major change in educators' and schools' professional practices. For educators to fulfill their responsibility in making sure that

students with special educational needs receive a proper education, they often need to become involved in personal and professional changes. Then, this definition of reflection as learning through experience toward gaining new insights or changed perceptions of self and practice (Boud *et al.,* 1985; Boyd and Fales, 1983; Mezirow ,1981) makes sense in this context. They will often be involved in helping other colleagues, principals, parents and students. Effective educators are usually the agents of change. In this case, one major change would be the use of appropriate disability terminologies in which the past education practices used medical terms that discriminated and excluded students from the community. Change in this particular view means that students with special educational needs will have full participation in regular schools. Consequently, educators are the key personnels who are directly responsible to actually make the idea of inclusion work in schools. Due to the importance of their roles, Dewey (1954) sees the educators as "the agents through which knowledge and skills are communicable and rules of conduct enforced which learning will significantly occur" (p.3).

"Inclusion as a movement and a philosophy is the subject considerable debate "(Fuchs & Fuchs 1994; Wilton,1994; Jenkinson,1997 cited in Foreman 2001:19). Hence, it is not essential for educational professionals to form a strong view in favor of or against inclusion. However, practicing educators are responsible for the education and the welfare of all students including students with special educational needs in an inclusive learning environment while at the same time can have a significant impact on students' success in school. The school accepts that it provides an inclusive environment which caters for all members of its community regardless of the type or level of disability (Brown,1995 cited in Foreman, 2001:19). Therefore, educators have to demonstrate new and better practices by promoting positive educational environment in which all students feel welcome, safe, happy and included. This is done when practitioners use appropriate disability terminologies in all communications and interactions with students, colleagues, principal and parents. Thus, the whole school community encourage and support barrier-free inclusive society in which all students actively participate in learning

and in other community activities. On the other hand, when educators are not the agents of change students with disabilities are still being discriminated and continued to be excluded and as the result, the idea of inclusion fails.

1.1.2 Definition of Appropriate and Inappropriate Disability Terminology

My definition for appropriate disability language are terminologies that refer to PWD as 'people first' such as 'people with disabilities' and the determined definitions by the World Health Organization (1980) as 'impairment', 'disability' and 'handicap' that are to be used appropriately in different context of inclusion. I believe these are friendly and inclusive terms that give values, rather than the process of becoming disabled to PWD, set them free from oppression and empowering them to equally participate in an inclusive society. On the other hand, my definition for inappropriate disability language refers to terminologies that were used in the past practices under the medical model that encouraged discrimination, separations, segregation, exclusion, devaluing and degrading PWD, for example, terms such as 'the handicap', 'the disabled', mentally retarded, cripple, the deaf/blind, victim of, suffers from and etc. How can we continue to use terms that were used in the past practice that encouraged discrimination and exclusion and use them in the present practice in which discourages discrimination and exclusion?. Similarity Barton (1993) states that "terms such as 'the disabled' are a catch-all and give an impression of sameness, but the difficulties and responses to being disabled are influenced by class, race, gender and age factors: this cushion and compound the experience of discrimination and oppression" (p.24). Thus, we are far from constructing an inclusive and barrier-free society and may not be possible until the past negative practices are removed and no longer used.

There is some significate about the use of terminology in language that makes it powerful in relation to the implementation of inclusive practice. Oliver (1990) points out that "language is a central aspect of discourse through which power is reproduced and communicated" (p.45). For instance, people who are hearing and using the terms 'able people' and 'disabled' instinctly know that one can do things

4

while the other cannot. I find it difficult to use these terms because firstly, it is not true that the so-called disabled can not do things, conversely, often they can do things differently and secondly, it is degrading and underestimating PWD. The labeling also decreases the level of self-esteem and having the feeling of being a failure and different. For example, in India, a young man who had polio, trained to be a horticulturalist, said that he does not have any regret but others underestimate him and they keep reminding him of what he cannot do. Finally, we are talking about people. Why cant we use people first and what they can do? The term 'people' gives a sense of belonging, togetherness, sameness and oneness as human beings. This could be the beginning of constructing an inclusive barrier-free society. However, Barnes (2007) argues that although much has been achieved over recent years, there is still a long way to go if the language of inclusion is to become more than empty rhetoric" (p.203). It is hoped that with this approach of using approriate disability terminologies we can succeed in the inclusive education practice and eventually live together in a barrier-free inclusive society.

1.1.3 Justifications for my interest in the issue

On my first teacher training visit to the children's hospital I could not stop thinking about the very sick children who were admitted with mostly server malaria, menningitis and malnutrition. I was only told by the doctors that some of the children will not hear, see, walk or will have intellectual problem. This was very distrubing for me when I was studying the early childhood development as part of my teacher training. My questions were: Will they go to school and who will be their teachers? However, I answered the questions myself being one of the first few teachers in my country to teach in the first special school. Over the years, I developed the love for the job, dedication and boldness to make sure that children with disabilities are fully participating in their communities. It was not that easy as I thought while teaching in the special school, in integrated programs and inclusive education in regular schools. The students with disabilities are still being labled as disabled, handicapped and other terms to discribe their specific impairments.

Children are still being discriminated, devalued, degraded, feeling of being different, and excluded. I also felt different when I was addressed as disabled or handicapped teacher. Although, recognizing the fact that labels are generally imposed rather than chosen by people with disabilities, labels are still in use. Labeling children with disabilities is enough to exclude them from communities. During the challenges in the segrageted special school, I took interest in the use of appropriate disability terminologies because I felt that the terms that were used to describe these children were discriminative, devaluing and dehumanizing and excluding them from many social activities in the community. This made me so determind to do something about it and so I started to carry out awareness in regular schools, work places, sporting activities and in both urban and rural communities about disabilities. The main emphasis is to call people with disabilities by their given names based on the principle of people first. However, in many schools children with special needs are being included and are equally participating in school activities as a result of raised school awareness and improved teachers' inservice programs. Professionals can now understand the importance of using people first in disability language and are changing their attitudes to include PWD in the community social activities. In the same logic, Armstrong & Armstrong & Barton (2000) state that "the only way forward in the struggle for quality for all is through a struggle against all forms of discrimination for all groups and individuals in society"(p.9).

I have continued to address the appropriate disability terminology in teacher education because it seems to have a bigger impact when teachers take up teaching positions thoughout the country to educate children and the community. One significant evidence in special education teacher training course book is my contribution to help both preservice and inservice teachers to understand the importance of disability terminology. The impact is greater in which to first educate the society and changing attitudes that will lead to an inclusive barrier-free society and eventually differences are celabrated as normal. "To understand that persons with disabilities are human and rightfully belong to human category, but also

deserve a degree of difference that connects with the outer world" (Devieger, Rusch & Pfeiffer 2003: 10).

1.1.4 Rationale of the Study

This study seeks to sensitize educational professionals practicing inclusion in all educational settings to pay attention to the terminologies that they use in their day to day language communication with others to describe students and people with disabilities. In writing and speaking about, and with PWD, whether they are young or old, it is most important to use appropriate terminologies. Firstly, it demonstrates to all that we value PWD as members of our society. Secondly, it educates those who read and hear what we say, about appropriate terminologies, and therefore give them an opportunity too, to help develop and promote, inclusive and equitable values. Such findings will help practicing educators to pay attention to the use of appropriate disability terminologies and take time to understand the importance and the effect it has on the students and people we care to help. This could also assist the educators to reflect on their own attitudes and to make improvements in their practices. Further more, educators can influence the whole society to use appropriate terminologies when communicating with or about people with disabilities. This will eventually encourage and promote the idea of inclusive society in which this group of people are not being discriminated by the use of language, and are valued and respected as people.

1.2 Research Question

Central question in this study is: Why is it important for inclusive education professionals to use appropriate disability terminologies?

Subquestion is: How do the students with special needs feel about the use of appropriate disability terminologies used by inclusive education professionals?

1.3 Scope of the Study and its Limitations

This research was an explanatory type of research which was carried out in

Charles University - Faculty of Education in Prague the capital city of Czech Republic. The research participants involved were third year special education / psychology students with and without disabilities. The study results might not be generalized to other teacher training institutions and schools in Prague or in the country as a whole. However, the study comparing different groups of students at this learning and training Institute has raised the level of reliability of the results and findings. One of the main limitations was the language and culture barrier. This made it more difficult to carry out the research in terms of communication, translation of English to Czech and vice versa. It was time consuming and caused some misunderstandings as well. In addition, to access schools at this time of the academic year was difficult when the schools were in the assessment period before their school holidays.

1.4 Overview of the Thesis

Chapter One provides the introduction and context of the study. Within this chapter, the scene of the research was set out with researcher's justification in carrying out the research. This was followed by the rationale for the study, followed by the major research questions of the study. The scope and limitations of the study were also provided as part of this chapter. Chapter Two provides the related literature that was reviewed for this study. The above-mentioned issues are presented as related topics for the purposes of coherence and clarity. The research methodology is detailed in the Third Chapter. This chapter presents the research paradigm and the research methodology for the study. Also included are data collection and analytical methods and processes. Issues relating to reliability and validity, and the ethical considerations that required attention are also discussed in this chapter. Other issues that were encountered during the data collection are also explained for clarity. Chapter Four details the data analysis and findings of the study. Chapter Five considers the research results identified in Chapter Four and discusses them in relation to the literature review in Chapter Two. The chapter retains the major themes identified in Chapter Four for consistency. The final chapter concludes the entire study with the summary of findings together with the implications of the study. Recommendations for practice and action,

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Overview of the Chapter

This chapter presents the related literature pertaining to the use of appropriate disability terminology in relation to inclusion with special reference to educational professionals.

The chapter is divided into four sections that are related to the study. Firstly, the model of inclusive inter-cultural communication and theories on labeling and behavior will be discussed. Secondly, is about the factors and practices that influence inclusive practices in relation to the study issue. The thirdly, section is about what PWD and other professionals are saying about the use of disability terminologies and language. Finally, the chapter provides the summary. In so doing, each piece of research must build on and develop what has gone before. It must seek to make a further contribution to our understanding and ability to erode the various forces: social, political and cultural, which continue to create and sustain exclusion at both the education institutions and in the society. This is not an easy task however, all of us involved in doing disability research should be aiming for. The ultimate aim of this presentation is done in this way to give the researcher a fair understanding of global and experts' impressions on related issues regarding the research study.

2.1 Inclusive inter-cultural communication conceptual model

"Our society places a high value on oral communication in terms of the use of language, and most of us it is the primary methods of interacting with others. We talk to each other to share knowledge, information and feelings" (Van Hattum, 1985, cited in Luckasson, 1995:56). It is claiming that "language has a central role in social life and the study of language provides the key to understanding our

social functioning" (Robson, 2002:365). It is not only about what is said but what words were used and how they were used in the spoken language. In this view, Hoffman (2001), in thinking and actioning inclusive approach of inter-culture communication, developed the *T.O.P.O.I model* for analyzing the *inter-ethnic* communication, referring to: T for Tongue=Language, O for Order, P for Persons, O for Organization and I for Interventions (p.10 - 13). He further states that, the inclusive model is philosophically grounded in the *plural* and theoretically in the general system theory (p.19). He believes that, the reality is not *uniform* but *pluriform* which consist of different local realities each with own interpretations of reality (p.11). For instance, Foreman (2001) claims that "people who have a disability sometimes find it offensive to hear their disability referred to gratuitously in conversation" (p.19). He further claims that "such reference are not only hurtful but also stereotype certain characteristics in people with disabilities" (idem). Thus, "interpersonal communication of images and ideas cause more problems when people are not free to give meaning to what they say and understand of each other" (Hoffman, 2001:14). This makes "communication process complex making differences and misunderstanding inevitable in communication"(idem). Subsequently, he forms an opinion that in everyday communication often professionals use inter-cultural communication, which is a scientific discipline that investigates the influence of cultural factors on communication. For example, "people who are deaf and signing to communicate do not generally regard their deafness as a disability, but rather as an alternative culture, with its own language and communication system. They usually do not believe that they suffer from deafness" (Foreman 2001:19). It means to pay greater attention to the cultural aspects that influence mutual communication between people communicating (idem). Ultimately, this serves as a platform to construct an inclusive education and an inclusive barrier-free society.

Thus, this conceptual model of communication provides a better understanding of the two way communication in which both persons are influencing each other when communicating at the same time. In so doing, both are also involved in many kinds

10

of influencing processes with a broader context and this can make it more complex. In addition, the model makes persons in communication aware of their own beliefs and of the others as they see as the reality. What is more important in this study is to try and find out the perceptions and behaviors to the communication patterns in which one can ask: What am I saying that the other acts or behave in that particular way or is this person happy and comfortable with the language used in the communication? This kind of reflective attitude helps to look back to one's practice. Hence, the application of TOPOI-conceptual model developed by Edwin Hoffman (2001) when thinking about inclusion and is used in this study is illustrated in Conceptual Frame below.

Conceptual Frame T.O.P.O.I

Places in the communication where differences and misunderstanding may occur:

TONGUE/**'Meanings'**: What do the words and the non-verbal language mean?

ORDER/**'Views'**: What is each person's view?

PERSONS/**'Identities'**: Who is each person (for him- or herself and for the other person)?

ORGANIZATION/**'Organization'**: What is the influence of 'the organization'?

INTENTIONS/**'Doing one's best'**: For what does each person do his or her best?

Source: Hoffman, E. (2001). Inclusive thinking and acting pg.15 Inclusion reader 2007-2008

2.2 Labeling Theory

Labeling stemmed from the medical model when a person has been given a specific diagnostic label. For example, when a person is "mentally ill" and receives mental health treatment that person is labeled as a "mentally ill" person. However, according to sociological terms, labeling is the attachment of a mental illness to a person who was given the mental health treatment. Significantly, "social theory, coming to terms with social life, means defining, describing, or naming our experience, our historical reality for ourselves rather than living with a definition imposed upon us" (Bologh, 1991, cited in Oliver,1993:38). In addition, Algozzine, Mercer, and Countermine, (1977, cited in Walker, Shea and Bauer, 2004:38), point

11

out the importance of 'labeling theory', which is concerned about being different and causing problems to the normal way of doing things in the schools and community we live. Vislie (2003) is ironic while parodying that "labeled pupils are in a special position within mainstream class" (p.30) and quoted Meijer (1999) that "in itself is not inclusive education in the pure sense of the world" (p.169). People who are different from the norm in anyway frequently have these differences exaggerated by the way in which the language is used to describe them. For instance, in school this often leads to name-calling. Further, "labels such as, 'invalid', 'cripple', 'spastic', 'handicapped' and 'retarded' all imply a functional loss and a lack of worth. These disabilist labels have particular significance in a society in which the values of production and economic worth shape social conditions and relations" (Barton, 1993:18). For example, in Australia, in IDEA Public Law, the language or label to be assigned to children to be served under special education law was changed from handicapped children to "children with disabilities". Walker et al. (2004) propose three principles to guide individuals in the helping professionals in their action towards people with special needs: "normalization", "fairness" and "respect" for the dignity (p.13). Are practitioners demonstrating respect for children with disabilities as human beings? Therefore, according to Walker et al. (2004), "all interventions must be judged against this question, which is psychological punishment: sarcasm, embarrassment, and name-calling" (p.14). Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton (2000) call it "bad mouthing when using terms such as 'feeble minded', 'retarded' and others that are not appropriate to use in the context of inclusion" (p.3).

2.3 Behavior Theory

"Another of the many social changes that have occurred in recent years has been the recognition that language has an effect on the way we think about things" (Foreman 2001:19). This might be true in the sense that when educational professionals think about their pupils and the words they use to communicate with especially students with special educational needs, influence the way they interact with them. For instance, when they think of them as disabled, then they tend to use

12

words like slow learners and dumb. This is also connected with the way they think about themselves, their vulnerabilities and their competencies. Beukering, Touw & Everaert (2005) claim that "teachers take their history, their entire selves, with them into the classroom, including the assumptions held by family and community and the experiences and beliefs can play an important role in the pedagogical relation between teacher and pupil" (p, 2), especially regarding students with special education needs. This is why it is important for teachers to change their beliefs, teaching styles and attitudes to meet the needs of the new approach on inclusive practice. Thus, Walker et al. (2004) raise series of questions such as: "What makes us behave as we do towards self, others, and the environment and how can we change our behavior and the behavior of others from inappropriate to appropriate, from in-acceptable to acceptable, from destructive to constructive?" (p.31). In addition, Walker et al. (2004) make a statement that "What you do is influenced by what follows what you do" (p.39). This theory specifically is in reference to behavior modification. For example, when a pupil is addressed as an handicapped or slow learner he/she feels different, exhibits low self-esteem and cannot actively participate and often is excluded from learning. However, Walker et al. (2004) define behavior as "human acts that are observable and measurable, excluding biochemical and physiological processes" (p.40). Walker et al. (2004) "call the perspective from which we analyze and attempt to understand behavior our 'theory-of-action' philosophy, or 'espoused beliefs'" (p.31). These are our beliefs that guide our actions in our work with children. What we believe about the behavior of the students affects how we respond and act towards them (Walker et al., 2004:31). For instance, when teachers think of some pupils with special needs as dumb they tend to ignore them. He further elaborates that "in an intervention, ideas, actions, and outcomes are tired together and greatly affect each other." This is why it is important for educators to change their attitudes and approaches towards pupils with special educational needs. Similarly, Fink (1988, cited in Walker et al., 2004:32) presumes that teachers' 'espoused beliefs' govern their actual behavior. He then says that "considerable variance exist between behavior and philosophy training and experience can decrease this discrepancy" (idem). Consequently,

13

universities and colleges are offering studies in behavioral psychology to help teachers to understand their own behaviors and of their students. A good example is that the student participants in my research are the third year special education/psychology students at Charles University.

Hence, changing attitudes is not always easy, however, changing perceptions is probably very important strategy in changing attitudes about disabilities, other special needs and especially the use of inappropriate disability terminology. Meanwhile, action is the most important component of attitude because it is action that makes the difference and it is through action that perceptions are changed.

The concept of inclusion practice in education has drawn attention to the need to rethink and change our practice. However, the most difficult one to change is our attitude. Specifically, in the case of this study is the use of appropriate disability terminology in the context of inclusion. Westwood (2002) agrees that "successful inclusion will depend very heavily upon teachers' skills in developing differentiated practices" (p.192). Inclusive teachers with positive attitudes are usually the most successful teachers and often the most influential teachers. It is teachers with this kind of attitudes that make inclusion practice work. Inclusion is asking for change therefore, inclusive teachers and other educational professionals need to be the agents of change to make the idea of inclusion work.

2.4 How PWD perceive the use of language

Advocacy groups, and others representing PWD and PWD themselves have continually asked that professionals, the media and schools discontinue the use of disability terminology that discriminate and devalues people with disabilities. PWD do not wish to be known as 'a Down syndrome' or the 'handicapped'. They wish to be recognized as people and valued members of society, for example, by saying, 'John is hearing impaired' or 'John has hearing impairment' and not deaf or handicapped boy. These are human beings with given real names and are people just like other people. The principle to be followed is 'people first, disability second'

14

can be use in language when talking about disability. For example: avoid expressions such as 'the disabled' and use 'people with disabilities' (PWD). Hence, PWD do not wish to be seen as the object of a punishment or as victims. Nor do they wish to be seen continually suffering or in need of sympathy. They do not like terms such as 'suffers from', or 'afflicted with'. They prepare their disability to be referred to as something that they just have.

The language that people use reflects what they think and can influence how they deal with situations. If they behave as if the problem is with the individual, they will take a different approach than if they regard the problem as being with the attitudes, systems and practices that create disabling barriers. Therefore, it is important to re-examine their origins and evaluate their meanings and connotations today" (Office of Civil Rights-Dept. of Executive Service).

At the end, "yesterday's definitions become today's term of abuse" (Armstrong &Armstrong & Barton (2000:13). Over the years, different views of people and culture have created confusions to disability language and terminology as to what should be considered offensive. In this view, using the terminology that individuals prefer is a matter of dignity and respect (Oliver,1994). At the policy level, I have the suspicion that calling someone a 'retarded' or 'a schizophrenic' makes it easier for us as a society to lock them up, drug them into insensibility, electrocute or even kill them. Those born with impairment only usually realize they are 'different' when they come into contact with others (Oliver, 1994). In addition, the media language plays a vital role in shaping social attitudes about people with disabilities (Barnes, 2004) and offensive terms occur in the newspapers over a longer period of time (Hermeston, 2008).

There are lots of people who do not know the right words who are nevertheless respectful of the rights of people with disabilities and there are people who do know the right words who are not (Shakespeare, 2001) and continues to say that "you can not read people's attitudes from the words they use but he says that there is

15

plainly offensive language which we all agree on however, adding that it is also important to call people what they wish to be called". In the similar note, Forman (2001 p.19) claims that "there are also ways in which we unintentionally use language that leads to inappropriate steteotying, classifying or labelling of people with disabilities. He further states that as professionals, teachers should avoid using expressions such as; are you deaf/blind or something. Such reference are not only hurtful but also stereotype certain characteristics in people with disabilities." In this respect, it is right to call them what they wish to be called however, there might be so many different terminologies use to describe people with disability and thus creates more disagreements and confusions especially in the context of inclusion .

"The language we use and the images that we create and promote through that language, reflect the attitudes we have towards any particular group of people. Our language is picked up and evaluated by others around us. The words and phrases that are preferred show respect for the dignity of people with disabilities. Some describe this as 'people-first' language where the individual is recognized as a person first, then further defines in terms of their characteristic, disability, or functional limitation. For example, person who is deaf; likewise, services and programs do not have disabilities, but they are provided for people who do" (Clark and March, 2002).

When using people-first language to describe PWD, it removes many other issues corncerning human rights such as disacrimination. It basically and importantly supports and encourages the idea of inclusion when PWD are seen as people first then the disability.

2.5 Summary

The literature review comprised five main sections. These include inclusive inter-culture communication conceptual model, labeling theory, behavior theory, and what has been said about the use of disability terminologies and language. According to the literature, communication is a vital tool for social interaction. It gives meaning and understanding to experiences and the environment. When language is used it involves two or more people with different beliefs and values

and often causes misunderstandings and can be abusive. Communication TOPOI conceptual model tries to make people aware of and consider the importance of listening and looking at different views, habits, values and standards of different individuals and their cultures. Labeling stemmed from the medical model when a person has been given a specific diagnostic label. However, the present social model in which social theory is based on is coming to terms with social life, which means to define, describe, or naming our experience, our historical reality for ourselves rather than living with a definition imposed upon us. The way we behave is the result of the we think and feel about certain experiences in life. The ideas, actions, and outcomes are tired together and greatly affect each other. We often express it in the use of language in out interactions with others. Various commentators and concerned people have raised concerns about the use of appropriate disability terminologies however, the issues surrounding the concerns are complex in theory and practice. Nevertheless, the significant of this literature will provide some insights of using appropriate disability terminologies. It might help us to establish the foundation to continue to develop new ways and understanding that might be significant and useful to this study and other studies in future.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

3.0 Overview of the Chapter

In this chapter the research paradigm and research methodology used for this study are described. This chapter has two sections that discussed and described the methodology that was used to carry out this research. The first section of the chapter discusses the research interpretive/constructivism research paradigm which is a theoretical framework within which the research is being constructed and organizes the researcher's view of reality. The second chapter discusses the methodology that was used for the study. This is followed by an explanation of data collection methods and procedures. The research participant selection, description of the schools, the research plan and data analysis procedures used for this study are presented. The chapter concludes with a description of the validity, reliability, and ethical considerations for this study.

3.1 Interpretivism / Constructivism Paradigms

In the most resent study carried out by Johnson et al., (2007); Morgan,(2007); Tashkkori & Teddlie, (2003) House & Howe, (1999);Patton, (1988); "reject traditional dualism and prefer action to philosophizing by privileging inquire questions over assumptive world. Hence, this stance endorses methodological pluralism because, in practice, most research questions cross paradigmatic boundaries" (Jang, E., McDougall, D., Pollon, D., Herbert, M., Russell, P. 2008). For example, in the case of this study complementary mixed methods design aims to elaboration, clarification, and explanation by using different methods which are the quantitative and qualitative methods across different paradigms. (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Jang et al., 2008). Significantly, in view of the research objectives,

18

questions and the related theories in literature that are used for the study, the interpretive/constructivism research paradigm were deemed the most appropriate lens through which this study should be viewed and conducted. The empirical inquiry which falls within the qualitative research and is combining with the quantitative method as a means of studying the context of the inquiry, in a complementary way to interpret ability in which the quantitative study provides the interpretation of the statistical analyze. This might improved the value by the qualitative narrative account. The approach was used in that way to study students studying to become education professionals in the natural settings. The study was both fixed and flexible designed in which, explanation might emerged from the data that were used to explain student education professionals' views, perspectives and feelings on the importance of inclusive practitioners use of appropriate disability terminologies in language that leads to successful inclusion in schools. Lindsay (1995b;2003 p.8) argues that "all empirical research needs to be conceptualized, planned, implemented, analyzed and reported with full recognition that the research endeavor exists within a social, value-laden world, and that consideration of the implications is necessary at all these points". Thus, the research paradigm and process are discussed below to show how they were used in the study.

According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000), research paradigms are referred to as lenses through which one could view and unveil the social world. Hence, constructivism paradigm which, generally views that reality is socially constructed by the participants in their natural social settings through knowledge and making meaning from their perspectives (Guba and Lincoln,1989 in Ponte (2005). Also, states in Mertens (2005,p12) in Mackenzie and Knipe (2006,vol.16) that reality is socially constructed. Interpretivism and constructivism have very similar common beliefs of reality of the social world which, is made up of concepts of actors. The ontological belief for interpretivists, therefore, is that when people get knowledge and make meaning out of their actions in their natural settings. Constructed realities can be understood clearly when qualitative researcher is also an actor in

the same setting, interpreting and making meaning of people's perceptions. Nevertheless, constructivist researcher might use both qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data to provide the richness and fullness to the social reality that could have been left out by the interpretivist. In this view, interpretivism and construtivism paradigms are specifically used for this study. For example, Rose (2006), uses both closed and open-ended questions. Closed questions generate quantitative data while the open-ended question was purposely to gain insight into the perception of the research. This study research has used the complementary mixed-method design through the use of Likert scale in a case study which, quantitative data were used to complement qualitative data and vice versa. Miles and Huberman (1994) in Goodwin &Goodwin (1996) points out that "we need both words and numbers to understand our world.

3.2 Research Methodology and Procedures

3. 2.1 Mixed Methods - Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods

Over the years the two main approaches to research studies; quantitative and qualitative and their paradigms and the methodologies have been the focus of critical discussions and sometimes to the extent of sinister among researchers. In particular, the education research for a teaching profession that is facing the huge challenges of rapidly changing world, where what works today may not work tomorrow. In other word, there is no time to waste but to get on with the research and produce effective results for whatever the challenges are current. Patton (1990), cited in Goodwin and Goodwin (1996), states that "it is time the education researchers withdraw from methodological wars and use all their strengths and energy in conducting education research". Others have also expressed similar sentiments however, Shulman (1988), in Goodwin and Goodwin (1996), elaborates that "educational researchers must not become slaves to some particular methods". Robson (2002 p.373; Lindsay 2003 p.9) adds on to say that ..."you need not to be the prisoner of a particular method or technique when carrying out an inquiry". We must address a range of research questions and these need a range

20

of methods. ...'mixed method' approach is to be advocated. On the other hand, it is important that professional colleagues and others critically examine and comment on all researches because there are times when what is true to one may not be true to others. Thus, in agreement helps researchers to review and improve research methods to achieve desired results. In relation to the five theories of truth; "truth as consensus is evident when there is an agreement universally or among relevant population" (Bridges 2003, pp.72-78, extracted from Bryson (2003).

The most recent study (Jang et al.,2008) on mixed methods reveals that the mixed methods research is increasingly being used as an alternative to the traditional mono-method ways of conceiving and implementing inquiries in education and social science (Brewer&Hunter, 2006; Creswell, 1994; Creswell & Plano, Clark, 2007; Greene, Caracelli & Graham, 1989; Howe, 1988; Reichardt & Rallis, 1994; Tashakkori &Teddlie, 1998, 2003 Jang et al.,2008). However, to conceptualize mix methods studies and the paradigm assumptions are still being debated. In other recent researches carried out reveal rejection to "traditional dualism and prefer action to philosophizing by privileging inquiry questions over assumptive world". (House & Howe, 1999; Johnson et al., 2007; Morgan, 2007; Patton, 1988; Tashakkori & teddlie, 2003 Jang el al., 2008). Hence, mixed methods have been recently strengthened by means of mixed methods design in which researchers are able to link the purpose of the study to methodologies and integrate findings from mixed methods (Caracelli & Greene,1997; Creswell, 1994; Creswell & Plano, Clark, 2007; Greene et al., 1989; maxwell &Loomis, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, 2003; Teddlie, &Tashakkori, 2006; Jang el al., 2008).

Component designs are also recently proposed as broad categories of mixed method research design alternatives (Caracelli & Greene,1997; Jang el al., 2008). In component design different methods remains discrete through data collection and analysis and the mixing method occurs during interpretation process. An advantage of this design is that researchers can verify and generate theories by utilizing both qualitative and quantitative strands. To valid the approach

"triangulation design is used in the component design s to seek convergence on a single perspective of a particular social phenomenon and to strengthen validity by off setting biases resulting from various sources such as substantive theories,researchers, and methods" (Denzin,1978; Mathison, 1988 in Jung et al., 2008). Nonetheless, practising methodologists admit that the mix methods research can also be inconsistent and contradictory results (Caracelli, & Greene, 1993; Mathison, 1988; Jang et al., 2008). This can "lead to in-depth analysis more for substantiating such inconsistency" (Jang et al., 2008).

In integrated mixed methods designs 'mixing' takes place throughout the inquiry from data collection to analytic processes and to interpretation. For instance, in this current research study, Likert scale was used by integrating both close and open-ended questions/statements in the questionnaire for collecting data. Then they were together interpreted in which quantitative data were converted into statistic descriptive data which provided in-depth understanding into narratives interpretation that were analysed qualitatively. The advantage is that it gives more freedom and allows the researcher to move back and forth between qualitative and quantitative methods. An example, of this method used is seen in the study carried out by Maxwell, Bashbook, and Sandlow's (1986) research which integrated an ethnographic design into a quasi-experimental design (Jang et al., 2008). According to Teddlie and Tashakkori's (2006) conversion and fully integrated designs mixing occurs throughout all stages. Both qualitative and quantitative data are collected and analysed accordingly. Hence, results are transformed for further analysis using other methodological methods. An example, might be that quantitative data are converted into narratives that can be analysed qualitatively (qualitizing) and qualitative data are converted to numerical codes that can be statistically analyzed (quantizing). The two approaches are interacting with each other at each stage by affecting the formation of the other (Jang et al., 2008).

Complementary mixed methods design aims to elaboration, clarification and explanation by using different methods either a single research paradigm or across

22

different paradigms (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Jang et al., 2008). An expansion design aims for the breadth of the inquiry by incorporating methods for different components of the inquiry in a parallel fashion. According to Caracelli & Greene (1993; in Jang et al.,2008), both designs can be done together with an integrated analytical approach depending on the most important aspect of the findings from the different methods. Such importance (heterogeneity) will naturally lead researchers to revisit the data across methods to substantiate the nature of the observed heterogeneity (Jang et al., 2008). These mixed methods designs and analytical approach are appropriate and fitting in the current research in which the study is trying to measure the strength of what the respondent's feelings and perceptions on certain disability terms used by inclusive practitioners in their communication and inactions with students with disability in an inclusive educational setting. Kopinak (1999), Tolson et al. (1999), Winchester (1999) are some examples of researches done using "multiple designs (I.e. Incorporating both fixed and flexible elements)" (Robson 2002 p.86).

In some literature reviewed, communication through the use of language is vital for social interaction with one another. It takes two or more people with different views and values in the communication therefore, care must be taken in what is said and how it is said. In the inclusive school settings educational professionals are the key players to include all students with and with out special needs in active participation without discrimination and devaluing of students with special needs in the use of disability terminologies in the language they use. Many commentators, especial people with disability are voicing out to others to avoid certain terminologies that are no longer appropriate to use in this social model way of thinking and acting.

3.2.2 Quantitative Research Method

Quantitative approach basically operates on information that is based on facts. For example, the research is usually carried out to test theories and against facts. It operates on the principles of natural science to pursue the truths. Basically,

23

following rules in a systematic way, using deductive approach to show from what they can find out that is the only truth. It establishes clear link between what is known and what is to be discovered. However, it is only limited to "looking only at one small portion of a reality that cannot be split or unitized without losing the importance of the whole phenomenon" (Krauss 2005).

Quantitative research is more focused on statistical findings of truth and uses data analysis in for example, experiments and questionnaires in an attempt to establish general laws or principles. It is strictly and systematically carried out to verify the truth by careful investigation. For example, this research study used Likert scale in which respondents indicate the strength of their feelings and perceptions which also leads to the 'measurement' of the respondents attitudes. However, this scale is used mainly to gain insight into what the respondents feel and believe about something (Robson 2002 p.292). He also points out that "the field of quantitative data analysis is complex and specialized" (p.292). In other words, you must be very good with numbers- statistical specialist in order to produce accurate and useful results. Nevertheless, in the case of this research it is comparably small for easy statistical analysis which means that you do not have to be a statistical specialist. In addition, it has control over its participants and the environment and the researchers have precise and clear aims and objectives. Further more, it is quick and easy in which large amount of data can be collected and added to. For example, Rose (2006) survey on religious education carried out in England using closed questions to collect quantitative data On the other hand, the problem of quantitative research is dehumanizing the social sciences and the systems which apply to the natural world cannot be applied to the social world. This refers to respondents who are human beings and are treated as objects in quantitative research.

3.2.3 Qualitative Research Method

☞Qualitative approach in research is mainly focus on human being's perspectives

24

in a natural setting. Thus, it seeks to find reality by interpreting people's interaction with one and other and their environment and the knowledge and meaning they make of it. For instance, in the current study the researcher attempted to grasp an authentic understanding of education professionals' use of disability terms in inclusive education practice that might exclude and discriminate students with special educational needs. This will be done by way of gauging the school professionals' and students with and without disabilities views and experiences from questionnaires. Bryman (2004 p.62) states that "social phenomena is in the minds of people and their interpretations". In other words, people make meaning and sense from their interactions in their natural social settings. Thus, qualitative researcher needs to be observant and sensitive to everything that is happening around the issues that are being investigated. qualitative approach attempts to make sense of people's interactions and interpretations to make meaning in social reality. It is also known for its flexibility (Robson 2002 p.164), and therefore, will be predominately use to collect data mainly in words.

☞However, quantitative approach are incorporated as to complement the qualitative finding. This is done using the Likert scale in which the respondents are asked to express their views and feelings. (Robson 2002 p.164), to also collect data in the form of numbers to provide the richness and fullness to the social reality that could have been left out by either of them. This is supported by Stainback and Stainback, (1988) in Robson, (2002 p.507) that suggest the need for 'deep and valid description' and well-grounded theories emerging from a wide variety of data".Subsequently, qualitative research commonly use multi-methods approach to gather data which, means more than one methods such as the use of open ended questions, interviews, observations, document analysis, case study, visual texts and etc.

☞Qualitative research approach and results have been questioned, based on issues of validity and reliability (Cohen et al. 2000). Qualitative researchers insist

that knowledge can be generated through the use of different assumptions, methodologies and appeals to different forms of understanding (Burns, 2000; Creswell, 2005). This would mean that by using different groups of people in learning and teaching institutes in Prague, the researcher sought to identify the most salient features of situations and meanings that emerged from the students and the practitioners and thus, discover a holistic world view of the phenomenon (Cohen et al. 2000). Consequently, this has led to making meanings, explanations and interpretations of events which could have been quite different from relying on predictions and inferences alone, or through other quantifiable means. Due to the use and application of a qualitative research approach, the researcher in the current study considered that every social reality was associated with the explanations and interpretations of the people researched. This led to making meanings that were generated in line with the research topic, purpose, and the major research questions that guided this study.

There are many limitations to especially data collection and analysis because basically qualitative research deals with people to people. Hence, during the process of the research there could be easily human errors encountered. For instance, there might be too much data to remember and to deal with and also, when there is no data available there is a tendency to compare with the average. These human errors can affect the process of the research as well as the reliability and validity of the research outcome. However, Robson (2000, p.115) based on real world research and settings, points out that it would be "artificial to do laboratory experiments on what subjects tend to do and what they think you want them to do." Further, acknowledging the fact that there are participant and observer error and bias experiences however, he suggested that by getting rid of the error and bias and can show the reliability on whatever is being measured, is a good measurement (p.120).

3.3. Data Collection Methods Overview

In this part of the section, discussions were presented in two parts. Part one

26

discussed the different methods, strategies and instruments used in this study to collect data and why the researcher has chosen them. Part two discussed how the data was collected to find the answer to the research questions. This part of the study plays a vital role in the success of the end result if it was carefully carried out in a systematic principle and fashion. Therefore, the discussions are presented according to the importance of this part of the methodology section.

3.3.1 Methods: mixed methods methodology

This research study purposely employed a concurrent mixed methods research design (Teddlie &Tashakkori 2006 in Jang et al.,2008) to gain insight into the factors that associated with good practice and success in full inclusion of students with special educational needs in regular schools. Also, to gain in-depth understanding of the values and perceptions of how students with special needs view certain terms in language used in describing and concerning them especially by practicing education professionals in the inclusive education context. Mixed methods are both conceptual and therefore appropriate and practical challenges in dealing with data from mixed methods research studies. Some recent studies have endorsed methodological pluralism because they revealed that in practice, most research questions cross paradigmatic boundaries (Jang el al., 2008). In this view, the researcher chose to use mixed methods because the questions in the research study carried out crossed over the paradigmatic boundaries in which the measurement of attitudes statistically would be compared and analyzed in words. In addition, recent studies also reveal that mixed methods have been recently strengthened by means of mixed methods design in which researchers are able to link the purpose of the study to methodologies and integrate findings from mixed methods (Jang el al., 2008). Thus, the researcher is confident that by choosing these methods the study undertaken is more likely to provide evidence useful for answering important research questions given the inquiry objectives, research context, and the available resources. This is seen in the literature as important and relevant discussion as well as in the whole context of this research study. In this

27

view, two groups of student were specifically selected. One group included students without disability and the other group included students with disability. The selection of the two groups represent two different cultures, values and perceptions in communication as illustrated in the conceptual TOPOI-model in the literature. Both groups of students are studying special education/psychology at the faculty of education at the Charles University Prague in Czech Republic. These samples were specifically selected but voluntarily participated based on the understanding that after graduating from the university, they might be involved in one way or another in an inclusive educational setting.

3.3.2 Likert scale

Likert scale that was developed and used by Likert in the 1930s, and still widely used in today's research (Likert, 1932; Robson, 2002 p.293) was used to collect quantitative data. Likert items were used as closed questions in the questionnaire. The scale firstly, it was easy to develop based on a four point scale in which respondents stated whether they strongly agree or strongly disagree from a question/statement included. Secondly, because it looks easy and interesting. to complete respondents are likely to get involved. The interesting and usefulness of this item is that it gives opportunities for respondents to express themselves by choosing between strongly agree and strongly disagree which really 'measures' the strength of the respondents' attitudes. Because it was done in a systematic way "it would help to ensure that the scale has internal consistency or can show difference in individuals" (Robson, 2002 pp.293-295). The advantage of this approach is that "it enables one to find out not only those statements which the respondents endorses, but also the strength or emphasis with which they hold the opinion" (Robson, 2002 p.298). On the other hand, open-ended questions were used so that the participants had the opportunity to explain the reasons for their thoughts and feelings about particular terms stated in the statements/questions provided (see Appendix A,B,C,D). In this way, it provided greater insight and deeper understanding of what was going on would be gained by having those involved tell you about it (Robson, 2002 p.367).

3.3.3 Triangulation

There are four types of triangular methods;data, observer,methodological, and theory (Denzin,1988; Robson,2002 p.174). Researcher has chosen methodological triangulation in which both quantitative and qualitative as mixed methods were used in the study. It was done in this way to ensure that qualitative analysis provides the narrative account of subjects' perceptions and explanations from data summaries. Hence, are real life experiences that were interpreted and analyzed to make meaning to the findings. Consequently, this might provide sufficient and balance evidence to explain the study findings. Data triangulation method was also used in a way to compare different people's perspectives at different settings and at the same time data collected from different methods and instruments used. It was simply used for checking of quantitative method with those of a qualitative (or vice versa) (Robson 2002 p.371). "Triangulation can help to encounter all of the threats to validity" (p.175). On the other hand, it might raise both logical and practical difficulties. (Bloor 1997,pp.38-41;Robson 2002 p.175). In the case of this research study, likert scale items were used as closed questions/statements to 'measure' the respondents' strength of their attitudes. while some space were provided for the respondent to explain their feelings and perceptions. Thus, data results were checked against the participants strength on their feelings and perceptions on the use of appropriate disability language in an inclusive educational context. Hence, expressing their views, feelings and perceptions based on the strength of their choice. The researcher used Likert scale to 'measure' the strength of the respondents feelings and perceptions to collect the data for the reason that (see Appendix A,B,C,D). the participants could freely and easily express their thoughts and feelings about the use of appropriate disability terminologies in language in relation to inclusion with special reference to education professionals.

3.3.4 Case study approach

Robson, (2002 p.178) defines case study as "a well-established research strategy where the focus is on a case (which is interpreted very widely to include the study of an individual person, a group, a setting, an organization, etc) in its own right, and taking its context into account. Typically involves multiple methods of data collection can include quantitative data, though qualitative data are almost invariably collected". Robson (2002 p.177) further explains that case study is a situation , individual, group organization or whatever it is that we are interested in. Yin (1981;1994) in Robson (2002 p.178) defines case study is a, "strategy for doing research which, involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real context using multiple source of evidence". Therefore, case study is a strategy or a approach and not a method in a research study. It is concern with the research on a particular: a specific case in a practical way of collecting evidence about what is going on. It focuses on a phenomenon in context and in particular when the boundary between the two are not clear. Case study can be undertaken using multiple methods of evidence or data collection. Case study is usually carried out in order to look in detailed at one particular aspect or example of something. The case study is also define here: as an in-depth investigation of "… a program, an event, an activity, a process, of one or more individuals" (Creswell 2002 p.15). "Barrett and Cooperrider (1990), Brez and Taylor (1997), Oniskiw et al. (1999) and Pervin and Turner (1998) are some examples of case studies carried out in different fields" (Robson 2002 p.179).

This qualifies the use of case study in this research carried out on students with and without disability studying special education/psychology at the faculty of education at the Charles University Prague in the Czech Republic. The study using this strategy carried out to find out the strength of the students feelings and perceptions on certain terms used in an inclusive education setting with special reference to educational professionals. The research questions in the study refers in particular, to students with special educational needs and their teachers in an inclusive educational setting. Literature makes references to educational context in which interaction takes place between teacher and students during learning and

teaching. Literature also reveals that more people with and without disabilities and have some kind of involvement with this group of people are expressing concerns on certain disability terms used in either talking or writing about people with disabilities. Bouma (1996) Yin (1994) states that, "data collection and analysis procedures are guided by the specific research question(s), context(s) and previous findings and explanations".

In general researchers who choose case study to carry out their researches tend to use an interpretive research paradigm to inform their approach to the knowledge about social reality (Cohen et al., 2000). Harker (1999, 1998) in Rombo (2007) "maintains that the case study is therefore a research methodology rather than being simply regarded as a method of obtaining data. The basic difference is that research methodology encompasses all the processes of the research endeavor underpinned by the theoretical basis, whilst methods refer only to data collection and analysis procedures" (Guba & Lincoln,1989) in Rombo (2007). Therefore, Cohen et al. (2000) in Rombo (2007) states that "the use and application of the case study as a legitimate research methodology in its own right is acceptable". This assertion is supported by Stake (1995) and Yin (1994) in Rombo (2007), "who respectively argued that case studies should not be regarded as a mere data collection technique or a design feature, but a comprehensive research methodology which can be used to unveil a social problem/issue". However, Yin (1981;1994) in Robson (2002 p.178) define case study as a strategy or a approach for doing research and not a method. They claim that it involves in practical investigation about a specific case in a particular context in approaches such as observation and interview. Nevertheless, weather case study is a strategy or a research methodology, this study has used it to carry out an investigation on a phenomenon and its context that was not very clear in the form of questionnaire. Because it is concern with research it has provided some kind of evidence that would be further analyzed and interpreted to provide clarification and explanation on the research study.

3.3.5 Data Collection Procedure

To understand more about how participants feel, and think about the issue in question for this study, case study strategy was used in a way that certain samples, the context, methods and instruments that were used to collect data. In this way, a variety of data collection methods and instruments were deployed to generate data to explain the research question(s). For example, both qualitative and quantitative approaches were combined as mixed methods to deal with both aspects of peoples' interpretation of narrative analyze and the structured items in statistical analyze. This was done in this way to provide explanations and clarifications to the study carried out. Robson (2002 p.371) states that "the main advantage of employing multiple methods is commonly cited as permitting triangulation. He further strongly argues that for charactering both fixed and flexible design as scientific - provided that there are carefully carried out in a systematic principle and fashion" (p.5). In this view, questionnaires were designed within the Likert scale that contained six (6) different items each for the two identified groups of sample. Both structured and unstructured questions/statements included on a four point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree and strongly disagree. This was particularly for the structured questions/statements to measure the strength of the respondents attitudes. However, space was provided directly below as unstructured questionnaire for the respondents to express and explain their reasons for their choice of the strength of the questions/statements. Consequently, expressing their views, feelings and perceptions based on the strength of their choice. The data were collected from the eight (8) volunteered participants, one (1) student with disability and seven (7) without disability to gather information about the use of disability terms in language used by education professionals in inclusive educational settings. The finding is also related to good practice resulting in full and successful inclusive education for all. They represent voices, actions, practices and interpretations as individuals and collectively in the total population of students with and without disability studying special education/psychology at the Charles University Prague in the Czech Republic. In this respect, the researcher found that

32

the scale used and the and the representation of the sample were internally consistent (J. Ross et al., 1998 in Jang et al., 2008)

Tutor responsible for the students made time arrangements in a way that the researcher was able to meet with the students after classes to collect data. Two groups of students were identified to participate in the study. One group was made up of students without disability and studying special education/psychology. The other group was made up of students with disability also studying education/psychology. Total of eight students who voluntarily participated in the study carried out at the site of which seven students without disability and one student with a disability. The type of questions/statements in the questionnaires were constructed differently for the two different groups of sample. It was done in this way to find out the different views , feelings and perceptions of the two different samples. Researcher does not speak Czech language therefore, constructed the questions/statements in English and got it translated in Czech Language. Hence, the researcher was able to provide questionnaires in both English and in Czech. Participants had the freedom to choose the language they were comfortable with in the questionnaires provided. However, all students that participated in the study opted to use Czech questionnaire than English. Researcher gave a brief word of appreciation and explanation of the study, then the questionnaires were given out to each participant. Researcher was at the site of the study during the participation but did not interfere in any way with the participants. Completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher at the site of the study carried out. After three days researcher was able to find someone from Czech who understood and spoke English very well who then translated the Czech language data collected in the questionnaires back to English questionnaires. Thus the researcher was able to analyze the data collected.

3.4 Method of Research Participant Selection

3.4.1 Participant Selection

Sampling in this study was considered very carefully because of its importances for good results. Homogenous sampling was deemed most appropriate due to the case study approach. According to Creswell (2005), in order to use the homogeneous sampling procedure, research participants or the research sites have to possess similar traits and characteristics that are inherent within all members and sites. Therefore, for the purposes of the current study, the homogeneous sampling procedure was used for the reason that pertaining to both the research participants and the research context. Out of the total population eight (8) students not selected but voluntarily participated in the study. The initial intention was to have four research participants from one basic school (primary), one secondary school and the University. This would include two teachers and two students with special educational needs in the learning institutions. However, this did not work out well and so the study was only able to involved University students. The rationale for this decision was to gauge equal number of participants' views, perspectives and feelings concerning the research study in different learning institutions to identify similarities and differences. The criteria used to select the research participants was that education professionals, trainees and students with disabilities had to participate in the study. They represent voices, actions, practices and interpretations as individuals and collectively. The demographic information on table 1 below represents the students that participated in the study.

3.4.2 Research Participants

The participants in this study were students with and without disabilities studying special education/psychology in the education faculty at the Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic. Seven (7) without disability and one (1) with disability. The participants voluntarily participated in the study because the initial selection of the samples did not work out as anticipated. It was very important in this study that the practicing professionals and students with special educational needs in the same schools participate. However, these samples were not available and so the researcher had to accept only the volunteered students as participants. Nevertheless, these students participants are studying in the most relevant

educational field in which the study was focused. Therefore, with the sudden change of samples the researcher used student participants without disability as the educational professionals and student participant with disability as the student with disability to collect data for the study. The decision was made in this way because they was not enough time left to change the research plan. After all, the student participants might be directly or indirectly involved in an inclusive education environment after completing their studies. In this respect the researcher valued the participants and treated them as very important people who have provided answers to the study conducted.

Table 3.1: Demographic information for the study .

Student without disability		Student with disability	
7		1	
Sub total	7	Sub total	1
	Total	8	

3.4.3 Issues of Validity and Reliability in the Study

Validity and reliability are quality assurance and data verification issues that were considered important in the study. Hence, the following issues were taken into account with the hope of maintaining authenticity of the data collected, analyzed, interpretation process, and the research findings. The most vital quality issues that were considered in this study include validity and reliability of the data collection and analysis procedures, and how the researcher arrived at the research findings. This was done to ensure that the data collected from the two data collection methods were accurate and answered what was initially sought. The issues of maintaining quality are explained below to show how they were upheld in the current study.

Validity There are two main types of validity, internal validity and external validity (Bell, 1993; Cohen & Manion, 1994; Merriam, 1988). Firstly, with regard to internal validity, the researcher used methodological triangulation approach to ensure that

findings were congruent with the social reality under inquiry. That meant the researcher used closed and open-ended questionnaire as methodological triangulation process in an attempt to authenticate the data collected from the two methods. Triangulation as such allowed the researcher to validate the quality of data analysis by checking the consistency of the data content, meaning structures, and the findings of the study using different methods of data collection (Cohen & Manion, 1994). According to Creswell (1994), as qualitative data is not bias free, the triangulation method is an appropriate way to neutralize and find convergence of results, other sources of data, investigators and methods. The notion of neutrality refers to the balancing of the data by using two or more methods, or participants in a study. On the other hand, convergence is when similar meanings, interpretations and findings from two or more sources are merged to give a bigger, more balanced picture of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2005). Secondly, external validity is concerned with the extent to which the results of the study can be generalized to the wider population (Bell, 1993; Bouma, 1996; Creswell, 2005). According to Merriam (1988), this is called population validity.

Reliability Reliability refers to the stableness and consistency of the responses of the research instruments and methods (Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 1988). In order to maintain reliability of the data collected, the researcher in this study did several things. Firstly, the researcher used the methodological triangulation process of data collection as mentioned above (Creswell, 1994, 2002, 2005). Secondly, a research plan for the study was developed which clearly described how the study was conducted, and how the findings were derived from the data. This involved how the researcher entered the research site, the application of the two data collection methods. Next, as qualitative research advocates a reflexive approach, the researcher strives to ensure that her personal biases, lived experiences and prior knowledge about the principle of inclusive practices in Papua New Guinea, were identified and incorporated in the entire research process. Creswell (2005) also supports that "... reflexivity means that the researchers reflect on their own biases, values, and assumptions and actively write them into their research" (p. 50).

Through the reflexive process, the researcher was able to identify the most salient and useful themes that emerged from the data collected and analyzed. In so doing, the researcher tried to ensure that the data collected from the two data collection methods were consistent with the researcher's own perspectives and lived experiences.

3.4.4 Ethical Considerations

In educational and scientific research, the participants and the context in which the study was done were two vital elements of the research process that required protection from being exploited (Bouma,1996; Harker,1999). In addition, rules of right and wrong were needed in educational research because it involved dealing with people. For example, researcher needed freedom to investigate and at the same time protected individual's rights to privacy. Both lives were affected as well as others around them therefore, ethical consideration has been an important aspect of any research carried out (Robson,2002 p.66). In this way, permission was obtained from the authority where research was carried out and participants were fully informed of the research purpose to get their consent to participate. Other things of importance were also considered such as data collected were kept confidential, and kept in a safe storage and were not disclosed to any other persons. Further, personal feelings and opinions did not interfere or affect the data collection and the results.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.0 Overview of the Chapter

The chapter involves the presentation and analysis of the results of this research study undertaken at the Charles University Prague in the Czech Republic. Major discussions will be based on the questionnaires return, analysis of ideas and argument. The chapter will discuss the analyzing of the findings according to the procedures and process of the mix method methodology which involves both qualitative and quantitative analysis independently, then into the integration process, to data transformation to data comparison, to narrative interpretation in which the finding is explained and clarified.

4.1 Setting the scene for data analysis.

This data analysis is the result of data collected from the sample of eight (8) participants with and without disability studying special education/psychology at the faculty of education at the Charles University Prague in the Czech Republic. Student participants without disability participated in this study as educational professional or teachers and the student with disability as the student with a disability. For further clarification refer to *3.2.5 Method of Research Participant Selection*. The two different samples (with and without disability) were used for the important purpose of data consolidation to gain an in-depth understanding of the question in the study from both teachers and students views, feelings and perceptions on the use of disability language which directly affects them both in the inclusive education context.

Mixed method methodology consist of qualitative and quantitative methods and through the use of the case study approach was employed to gather the desired data from the sample that participated in the study. Therefore, below is the illustration and the description of the data analysis and the findings. Firstly, the

questionnaire contained two major parts which data were gathered: Likert four point scale instrument that seeks to measure the respondents strength from strongly agree to disagree on their feelings and perceptions on certain disability terms used by inclusive practitioners. In this part respondents explained the reasons narratively in words for their choice of the strength of their feelings and perceptions on certain disability terms used by inclusive practitioners.

The first part of the questionnaire collected quantitative data which is analyzed and reported independently statement by statement using the table forms in which data were illustrated in frequencies and in percentages. The second part of the questionnaire collected qualitative data that asked for the written responses. The data collected were analyzed by the strengths from Likert four point scale into which responses fall. The number of responses in these categories would be reported as expressed in the data collected

One of the tasks in this research was also to study what students with disability and as student participants on what they think and how they feel about certain disability terms used to describe them in an inclusive educational setting by educational professionals. From this data collection and findings would contribute to the data collected from participants without disability and training to be future educational professionals. In so doing might answer the main question in this study which is why is it important for educational professional to use appropriate disability language in the context of inclusive education. Subsequently, data collected would be analyzed separately during this stage of process, however, would also be used for educational professionals to be aware of what students with disability think and feel about the use of certain disability terms in language. The data analysis would be discussed and presented in the same way as the other.

In this study , the data collection tools were in the form of questionnaires. The responses to each questions/statements were accumulated in a form of tally (*see appendix F,G p. xxxix & xliv*). From the tally, frequencies and percentages were

calculated and displayed in tables representing each subject head of which the respondents indicated through their answers. However, in the quantitative analysis, statistical tools were in the formed of tables (*refer to tables/figures list p.ix*) to reflect the significant aspect of the findings. On the other hand, in the qualitative analysis to some extent, the research used content analysis in topics to highlight most striking or significant interesting findings, depicted in the tables to add meaning and results made clearer. The two sets of analysis went hand in hand throughout the process of analyzing the data collected and provided the explanation and clarification on the question in the study.

Because of the research study questions, study context, related theories and the literature, the study findings had used the complementary mixed methods design which aimed to elaborate, clarify and explain the study (Caracelli & Green, 1993;Jang et al.,2008). Hence, the whole process used the integrated mixed method design which allowed mixing to take place throughout the inquiry from the data collection to analytic process to interpretation.(Caracelli & Green, 1997;Jang et al.,2008). This allowed the researcher to move freely back and forth between quantitative and qualitative methods (Jang et al.,2008). In this way, the quantitative data was converted into narratives that were analyzed qualitatively and qualitative data were converted to numerical codes that were statistically analyzed in a flexible manner to gain an in-depth understanding of the study (Teddlie &Tashakkori 2006). Consequently, findings were interpreted from the finally analysis that provided the clarification and explanation to the research study and generally to the research context (Caracelli & Green, 1993;Jang et al., 2008). Below is the structure of this research study integrated mixed method data analytic procedure.

Figure 4.2 Mixed Method Data Analytic Procedure for this Research Study

Special Education/Psychology Student Participants
with and without Disability- Charles University Prague Cz

Factors Analysis of Case Study

Qualitative Analysis   Quantitative Analysis

Parallel Integration
Research Checking

Data Transformation

Data Comparison

Qualitative Interpretation   Quantitative Statistical Interpretation

Narrative – Statistical Interpretation Analysis

Narrative Explanation and Clarification

Figure:4.2 Researcher's Improvised design (source:Jang. et al., 2008)

41

4.3 Quantitative Data Analysis

4.3.1 'T' General result presentation

Presents an overview of data collection from seven participants without disability studying special education/psychology at the faculty of education at the Charles University Prague in Czech Republic are presented in the tables below. These participants represent educational professionals which includes teachers as explained in *3.2.5 Method of Research Participant Selection.* Thus, the six questions in this questionnaire refers to 'T' QUESTIONS,**'T'** stands for teacher (*see appendix A,C*). The analyzed data are the relationship between the six questions/statements and the respondents four level of strengths. The statistical analysis were the results of tally done from the qualitative data collected. The presentation was done in this way to provide general information and understanding of the feelings and perceptions on certain disability terminologies used in language communication by education professionals in an inclusive educational setting. (*see appendix F*)

4

Table 4.3.2 'T' General result presentation

Question / Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Total Disagree
T1. It is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given names	4	3	7			
T2. Principle of 'people first' eg. People / Student with disability is appropriate to use.	3	4	7			
T3. It is appropriate to use 'disabled student' to describe students with special needs				3	4	7
T4. Intellectual/mental disability is an appropriate term to use than mentally retarded.	2	2	4		3	3
T5.Cripple person is an appropriate term to use to describe people with physical disability				4	3	7
T6. It is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language.	3	3	6		1	1

4.3.3 Single tables 'T' results presentation

This part of the results of data collected are the follow up presentation from Table 1., general information and understanding but presented in single tables to treat the data individually and to further increase understanding of data analyzed in single items. (question/statement and respondents' level of strength) The results of the respondents' level of strength are entered in frequencies and converted into percentage as illustrated in the tables below.

T. QUESTION 1. It is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given names

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)	4	57
Agree (A)	3	43
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)		
Total	7	100

Table TQ1. According to the results presented in the table, indicated four (4) out of seven (7) respondents (57%) 'strongly agree' that it is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given names. Three (3) out of seven (7) indicated that they 'agree' with the question. The overall result shows that all respondents agreed with the statement.

T. QUESTION 2. Principle of 'people first' eg. people/student with disability is appropriate to use.

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)	3	43
Agree (A)	4	57
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)		
Total	7	100

Table TQ2. The results in the table presents that three (3) out of seven (7) which is 43% of respondents 'strongly agree' that the Principle of 'people first' for example

43

people or student with disability is appropriate to use while four (4) out of seven(7) 57% agree. The results clearly show that all respondents agreed to the principle of 'people first' language to be used in the context of inclusive education.

T. QUESTION 3. It is appropriate to use 'disabled student' to describe students with special needs

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)		
Agree (A)		
Strongly Disagree (SD).	3	43
Disagree (D)	4	57
Total	7	100

Table TQ3. The results illustrate that three (3) out of seven (7) respondents (43%) 'strongly disagree' with the statement that it is appropriate to use 'disabled student' to describe students with special needs. Fifty seven percent (57%) of respondents, four (4) out of seven (7) 'disagree' with the statement. The overall result shows that all respondents disagree with the statement. The result can also mean that the respondents understand the correct terms to describe students with different disabilities and learning difficulties.

T. QUESTION 4. Intellectual / mental disability is an appropriate term to use than mentally retarded.

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)	2	
Agree (A)	2	
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)	3	43
Total	7	

Table TQ 4. Results show that two (2) respondents out of seven (7) that participated in the study indicated that they 'strongly agree' with the statement that either use of intellectual or mental disability is appropriate term than the use of mentally retarded. Two (2) respondents indicated that they 'agree' with the statement while three (3) respondents (43%) indicated that they 'disagree' with the statement. The overall result shows that about half of the respondents agreed to

the statement while the other half disagreed.

T. QUESTION 5. Cripple person is an appropriate term to use to describe people with physical disability

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)		
Agree (A)		
Strongly Disagree (SD)	4	57
Disagree (D)	3	43
Total	7	100

Table TQ 5. According to the results illustrated in this table, (57%) of respondents four (4) out of the total of seven (7) indicated that they 'strongly disagree' that cripple person is an appropriate term to use to describe people with physical disability. Three (3) out of seven (7) respondents (43%) indicated that they 'disagree' with the statement. Results also show that all respondents generally disagreed with the statement by choosing strongly disagree and disagree.

T. QUESTION 6. It is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language.

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)	3	43
Agree (A)	3	43
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)	1	14
Total	7	1

Table TQ 6. According to the results displayed in this table, three respondents (43%) indicated that they 'strongly agree' that it is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language. The other three (3) respondents (43%) indicated 'agree' to the statement. One (1) respondent (14%) 'disagree' with the statement that it is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language. The overall result shows that majority of the respondents agree with the statement.

Table 4.3.4 'S' General result presentation

Presents an overview of data collection from the only one participant with disability

studying special education/psychology at the faculty of education at the Charles University Prague in Czech Republic are presented in the tables below. This participant represents students with disability as explained in *3.2.5 Method of Research Participant Selection*. Thus, the six questions in this questionnaire refers to **'S'** QUESTIONS,**'S'** stands for student (*see appendix B, D)*. The analyzed data are the relationship between the six questions/statements and the respondent's four level of strengths. The statistical analysis were the results of tally done from the qualitative data collected. The presentation was done in this way to provide general information and understanding of students with disability's feelings and perceptions on certain disability terminologies used in language communication by education professionals in an inclusive educational setting. (*see appendix G)*

Table 4.3.5 'S' General result presentation

Question / Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Total Disagree
S 1. I feel good as a person when teachers call me by my real names.		1	1			
S 2. Prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'	1		1			
S 3. I am not comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'					1	1
S 4. I do not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school.	1		1			
S 5. It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'.		1	1			
S 6. I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'		1	1			

4.3.6 Single table results presentation

This part of the results of data collected are the follow up presentation from Table 2., general information and understanding but presented in single tables to treat the data individually and to further increase understanding of data analyzed in single items. (question/statement and respondents' level of strength) The results of the respondent's level of strength are entered in frequencies and converted into percentage as illustrated in the tables below.

S. QUESTION 1. I feel good as a person when teachers call me by my real names.

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)		
Agree (A)	1	100
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)		
Total	1	100

Table SQ 1. The result shows that one (1) and the only respondent in this study indicated 'agree' to the statement that the respondent feels good as a person when teachers call the respondent by real names.

S. QUESTION 2. I prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)	1	100
Agree (A)		
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)		
Total	1	100

Table SQ 2. According to the result, the only one (1) respondent indicated 'strongly agree' to the statement that the respondent prefer teachers call the respondent 'student' and not 'disable'.

S. QUESTION 3. I am not comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)		
Agree (A)		
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)	1	100
Total	1	100

Table SQ 3. the result shows that the only one (1) respondent indicated 'disagree' to the statement that the respondent is not comfortable when teachers call the respondent 'handicap student'.

S. QUESTION 4. I do not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school.

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)	1	100
Agree (A)		
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)		
Total	1	100

Table SQ 4. The result in this table shows that the only one (1) respondent indicated 'strongly agree' to the statement that the respondent does not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school.

S. QUESTION 5. It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'.

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)		
Agree (A)	1	100
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)		
Total	1	100

Table SQ 5. Result shows in this table indicated that, the only one (1) respondent 'agreed' to the statement that it is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'.

S. QUESTION 6. I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'

Respondent's Attitude Strength	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree (SA)		
Agree (A)	1	100
Strongly Disagree (SD)		
Disagree (D)		
Total	1	100

Table SQ 6. According to the result in this table, the only one (1) respondent indicated 'agree' to the statement that the respondent feels bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'.

This tables shows the number of 'S' respondents' 'measured' strengths against each of the questions / statements.

4.4 Qualitative Data Analysis

At this stage of qualitative data analysis, data collected from respondents in written form reasoning their choice of strength in the way they feel and think about the use of certain disability terminologies from the statements in the questionnaire were treated independently and in this manner. This first presentation is for the seven (7) education professionals participants. The second presentation in the same manner is for one (1) participant with disability.

Participants' responses were presented together according to their responses to each questions and strength levels from the questionnaires. For example, T.Question1-Strongly Agree, participants responses to this question and strength are entered under these items. Hence, the more common key expressions were identified and summarized for further clarification and understanding of the respondent's feelings, and perceptions on the use of certain disability terms by

inclusive practitioners. The first presentation for the education professionals is presented directly below.

4.4.1 Data Analysis of Education Professionals

T. QUESTION 1. It is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given names

Strongly Agree

If we call all children by first name, there is no reason to call disabled student differently

There isn't any difference, whether a student is healthy or disabled. Hes a unique human being.

I think that it leads to more friendlier and confidential relationship between teacher and student and therefore, it can develop better care. Its more personal.

Summary. According to TQ 1. that, 'it is appropriate to call students with disability by their given names' and the respondents' indication of the level of strength of 'strongly agree' in the way the three respondents feel and think about the statement are summarized by identifying the common and key ideas expressed by each of the respondents. Therefore, the most likely common and key concepts emerged from the respondents' explanations are; about 'equal treatment', 'value', and 'respect' for others, in this case, the students with disabilities as 'human beings'. These ideas and actions in an inclusive educational settings encourages, creates and promotes well-coming, safe and supportive inclusion practice.

Agree

I agree but not completely. I think they should be called the same as students without disability- right? Than it depends on the student's age. Its natural to call younger students by first name. Older ones call Ms. X. Y. , Mrs. X. Y (surname) and use polite form. In Czech difference between using and 'you'.

It's common to call students by Christian names, therefore I wouldn't do any

exceptions.

It establishes better and more confidential relationship teacher- students cooperation much better. Environment isn't so anonymous.

Summary. The respondents indicated that they 'agree' with TQ1, statement and have expressed they reasons in the data collected and stated above. However, to summarized the three different reasons for their explanation the researcher tries to identify common and key concepts expressed by each of the respondents. The most common key concepts emerge are the same as expressed by respondents that indicated 'strongly agree'. However, one explanation was stated as; it might depend on individuals and how they want to be called especially referring to adults.

T. QUESTION 2. Principle of 'people first' eg. people/student with disability is appropriate to use.

Strongly Agree

It's a unique human being, who wishes to be seen as other children.

It depends on the kind of disability, children with ' SPU' (?) would probably prefer it, but its different with children with mental retardation. There may be certain difference (with regard to disability) I don't know how to answer.

Summary. According to TQ2., two respondents indicated 'strongly agree' to the statement of the Principle of 'people first' language. For example, 'people/student with a disability is appropriate to use'. The most significant concept emerged from the explanation is the concern about 'values' and 'equality' as other children and human beings. However, there was an explanation that it depends on the kind of disability but the respondent indicated that the respondent did not know how to answer or rather express it well. The result indicates again the importance of equality and values as human beings.

Agree

They don't want to differ from class-mates but sometimes they might want to take

advantage of their disability.

If teacher behaves differently, he/she separates a student from collective group of others and so he/she stigmatizes certain student.

Why not? They are human as well. However, with limits, because disabled students have their specific needs and therefore, they need specific conditions, but those should be as similar as possible with conditions of majority population.

I rather agree because not everyone copes with his/her disability and might not be suitable for them the equal approach without reliefs etc.

They are trying to fit in group much more not to call attention to their disability.

Summary. The result shows majority of respondents indicated 'agree' to the statement however, with explanations that might consider other aspects of disability and being a person with a disability that also contributes to the appropriateness of using the 'principle of people first language'. What was common and significant that were behind most explanations was the idea of human value and equal treatment. Nevertheless, one explanation was referred to teachers negative attitudes that leads stigmatization, separation and inclusion of students with special educational needs. One agrees but expressed that not everyone copes with their disabilities.

T. QUESTION 3. It is appropriate to use 'disabled student' to describe students with special needs

Strongly Disagree

When we use this term we separate this child from the rest of the class and it's not about labeling (in integration).

According to my opinion, student is not disabled, his/her special needs might disadvantage him or her.

It's stigmatizing.

Summary. According to TQ3, three(3) respondents indicated 'strongly disagree' to

the statement that 'It is appropriate to use 'disabled student' to describe student with special needs. The significant concepts that emerged from the respondents explanations are that the use of the term 'disabled student' stigmatizes, separates and exclude students with special educational needs. One respondent explained that these students are not disabled but are disadvantaged by their special needs.

Disagree

Students with special needs is not disabled. He/she is student with certain handicap.

I think that the expression 'disable student' is already old-fashion and doesn't sound very nice and positive. On the other hand, it's not so essential, how do we call them (they mostly don't care) but how do we treat them.

When I talk about each student with ordinary person, it's better to use such term for better understanding. In front of the student or his/her parents, it is better to avoid it and so not stigmatize.

In the class we can avoid it. I can't imagine me calling student: you disabled. For legislation is this term important, but for common life not.

Summary The results from respondents' 'disagree' explanations pointed out as in the strongly disagree explanations that these students are not disabled but have some kind of handicap. The term is old-fashion (out of date) not nice and positive terms to use. I explained that it is not important how we call them because they do not mostly care but how we treat them. The other explained that this term can be used with ordinary people for better understanding but to avoid using in front of parents to avoid stigmatizing students in their parents presence. One respondent explained that in class this term can be avoided but it is important term for legislation but for common life not that important.

T. QUESTION 4. Intellectual / mental disability is an appropriate term to use than mentally retarded.

Strongly Agree

The term 'retardation' has in Czech language not nice.

Mental disability is for me less pejorative than mentally retarded.

Summary The results from respondents who indicated 'strongly agree' that 'intellectual/mental disability is appropriate to use than mentally retarded explained that the term 'retarded' is not nice even in Czech language and it is pejorative.

Agree

I think that mental disability sounds better than mentally retarded. It's more equitable.

It appears to me that mental disability is less 'dramatic'.

Summary Respondents that indicated 'agree' that the term 'mentally retarded does not sound good and mental disability sounds better and equitable.

Strongly Disagree

I would rather use term mental disadvantage or 'mental deficit'

Summary This respondent indicated 'strongly disagree' because the respondent suggested to use other terms such as indicated 'mental disadvantage' or 'mental deficit' and not 'mental disability' or 'mentally retarded'.

Disagree

I have the same opinion as in 'T3 – see above.

The word 'disability' sounds very pejoratively and stigmatizes.

Summary the respondents indication 'disagree" because they feel and think that the term 'disability' sounds pejorative and stigmatize students with disabilities.

T. QUESTION 5. Cripple person is an appropriate term to use to describe people with physical disability

Strongly Disagree

The same as said above . We separate child by using using this term.

This term is out of date. Today has emotional connotations. It's more like slur.

It's almost like a 'slur'.

In school or help center, this term is completely improper. Again it's very pejorative and leads to negative reactions.

Summary The four respondents chose 'strongly disagree' to the statement that , 'cripple person is an appropriate term to use to describe people with physical disability. The most common concept that emerged from their explanation is that the term 'cripple is out dated, pejorative, insulting, devaluing and thus exclude students with disabilities from an inclusive social settings.

Disagree

Only when disabled one calls himself so, but it is improper to call him/her so.

This term is historicist and for called one is degrading.

I don't think that this term is a suitable term. There is plenty of more suitable. In addition, today, this term is used in different occasions (Czech term 'nrza'k' also for poor people)

Summary Respondents indicated 'disagree' also explained in the same manner as the respondents who indicated 'strongly disagree' The emphasis was on term 'cripple as out of date and no longer acceptable to be used to describe persons with physical disabilities.

T. QUESTION 6. It is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language.

Strongly Agree

It's important to us actual terms.

Other terms could be misleading.

No explanation but indicated strongly agree.

Summary Results from respondents that chose 'strongly agree' that it is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language explained that positive and inclusive terms are important for successful inclusion practice otherwise other negative terms could be misleading the concept of inclusion.

Agree

I agree but nothing should exaggerated to not to spoil students by teachers.

I don't know why and I might even not understand the question.

Indicated agree but no explanation given.

Summary The respondents indicated 'agree' to the statement however, had difficulties understanding the question. They might have other reasons or explanations to the term inclusive disability language.

Disagree

I think teacher should talk naturally. When he/she starts to think about his/her language as inclusive one, it's not good for a child, kindness and naturalness are the best recipe, how to approach ALL people.

Summary This respondent indicated 'disagree' to the statement that 'It is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language'. Explanation is that teacher should not think about the appropriate disability terms to use but to talk naturally which is good for the child. Further stated that kindness and naturalness is the best way to approach people.

4.4.2 Data Analysis of Student with Disability

S. QUESTION 1. It is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given names

Agree

I feel good as a person when teachers call me by my real names. In spite of my handicap I am person like other students. I think that handicap is not important when we speak with handicapped person. I feel better when teachers call me by my real names because handicap isn't important, they speak with me as other students. They do not see my handicap and I am person with positive and negative characters as other people.

Summary The only respondent from student with disability indicated 'agree' to S. Question 1., that 'it is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given name'. From the explanation given, the key concepts emerged are the emphasis of feeling good and better just like others, as a person and human beings like others when call or address by the real names given. Handicap is not important but the person is important and also think and feel just like other people.

S. QUESTION 2. I prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'

Strongly Agree

I prefer my teacher s call me 'student' and not 'disable'. I am student as other students say me 'student' they have never said me 'disable'. My teachers called me by my real name or said me student but they did not call me 'blind' or 'disable'.

Summary Respondent indicated 'strongly agree' to the statement that 'I prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'. The important argument is that 'I am a student just like other students. Teachers have also treated the respondent as student and have used the real names and not 'disable' or 'blind'.

S. QUESTION 3. I am not comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'

Disagree

I am not comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'. Respondent's reason for disagree: There are important different situations. When teachers speak with me, they call me by my real names but the fact is, that I am handicapped student and I do not mind when teachers in some situations call me handicapped student for example when teachers do not know my name (in the school there are many students so teachers do not know students names) so they call me handicapped or blind and other student and me know that teachers speak to me or about me. When teachers do not know my name and want speak with me and say me: 'blind student' I think it is OK.

Summary Respondent 'disagree' with the statement that, 'I am not comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'. Respondent explained important and useful reasons for further discussions. Refers to different situations. "my teachers call me by my name but for others who do not know me use the terms 'handicapped student' or 'blind student'. It is OK for the fact that "I am handicapped student", I know as well as other students that they are referring to me.

S. QUESTION 4. I do not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school.

Strongly Agree

I not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school. I think that people with small mental handicap know very well what this term mean and they are stigmatized by this term. People think that they are as child and there is not quality between mental handicapped and intact.

Summary Respondent 'agree' to the statement that, ' I do not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school. The key point raised in the explanation is that the term stigmatize and even people with mild mental or intellectual disability know and understand what this term means and feels unfairly treated.

S. QUESTION 5. It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'.

Agree

It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'. Term 'student with physical disability' mean that first is here student, person and secondary is there some specific character-disability. In my opinion cripple person is absolutely unsuitable term but wheel chair student is specific term- I think that it is same for example as term 'student with visual handicap' (to this group belong blind, low vision, ...) and the term 'student with physical disability' is general (there are many people who need sticks but not wheel chairs). I think that is important to have this term 'wheel chair person' because if we know that it is wheel chair student we will know that this person will need for example ramp which do not need student with sticks but both of them students are physical disability.

Summary Respondent chose 'agree' for the statement that, 'It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'. From the explanation key concepts were identified and summaries. When use 'student with physical disability' , student or the person is important and comes first while disability is a specific character in the person and therefore, is secondary. The term 'cripple person is unsuitable or unacceptable term to use while wheel chair person is for the specific character in the person that can help to make needs known. However, this explanation contradicts to the first explanation about people first.

S. QUESTION 6. I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'

Agree

I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'. I think that teachers accent student's positive characters and handicapped students are many a time slow but it

does not mean that they learn slowly but handicap slow down example reading, writing, ... but students are not slow learners – they need only more time on working with informations.

Summary Respondent indicated 'agree' to the statement that, 'I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner". The explanation provided useful and important understanding of the use of using the terms 'slow learner'. Students are handicapped in some situations because of their disability and in many times are slow but this does not mean that they learn slow but the handicap slow them down. They just need more time to work on information.

Additional Notes from the respondent: (see appendix E p.xxxviii)

We have many terms that mean handicap. I think that majority of these terms are OK and handicapped person do not mind (but when they are not meant pejorative). For, example, in Czech we distinguish these words of visual impairment:

Blind – slepy – this term some handicapped people mind

Nevidomy - (I do not know equivalent term in English – may be unseeing?) - this term is most suitable and is not pejorative.

Visually handicapped (here are people with different visual defects- blind, low vision, ...)

In some situations I do not mind that people call me blind, because the fact is I do not see and in other Czech words we use only blind (slepy) not nevidomy: Blind stick-slepec ka hul, Deaf blind hlucho slepy, Braille- slepecky tisk.

I think that when speak intact people with handicapped person, they would use terms that are most suitable so not say the the person is blind but that is nevidomy (in English unseeing?), because some handicapped people term blind do not mind and they use each other this term but some handicapped would this term mind.

In some situations intact people do not know how call handicapped person, often they do not call him blind, handicapped,... and there is problem with communication. For example, when I get into bus, people do not know how to call

me, so they say, sit down and blind person do not know that they speak with her (there maybe old man too), so it would be better in this situation when they use term 'blind'.

Summary From the additional notes provided by the respondent, key points are identified and presented in this summary. Important point is that people with disability do not mind the terms used as long as the terms are not pejorative. However, some do mind certain general terms used to labeled them. It is more about individual values. Sometimes people do not know the appropriate words to use and therefore turn to use general and commonly used terms like 'blind' or 'deaf' to refer to people with vision or hearing impairments.

4.5 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter has presented the analysis of data collected from a case study which involved volunteered students with and without disability from the Faculty of Education, Charles University Prague in the Czech Republic. The study carried out used complementary mixed methods design aimed to elaborate, clarify, and explain the use of certain disability terminologies in language communication and the importances of using them in an inclusive educational setting. Mixed methods included the quantitative and qualitative approaches across different paradigms were used to collect necessary data for the study findings. During the process of analyzing the collected data, the quantitative statistical data in figures and percentage in tables were statistically described in an integration process with the qualitative descriptive collected data. This led to the next process of data transformation in which both quantitative statistical data and qualitative descriptive data were transformed into narrative descriptions of respondents' level of strength and their explanations of their feelings and perceptions on the use of certain disability terms in an inclusive educational setting. Although, both methods captured some overlapping aspects of the use of disability terms, the results from the qualitative data provided additional information about the importance of education professionals of the use of appropriate disability language in practice.

Data consolidation was also used between the teacher and student data analyzed process. This was done during the data comparison process. This process helped to compare and assess teacher/student feeling and perceptions on the study question that directly involves both of them. Data comparison took place at the same time with the data consolidation process when the researcher moved back and forth comparing all analyzed narrative interpretation that provided some insight and deeper understanding of the study in question. Finally, the narrative clarifications and explanations will be discussed in the findings in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

EVALUATION

5.0 Overview of the Chapter

This chapter discuses the findings of the data collected from the sample of volunteered students with and without disability at the Faculty of Education Charles University Prague in the Czech Republic, in reference to the different theories together discussed in the literature reviewed for this study. The purpose of the study was to find out as to why it is important for inclusive education professionals to use appropriate disability terminologies in language in an inclusive setting. In the light of the research purpose, significant concepts and issues emerged from the data analysis and descriptively presented in the summary of each six items in both teacher and student under each chosen level of strength measured using the Likert four point scale. The findings and evaluation of this study will be discussed in the new emerged themes from data collected and analyzed which includes; (1) Label-Use of Real Names, (2) Appropriate Inclusive Disability Terms; and (3) Outdated Disability Terms. Where possible references will be made together from both teacher/student summaries when discussed together along with other findings derived from the literature.

5.1 Label-Use of Real Names

According to the first two same statements to both teachers and the student with disability that, 'it is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given names', the findings of this study revealed that three teachers strongly agree to the statement while the other four teachers and the only one student agree. Nevertheless, all the teacher participants either strongly agree or agree expressed their feelings and perceptions in regard to the statement used very much the same concepts of equal treatment, value and respect for all as human beings. The concepts used and expressed in all the teacher participants are basically the

fundamental guiding principles in many societies' Constitutions and policies for social justice. For example, the Constitution of my country, Papua New Guinea reflects principles of social justice and equity, declaring the respect for the dignity of the individual and community interdependence are basic principles of our society. Literature reviewed in this study made a lot of references to these concepts. One example is seen in Walker et al., (2004 p.13) propose three principles to guide individuals in the helping professionals in their action towards people with special needs – "Rights of All" in "normalization", "fairness" and "respect" for the dignity and worth of the individual. In actions towards children, are practitioners demonstrating respect for them as human beings?. This can be also seen and felt through out this study context.

On the other hand, student with disability added that "I feel good and better just like others, I feel and think like others when my teachers call me by my real name(s). Handicap is not important but the person is important". These particular expressions from the student with disability are very important for all inclusive education professionals to take note and time to think it through when using disability terms in language communication in an inclusive educational setting. When students are feeling good and happy they feel included and thus actively participate in school activities. Additionally, when the student see the person more important than the handicap as expressed by this student participant, this positive behavior must be encouraged by teachers in the way they treat and behave towards these students. This is also reviewed in the literature that, what educational professionals think about their pupils and the words they use to communicate with especially students with special educational needs, influence the way they interact with them (Foreman 2001p.19). It is further reviewed that "what we believe about the behavior of the students affects how we respond and act towards them" (Wood,1978 p.119) in Walker et al.,2004 p.31).

This positive result is evident in all the responses from the study which means that it is right, fair and out of respect for individuals as all human beings to be called by their real given name(s) and not by other names that are imposed on them. In

addition, this positive feelings and perceptions expressed by the future education professional indicates change of attitudes for good practice which includes all students in equal participation in school activities. In so doing teachers understand the importance of using appropriate disability language and thus creates and promotes an inclusive learning and teaching environment for all. Several writers in Westwood (2002 p.192) agree that "successful inclusion will depend very heavily upon teachers' skills in developing differentiated practices." Inclusive teachers with positive attitudes are usually the most successful teachers and often the most influential teachers. It is teachers with this kind of attitudes that make inclusion practice work. Inclusion is asking for change therefore, inclusive teachers and other educational professionals need to be the agents of change to make the idea of inclusion work.

Labeling in terms of using language to describe people and specifically in this study; the students with disability and with special education needs. Labeling in this sense and reviewed in the literature in the different models used to discuss and make meaning for disability studies and the different practices have been historically used. In the past practices medical model of understanding disability was used and as the result, labeling of children and people with different disabilities were done in that manner for the prescriptions of medication and the special services to be provided for them. These labeling terms then became new and extra names added to the names given to them even before they were born just like any other persons born into this world. The fact in this regard is that labels are generally imposed rather than chosen by person with the disability and consequently often creates discomfort, feeling of being different from others. This further leads to discrimination and exclusion of these people in the society as a whole. However, as informed by the literature review that "social theory, coming to terms with social life, means defining, describing, or naming our experience, our historical reality for ourselves rather than living with a definition imposed upon us" (Wallach Bologh 1991 38 in Oliver 1993). In addition, Algozzine, Mercer, and Countermine, (1977) in Walker, Shea and Bauer, (2004 p.38), point out the importance of 'labeling theory' which, is concern about being different and causing problems to the normal way of

doing things in the schools and community we live. Vislie (2003 p.30) argues that pupils labeled are in a special position within mainstream class and quoted Meijer (1999 p.169) that "in itself is not inclusive education in the pure sense of the world". People who are different from the norm in any way frequently have these differences exaggerated by the way in which the language is used to describe them.

In relation to Hoffman (2001) in thinking and actioning inclusive approach of inter-culture communication developed the TOPOI conceptual model of communication provides a better understanding of the two way communication in which both persons are influencing each other when communicating at the same time. This can be viewed in the situation in which there is constant interactions between the teacher and the students. Especially for the teachers to promote an inclusive learning environment, teachers need to be aware of this conceptual model of thinking and behaving in practice.

However, one of the teachers that indicated 'agree' to the statement in this discussion, made an additional point that "it also depends on individuals in how they want to be called. Similar expression was made in the literature that "it is also important to call people what they wish to be called" Tom Shakespeare, a sociologist at the University of Newcastle. In many societies there are laws on freedom of choice and freedom of expressions. This can also be referred to individual rights and respect. Hence, understanding this fact of life and the struggles that people with disabilities have been experiencing can be very complex when two important things of these nature have to be done for positive results. For example, teachers and student all agreed to call students with disabilities by their real given names. On the other hand we have the laws on rights, respects and freedom of individual choses and expressions, meaning that students also have the right to chose how they want to be called. In this view, we cannot have two together or both ways in this situation where we are trying to use calling of real names to create positive learning environment which includes all students. In literature

review, according to Walker et al., (2004 p.14), "all interventions must be judged against this question which is psychological punishment (sarcasm, embarrassment, and name-calling)". If this is one of the factors that exclude students with special educational needs in schools and failing the idea of inclusion practice then schools should develop policies that can address the issue of calling students with disabilities by their real given names and not by the labels of their disabilities.

5.2 Appropriate Inclusive Disability Terms

The study identified some significant findings that are discussed in this theme of appropriate and acceptable terms. Firstly, all participants agreed to the use of 'people first language' which means that when addressing or referring to people with disability, people or students or children comes first then the disability. The preferred use of language that tries to avoid talking about the disability first because it is the person having the disability. In this way when we are referring to the disability, it is preferable to talk about a person with a disability, rather than a disabled person. In this way, "we convey the impression that the person's disability is just one of the characteristics, just part of their humanity" (Foreman 2001 p.20). In other words, these are people and its about the people and for the people we are referring to, while the disability is just part of the person that is impaired. With that understanding, the concepts of human values, equality, and respect were the main reasons for participants to either strongly agree or agree to the statement of 'people first language'. If these are the main reasons for all participants to agree on human values, equality, and respect and importantly to include all students in learning and teaching in schools then we need to stop using the terms that first describes the disabilities. For instance, this was a part of the presentation of a person with a disability on 'Human Rights, Inclusion and the Voice of the Oppressed' (Richard Rieser no date).

We try to get people in schools to understand that what we call the "Medical Model" is more than just what doctors do to us. It started from what doctors do to us because it was looking at our impairment. We were no more than our impairment. In fact many children

are still labeled by their impairment. A Downs Syndrome child, a child with spina bifida. They are children first, we are people first. The focus is on the impairment and the cure or if we cannot get the cure we get shunted off to this "special land" which is different. In fact it is very similar. In "special land" you have hydrotherapy, in mainstream schools we have swimming. In "special land" you have Art Therapy, we just have Art in mainstream schools or Speech and Language Therapy. We call it development of literacy in the mainstream. Physiotherapy not PE. Once you are in "special land" you have few skills, you often have no qualifications, you have no self-esteem and no life skills so then you have to be looked after for the rest of your life.

Some people dismiss concerns about discrimination in the use of language as 'political correctness'. However, there are frequently important social justice issues at stake and this is particularly the case in relation to people with disabilities. For example, the student with disability respondent indicated 'strongly agree' to the statement that "I prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'. The important argument is that 'I am a student just like other students". This student might be the voice of many children and students with disabilities who might be feeling and thinking in the same way. Such results are revealing that as educational professional we need to re-visit, re-think, and re-structure the terms we use to talk about these group of people and importantly in an educational settings. Therefore, 'people first language' seems to be more appropriate terms in language communication.

TOPOI-conceptual model developed by Edwin Hoffman when thinking about inclusion sets out the framework of the entire research study carried out. It is a fitting and relevant concept that guided the processes and progresses discussions in this study. Therefore, another important part of this idea is that, the model makes persons in communication aware of their own beliefs and of the others as they see as the reality. What is more important in this study is to try and find out the perceptions and behaviors to the communication patterns in which one can ask ; what am I saying that the other acts or behave in that particular way or is this person happy and comfortable with the language used in the communication. In this sense, educational professionals might reflect on past experiences and try it

out again with this new concept in a new experience to improve practice. This is stated very well in Ndoye (2003 p.353), that "professional skills are usually updated through engagement in active learning by connecting prior experiences to new ones and also sharing information with others through reflection and hands-on activities. Such learning processes can be achieved through experiential learning". Importantly, this is about linking theory to action. Theory is also about how things work out and is an organized system of accepted knowledge that applies in a variety of circumstances. Consequently, this might help practitioners to clearly understand their own practices and be fully responsible for their actions.

Barnes (1993 p.8) states that if we are to include these people and students in all aspects of developments in the society, and be valued as individual human beings, we must stop using negative and disempowering terms. Slee (2000) agues that ... "it is the problem of language and meaning that lies at the heart of the inclusive education project". Nevertheless, from many of Oliver (1994) articles he maintains that "if we believe that we can improve the quality of all our lives through better policy and changed practice, then we have to recognise that language has a central role to play in this improvement". Over the years we have heard and seen docomments about the change of policy and practice. Many countries have accepted the changes however, some of the practices especially in the inclusive educational settings have not been changed. In particular the past practiced disability terminologies are still being widely used by practicing education professionals. This is another evidence of this part of the discussion which was expressed by the person with disability, (Richard Rieser no date) on Human Rights, Inclusion and the Voice of the Oppressed:

... we say there is a choice, you can either stick with the old model which is faulty, where the child is faulty and spend a lot of money on this but at the bottom line there is no output for the child or for society. It is segregating and it is a denial of human rights. Or we can start by valuing the child, by developing the Social Model of Disability which includes them and using them and their peers to support that position.

69

The World Health Organization (1980) determined the following definitions, which have been generally accepted throughout the world:

impairment	an abnormality in the way organs or systems function e.g., a medical condition, eye disease, a heart problem
disability	the functional consequence of an impairment e.g., an intellectual disability due to brain impairment; low vision;deafness
handicap	the social or environmental consequence of a disability e.g., a person with a wheelchair is not handicapped when paths and buildings are wheelchair accessible

'People first language' such as 'people with disabilities' (Foreman 2000) and the determined definitions by the World Health Organization (1980) as 'impairment', 'disability' and 'handicap' that are to be used appropriately in different context of inclusion. These are friendly and inclusive terms that give values, rather than the process of becoming disabled to PWD, set them free from oppression and empowering them to equally participate in an inclusive society. On the other hand, in chapter one of this study, my definition for inappropriate disability language refers to terminologies that were used in the past practices under the medical model that encouraged discrimination, separations, segregation, exclusion, devaluing and degrading PWD. For example, terms such as 'the handicap', 'the disabled', mentally retarded, cripple, the deaf/blind, victim of, suffers from and etc. How can we continue to use terms that were used in the past practice that encouraged discrimination and exclusion and use them in the present practice in which discourages discrimination and exclusion?. Both teachers and student participants in the study either strongly disagree or disagree with these terms to be used in the inclusive practice. They all either strongly agree or agree that these terms exclude,separate and discriminate students with disabilities.

However, people with disability in particular the Union of the Physical Impaired against segregation (UPIAS), did not fully agree with the terms that were defined by the International Classification of Impairments regarding the terms 'disabilities' and 'handicaps'. They felt that the terms disabilities and handicaps were not representing their true experiences and challenges in their lives. They agreed with the term disability to be used and singled out for political attention. Thus, in the process of turning policy into practice, they adopted the following definition which is in the Constitution of the Disabled Peoples' Internationals (Davis1990).

Disability: the restriction on activity resulting from social and physical barriers erected by people who have failed to take into account the needs of individuals with physical, sensory or mental impairments.

Then 'people first language' such as; 'people with disability' is more appropriate as it is referring to people first then 'disabled people'.

However, there were some expressions by all participants that need to be discussed and clarified. One of the respondents indicated that, 'how we call them is not essential but it is how we treat them'. Referring to the literature on behavior in relation to the study, Foreman (2001p.19). points out that "Another of the many social changes that have occurred in recent years has been the recognition that language has an effect on the way we think about things" This might be true in the sense that when educational professionals think about their pupils and the words they use to communicate with especially students with special educational needs, influence the way they interact with them. In addition, Wood (1978 p.119) in Walker et al., (2004 p.31) state that "what we believe about the behavior of the students affects how we respond and act towards them". For instance, when teachers think of some pupils with special needs as dumb they tend to ignore them. He further elaborates that, "in an intervention, ideas, actions, and outcomes are tired together and greatly affect each other." Therefore, how we call them effect or influence the way we treat them and so we cannot separate how we call them to how we treat

71

them. The respondent further stated that they mostly don't care. However, the student with disability indicated that she does care about the negative terms used and especially when they are used in bad manners such as in pejorative and slur. On the other hand, student explained that when teachers and other people do not know how to relate to us then we do understand but again it is an individual values that matters. This is important for the education professionals to know that they are responsible to provide and promote inclusive environment in school.

According to one of the results of narrative analysis all respondents either strongly disagree or disagree to the statement that, ' It is appropriate to use 'disabled student' to describe students with special needs. They all expressed that students with special educational needs are not disabled but have some difficulties or specific challenges in learning. One of the respondents that indicated disagree expressed additional explanation that it is OK to use disabled student when communicating with any ordinary people for better understanding but better to avoid in front or with the student's parents. This might not help the student and the parents because after all, they live together with these other ordinary people in the community and belong to the same society. Disability terms should not be used differently for different kind or group of people. This is another form of discrimination. Inclusive education or inclusion practice is in a way discouraging discrimination and trying to help to construct inclusive barrier free society. Teachers are known as agents of change and therefore, need to help the whole society to understand the importance of using appropriate disability terms in our communication with anyone. This view is reviewed in the literature in which Dewey, (1954 p.3) sees the educators "... are the agents through which knowledge and skills are communicable and rules of conduct enforced which learning will significantly occur."

5.3 Outdated Disability Terms

Results from data analysis clearly identified some terms that were describe and expressed by respondents as 'old fashion, used in the past, not nice, slur,

pejorative, not suitable, unacceptable and improper. These terms were used to described 'outdated disability terms'. All respondents indicated in their expressions to explain their level of strengths that terms; 'cripple', 'mental retarded', 'disabled' and to some extend 'slow learner' are outdated terms in the recent social model practice of explaining disability studies. Even in Czech language these terms portray a very bad image of a human being in a way as pejorative and slur. Student respondent explained that even people with mild intellectual disabilities know that these terms are very bad and therefore, should not be used in anyway to refer to people with disabilities. Literature reviews in Foreman (2000,p.21) provides a list of terms to avoid and suggested terms to use. Corbett, (1995) in Armstrong and Armstrong and Barton, (2007-2008 p.3), call it 'bad mouthing when using terms such as 'feeble minded', 'retarded' and others that are not appropriate to use in the context of inclusion. In this way, Digby (1996,p.3) in Armstrong and Armstrong and Barton (2007-2008 p.3) argues that, "'yesterday's definition becomes today's terms of abuse'". The understanding and the full use of the TOPOI conceptual model of communication can help people avoid in this circumstances. Therefore, these terms should be discouraged at all times and ruled out in any culture of human race.

One of the respondents stated in the explanation that "In class we can avoid using it but for legislation is an important term but for common life not". This is where it can be very complex and creates confusions among people and for the people directly involved in especially the implementation of certain policies in practice. Recently people with disabilities have increasingly being in the forefront of political struggles for social reform premised not on 'equal opportunities' but on demands for human rights and social justice. It is against the daily realities of discriminatory experiences that people with disabilities struggle for a positive self-identity, empowerment and full participation in society. For example, people with hearing impairment want to keep their identities as 'deaf culture' and generally they want to be known as 'Disabled'. On the other hand, while developments are critical to the quality of lives of persons with disabilities, people with disabilities themselves claim their uniqueness of their history and their personal and cultural identities as

disabled in the sense of being different that has developed due to the oppressions and that they have continued to face. Because of the oppressions at times and in some circumstances, they just want to keep to their identities and cultures as 'disabled'. Thus, creates a more complex challenges for both people with and without disabilities in social and political levels. Historically it continues to raise serious issues in regard to empowerment, rights, equality and participation in an inclusive approach society. There is no easy solution and often turn out to be contradictory issues which, create more difficulties to make appropriate decisions. Hence, this statement made by Oliver is sending a strong message that there must be a serious discussion on disability language:

"...language cannot be understood merely as a symbolic system or code but as a discourse, or more properly, a series discourses, ... it allows for the existence of the power and inequality that exists in society to be reproduced in language use. Discourse is about more than language. Discourse is about the interplay between language and social relationships, in which some groups are able to achieve dominance for their interests in the way in which the world is defined and acted upon. A good example of this in respect of policy is the way the discourse of caring has been central to recent attempts to close down long-stay institutions of all kinds. In linking language to politics through the notion of discourse". The other example is the "language of welfare provision serves to deny disabled people the right to be treated as fully competent, autonomous individuals, as active citizens" (Oliver 1994).

This statement refers to the importance of appropriate disability language in all aspects of understanding disability studies in the inclusive context. (Hugman 1991.37in Oliver 1994) "Language is a central aspect of discourse through which power is reproduced and communicated". Ultimately, the use of appropriate disability terminologies used in language communication is an important issue that needs serious attention in both people with and without disabilities and in particular in this research study reference made to education professionals. More studies in this area should be carried out involving all stake holders, parents, students, education professional at all levels, other specialists either in related fields or

directly involve with disability work and people with disabilities. There must be some kind of solution or answer given to this issue in this research study especially for the inclusive education practitioners as they are the agents of change.

5.4 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter which adds to another important part of this research study contains the discussions and the interpretations of the results from the investigation in the context of the review of literature and in the whole context of this study. Three significant themes emerged from the data analyzed and were critically discussed in this chapter. The themes (1) Label-Use of Real Names, (2) Appropriate Inclusive Disability Terms; and (3) Outdated Disability Terms were critically discussed as the results of the study from future education professional with and without disability and relating to literature reviews on theories and on others' views. As the result of this discussion it has brought more opportunities to new in-sights and in-depth understanding of this issue especially in educational context. However, it became more interesting and challenging when the discussion linked to and involved the disability study in general from time to time and in parts. Thus, turns to provide the whole picture of the issue in the study. Nevertheless, the study found out that for good practice and for the success of inclusive education, education professionals need to take note and take time to think it through before using appropriate disability terminologies in language in their interactions with all students in an inclusive setting and as well as in the community at large. In addition, out of individual and human respect and in equality students with disability have to be call by their given real names and not referred to their disability that is labeled term which in noway is a given name to them. In that way, students also feel good, better, equal and included in school. Further, out of date terms must not be used and avoided at all cost because these terms no longer are appropriate, suitable, acceptable in the new approach of understanding disability studies in this inclusive contemporary society. This study has evidently provided some interesting new in-sights and in-depth understanding of the issue and would encourage more studies in future, to find positive answers or solutions to this historical complex

circumstances, involving both people with and without disabilities to celebrate differences in an inclusive barrier-free society.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

6.0 Overview of the Chapter

This research has investigated the use of appropriate disability terminologies in relation to inclusion with special reference to education professionals. The first section presents the evaluation of the research study undertaken. The second section presents the major conclusions and implications drawn from the study. The third section makes some recommendations for practice and action, which emanated from the findings of the study. The final section makes recommendations for further research.

6.1 Evaluation of the research study undertaken.

The interest in the research topic came about as the result of studying inclusion and finding out that many practicing countries and practitioners are saying that it is not working or others saying that it is failing. We have seen different schools in different countries, heard so many different education professionals from classroom teachers to university professors talking about inclusion practice. They talked about theories, models, histories, developments, social, economic and politics of inclusion, different children, parents, teachers and different practices at different levels of schooling. The same is written in all the books you can read about inclusive education or inclusion. Many were saying the same things but expressing in different ways. There are so many things and ideas said about the practice itself that made it so complex to understand and find solution(s). Others are talking about advance technologies while others want to bring back the past. Others are trying to take children with disabilities to improve and develop their skills from animals and plants. There seem to be total confusions and no proper direction and truth about inclusion.

Nevertheless, this has been the researchers simple and humble strategy in one of the many challenges in inclusive education back at home country to try and make inclusion work. With many years of experiences working with children and people with disabilities, researcher strongly feels that the most challenging battle is human attitudes. This can be seen especially in chapter one but also in the whole study context. Therefore, the researcher specifically chose this research topic ' The Use of Appropriate Disability Terminology in Relation to Inclusion with Special Reference to Education Professionals'. The researcher's expression in prologue in (p. x) referring to inclusion practice. The main driving question in this study is 'Why is it important for inclusive education professionals to use appropriate disability terminologies in language communication in inclusive setting. The researcher is including another expression which is giving the message of what had happened and why is it happening this way, referring to the use of disability terminologies in language communication:

Powerful flood from the highest mountains forces its way down the rivers carrying debris along as the river flows fast into the sea. The sea washes the debris clean and shiny and throw them back on the beach. Mmm... I thought the debris have disappeared for good but the same appeared again this time around with different outlooks but they are the same debris seen in the areas surrounding the mountains and the rivers before. (Mailil 2008)

The rationale was precise and clear targeting the education professionals and the importance of using the appropriate disability language was also made clear. Target group of study participants initially plan see; in *3.2.5 Method of Research Participant* Selection for well balanced, consistency and validity reason. However, because the initial plan did not work out as anticipated, the students without disability and one student with disability studying special education/psychology at the Faculty of Education at the Charles University in Prague. participants voluntarily participated in the study and made good contribution to the success of this study. They gave the study a balance representation of being students studying inclusive education, students with and without disability, and future education professionals.

They also might represent voices, actions, practices and interpretations as individuals and collectively. This was evident in the data collected and analyzed. Their participations and contributions greatly affected the discussions in chapter 4,5, and 6. which were also evident in the whole context of the study. As the result, it helped to provide the answer to the main question in the study.

In literature review the TOPOI conceptual model of communication was specifically selected for this study which gave meaning and provided conceptual guidance and also gave direction to the discussions and findings in the study. Theories and literature reviews on labeling, behavior were relevant in the sense that in an intervention, ideas, actions, and outcomes are tired together and greatly affect each other which, supported the study. There were more than enough literature reviews to back up the findings. Even many appropriate literature reviews were used in the whole context of the study. In the same note, the selection and the application of the methodologies made another additional to the success of this research. The different methods, approaches and strategies employed were carefully and systematically applied where appropriate and relevant. The Likert four point scale used in the questionnaire was effective and helped to collect appropriate and relevant data needed. The paradigms used as the conceptual framework for the methods to carry out the study, the mixed methods that were guided by the latest (Jang, et al.,2008), and the case study used as the strategy to carry out the study and collect data were all applied and implemented. Triangulation took place effectively in the way that there was constant checking on the variety of methods used and different respondents but in the same site with same interest provided validity and reliability to the findings. The results of the success was evident in the data analysis. There was proper procedure of analyzing the data in place which was guided by the *Figure 4.2 structure of Mixed Method Data Analytic Procedure* for this Research Study. Both quantitative and qualitative data analyzed systematically and displayed findings effectively. Hence, the data analyzed resulted as the new themes emerged thus, added new insights and in-depth understanding of the question in the study. Consequently, evaluation of the

findings were presented in a logical manner with the support and back up of the literature reviewed and the whole context of the research study. This is all evident in the discussions that were presented in the study. Ultimately, the end of the study discussions and the presentation can be followed back and forth at ease linking up the different chapters and ending up with the same desired answer to the research question.

6.2 Conclusions and Implications of the Study

The finding of the study revealed three important areas (1) Label-Use of Real Names, (2) Appropriate Inclusive Disability Terms; and (3) Outdated Disability Terms, in the use of disability language. The study also identified the different terms in particular the 'people first language' that were generally agreed by both teachers and student with disability to be appropriate terminologies to use in disability language when education professionals communicate especially with students with disabilities in an inclusive educational setting. The finding showed the positive levels of their strength, in other word, 'measuring' their attitudes towards the most like appropriate terms to use. Findings also revealed majority of strong strengths which means positive attitudes for appropriate terms. In addition, the positive concepts used in their expressions in their explanations to their chose of terms showed great significance in the way they feel and think about certain terms in the disability language in inclusive practice. The study findings identified frequently used concepts such as human values and dignity, equality, and respect, which were evidence of their positive attitudes towards using appropriate disability terminologies. All findings were checked against the theories and literature reviews which reveals and illustrates realities and ultimately answers the question in the research study. When teachers use appropriate disability language all students but especially students with disabilities feel good, welcome and comfortable and included in learning. Thus, students are motivated will continue to advance in learning. On the other hand, teacher also feels good and satisfied with teaching and will continue to improve and increase in professionalism. However, the other

issues relating to the use of disability terms were also identified at times comparing what both teachers and student were expressing and relating to the theory and literature review. In that way, certain issues were clarified for positive attitudes and good practice for education professionals. Ultimately, the study findings aimed to help education professional to reflect on their practice, revisit, re-assess, and re-think of their attitudes in the way they use disability terminologies in practice. Hence, teachers make changes if they have to improve on their personal and professional development. This would lead to good practice and successful inclusion of all students equally and actively participating in school activities.

6.3 Recommendations for Practice and Action

It is very clear that globally, there is a real concern and every effort made to make inclusion work. For instance, a parent of a student with a disability shared this part of her experiences in the paper presented in the 'Human Rights, Inclusion and the Voice of the Oppressed' (Richard Rieser no date):

Inclusion and the social model of disability are regarded by too many people in the 'caring professions' as rhetoric, or mere rhetoric. But for us they are a lived reality, and the hope and promise of a better future. They give us an understanding of our oppression and a tool to combat it.

In this view, the first recommendation suggested is that, as the saying goes; 'simplicity is the best' Many in special / inclusive education field see other issues as of big importance to make inclusive education work through additional and expensive resources of materials, man power and high technologies. These can also help however, we need to see the power of the use of language that can make a lot of difference in the whole context of inclusive education. It is worthless and does not take energy and time. Everyone involves in making a positive change to use appropriate disability language, benefits freely in the way that one feels good about self and what one is doing for others and finally everyone succeed. The second recommendation suggested is that to use the 'human natural power'. Inclusive and inclusion education is about human beings and for the human beings.

81

Human beings are responsible for the cause of any action which, usually comes within them. Work within developing a human being to produce positive and good results. It is all about human beings' attitudes. We need to have positive attitudes to relate to another human being. This can be done earlier in life as a child growing up to adulthood. It can also be done in schools, in the community and for the education professionals in teacher training programs, staff developments, in-services, workshops and in conferences. In this way, educational professionals can be seen as the true agents of change and can influence others and make a difference in their lives.

6.4 Recommendations for Further Research

They are many research studies done in other related issues in inclusion and have included in parts of their discussions in the use of disability terminologies and language. They are also papers presented in lectures and conferences. While there are still many areas of research that can be executed, this particular issue can be further researched. As evidently presented in the findings that 'People First Language' is the disability language that has a bigger impact on the disability studies because as, Hugman (1991.37) in Oliver (1994) claims that "Language is a central aspect of discourse through which power is reproduced and communicated". For political recognition and reasons, people with disabilities strongly defended the language of 'Disabled People' which, in other walks of life it simply displays the disability first and not the person. In this way, many people are not interested to deal with the disability but more often show interest to relate to the person. Disabled first will continue to encourage discrimination, labeling, exclusion and so on. As the result, the idea to include all in a barrier-free society can be still complex and the history repeats itself again. Therefore, recommendation for 'People First Language' research can be a follow up of this current research study.

Bibliography

Armstrong & Armstrong & Barton (2007-2008). <u>Introduction: What is this book about?</u> European Master/Magister in Special Education Needs – Erasmus Mundus; Inclusion Reader 2007 - 2008.

Barnes, C. (2007). <u>Disability Activism and the Struggle for Change:</u> Disability, Policy and Politics in UK DOI: 10.1177/1746197907081259. Education, Citizenship and Social Justice 2007; 2; 203. UK.

Barnes, C. Barton, L. & Oliver, M. (2004). <u>Obituary Paul Abberley: an appreciation; Disability & Society,</u> Vol. 19, No. 6, October 2004.

Barnes, C. (2001). <u>Emancipator y' Disability Research: project or process?</u> Public Lecture at City Chambers, Glasgow, on 24 October 2001 Centre for Disability Studies Department of Sociology and Social Policy University of Leeds London.

Barton, L. (1993). <u>Disability, Difference and the Politics of Definition</u> – Inaugural lecture. The University of Sheffied London.

Beukering, van.T.,Touw, H. & Everaert, H. (2005). Teachers' Personal Constructs on Problem Behaviour: towards professional development. University of Professional education Hogeschool Utrecht, Facultyof Education)&(in Erasmus Mundus; Inclusion Reader 2007- 2008).

Bouma, D. (1996). <u>The research process (3rd Edn.).</u> Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2004). Social Research Methods (2nd ed.), Oxford University Press New

Clark, L & Marsh, S. (2002). Patriarchy in the UK; The Language of Disability: http://www.disabilitynow.org.uk, Wikepedia Website.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). Research methods in education (4th Edn.). London: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). Research methods in education (5th Edn.,). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Creswell, J.W. (2002). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merill.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd Edn.). California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (2nd Edn.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2002). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merill.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd Edn.). California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (2nd Edn.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Davis, K. (1990). A Social Barriers Model of Disability: Theory into Practice; The Emergence of the "Seven Needs". Paper prepared for the Derbyshire Coalition of Disabled People: February, 1990.

Devlieger, P., Rusch, F., & Pfeiffer, D. (2003). Rethinking Disability as Same and Different!   Towards a Cultural Model of Disability. European Master/Magister in Special Education Needs – Erasmus Mundus INCLUSION Reader 2007-2008.

Dewey, J. (1959). Experience and Education, Macmillan Company, New York.

Foreman, P. (2001). Integration and Inclusion in Action 2nd edition., Sydney: Harcourt.

Gephart, R. (1999). Paradigms research methods. Retrieved on 19, March 2005, fromhttp://www.aom,pace.edu/rmd.

Goodwin, W. L. and Goodwin, L. D. (1996). Understanding Qualitative and Quantitative Research in Early Childhood Education: New York, London: Teacher College, Columbia University, Columbia University.

Gordon, C., & Arthur, M., (2002). ESS403 Managing Behavior Problem Faculty of Education, Module 2, Charles Sturt University, New South Wales, Australia.

Hoffman, E. (2001). Inclusive Thinking and Acting: Inter-culture and Communication and Management of Diversity in Social Work practice: European Master/Magister in Special Education Needs – Erasmus Mundus; Inclusion Reader 2007 - 2008.

Jang, E., McDougall, D., Pollon, D., Herbert, M., Russell, P. (2008). Integrative Mixed Method Data Analytic Strategies in Research on School Success in Challenging Circumstances: Journal of Mixed Methods Research Volume 2 No.3 July 2008 221 - 247

King County (2007). Office of Civil Rights; Department of Executive Services, Disability Language and Etiquette, http://www.disabilitynow.org.uk Web pages, Wikepedia.

Krauss, S. E. (2005). Research Paradigms and Meaning: A Primer. The Qualitative Report Volume 10 Number 4. University Putra Selangor, D, E, Malaysia.

Linsay, G. (2003). Inclusion: a critical perspective. British Journal of Special Education, 30(1),3-12

Mackenzie, N. and Knipe, S. (2006). Research Dilemmas; Paradigms, Methods and Methodology: Issues in Education research 16 (2), 193-205 .

Maxwell, J. A., Bashbook, P. G., & Sandlow, C. J. (1986). Combining Ethnographic and Experimental Methods in educational Evaluation. In D. M. Fetterman & M. A. Pittman (Eds), Educational Ethnography in Theory, Practice, and Politics (pp. 121-143). Beverly Hills, CA:Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. California: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Ndoye, B. (2003). Experiential Learning, Self-beliefs and Adult Performance in Senegal.
International Journal of Lifelong Education, 22(4), 353-366.

Oliver, M. (1994). <u>Politics and Language: Understanding the Disability Discourse.</u> Paper prepared for Inclusion in the MA in Disability Studies Programme: Dept of Psychotherapy, University of Sheffield.

Oliver, M. (1996). <u>Understanding Disability from Theory to Practice</u> (Basingstoke, Palgrave Press).

Oliver, M. (1990). <u>The politics of disablement</u>. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Ponte, P. (2005). <u>Reciprocal Relationships between first-and second-order research in a Postgraduate School of Education: the development of a Reflective Culture,</u> European Master/Magister in Special Education Needs – Erasmus Mundus; Inclusion Reader 2006- 2007.

Rieser, R. (no date). <u>Human Rights Inclusion and the Voice of the Oppressed:</u> London UK.

Robson, C. (2002). <u>Real World Research (2nd ed.):</u> Oxford Blackwell.

Rombo, J. L. (2007). <u>School Cultural Features and Practices that Influence Inclusive Education in Papua New Guinea:</u> A Consideration of Schools in Southern Highlands Province. An Unpublished M Ed Dissertation at School of Education, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Rose, D. W. (2006). <u>British Journal of Religious Education Vol. 28, No.2, March 2006, pp.185-199.</u>

Slee, R. (2001). <u>Social Justice and the Changing Directions in Educational Research: thecase of inclusive education. Int.j. Inclusive Education, 2001, VOL. 5, NO. 2/3,167-177.</u>

Slee, R. (2000). <u>Social Justice and the changing Directions in Educational research:</u>
<u>the case of Inclusive.</u>

Smith D. & Luckasson, R. (1995). <u>Introduction to Special Education;</u> The University of
New Mexico, United States of America.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2006). A General Typology of Research Designs
Featuring Mixed Methods, <u>Research in the Schools 13 (1), 12-28.</u>

The Open University, <u>Making your eaching Inclusive, http://www.disabilitynow.org.uk,</u>
<u>Wikepedia Website.</u>

Vislie. (2003). From integrating to inclusion: focusing global trends and changes in
the Western European society. <u>European Journal of Special Needs Education,</u>
<u>18(1),17-35.</u>

Walker, J. E., & Shea, T. M. (2004). <u>Behavior Management; A Practical Approach for</u>
<u>Educators (8th ed.),</u> Upper Saddle River, New Jersey Columbus, Ohio, USA.

Westwood, P. (1997).<u>Commonsense Methods for Children with Special Needs,</u>
London: Routledge / Falmer.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE - INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL

TITLE: THE USE OF APPROPRIATE DISABILITY LANGUAGE IN RELATION TO INCLUSION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

Dear _____

- I understand that you are currently involved in teaching in an inclusive class.
- I want to know how you feel and think about certain disability terminologies that you are using or might want to use when describing students with disabilities and special educational needs.
- This will help me and the student teachers in the teacher training program to use appropriate disability language in our inclusive schools.
- Please complete this short questionnaire and return to me through your school administration office, if possible before ____ / ____ 2008.
- Your reply will be treated as confidential.
- Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

_____

Donna Mailil

Erasmus Mundus Student – Charles University Prague

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL

Note: <u>Put a cross in the box of your choice to each statement and briefly explain your choice in the space provided below.</u>

T 1. It is appropriate to call student with disabilities by their given names.

Strongly Agree	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Disagree	☐
Disagree	☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 2. Principle of 'people first' eg. 'people / student with disability' is appropriate to use.

Strongly Agree	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Disagree	☐
Disagree	☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 3. It is appropriate to use 'disable student' to describe students with special needs.

Strongly Agree	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Disagree	☐
Disagree	☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 4. Intellectual / mental disability is an appropriate term to use than mentally retarded.

Strongly Agree	☐
Agree	☐

Strongly Disagree ☐

Disagree ☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 5. Cripple person is an appropriate term to use to describe people with physical disability.

Strongly Agree ☐

Agree ☐

Strongly Disagree ☐

Disagree ☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 6. It is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language.

Strongly Agree ☐

Agree ☐

Strongly Disagree ☐

Disagree ☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE - STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT WITH DISABILITY

TITLE: THE USE OF APPROPRIATE DISABILITY TERMINOLOGIES IN RELATION TO INCLUSION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

Dear _____

- I understand that you are a student at the Charles University.
- I want to know how you feel and think about certain disability terminologies that your teachers / tutors are using or might use to describe students with disabilities and special needs.
- This will help me and the student teachers in the teacher training program in my country to use appropriate disability language in our inclusive schools.
- Please complete this short questionnaire and return to me through my email **patroniam@hotmail.com** if possible before ____ / ____ 2008.
- Your reply will be treated as confidential.
- Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

_____

Donna Mailil

Erasmus Mundus student – Charles University Prague

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT WITH DISABILITY

Note: Put a cross in the box of your choice to each statement and briefly explainyour choice in the space provided below.

S 1. I feel good as a person when teachers call me by my real names.

Strongly Agree ☐

Agree ☐

Strongly Disagree ☐

Disagree ☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 2. I prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'

Strongly Agree ☐

Agree ☐

Strongly Disagree ☐

Disagree ☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 3. I am <u>not</u> comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'.

Strongly Agree	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Disagree	☐
Disagree	☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 4. I do <u>not</u> think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school.

Strongly Agree	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Disagree	☐
Disagree	☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 5. It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'

Strongly Agree	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Disagree	☐
Disagree	☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 6. I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'.

Strongly Agree ☐
Agree ☐
Strongly Disagree ☐
Disagree ☐

Please explain your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU

APPENDIX: C SAMPLE TRANSLATED QUESTIONNAIRE IN CZECH -
INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

Q-T DOTAZNÍK PRO UČITELE V INKLUZIVNÍCH TTŘÍDÁCH

V dotazníku je postupně uvedeno šesst tvrzení. U každého tvrzení uveďte míru Vašeho souhlasu, resp. nesouhlasu, s tvrzením tak, že umístíte křížek do příslučného čtverečku. Váš názor pak stručně zdůvodněte.

T1. Je vhodné postižené žáky nazývat jejich křestními jměny.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 2. Principle of 'people first' eg. 'people / student with disability' is appropriate to use.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 3. Je vhodné používat označení "postižený žák" pro žáky se zvláštními potřebami.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 4. Tam, kde jde o mentální retardaci, je vhodné používat termínu intelektuální

(mentální) postižení.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 5 Mrzák je termín vhodný pro označení člověka s fyzickým postižením.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

T 6. It is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability language.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q-S DOTAZNÍK PRO STUDENTY S POSTIŽENÍM

V dotazníku je postupně uvedeno šesst tvrzení. U každého tvrzení uveďte míru Vašeho souhlasu, resp. nesouhlasu, s tvrzením tak, že umístíte křížek do příslučného čtverečku. Váš názor pak stručně zdůvodněte.

S 1. Cítím se dobře, když mne učitel oslovuje mým jménem.

Velmi souhlasím	☐
Souhlasím	☐
Nesouhlasím	☐
Velmi nesouhlasím	☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 2. Dávám přednost tomu aby o mně učitel mluvil jako o "žákovi" a ne jako o postiženém.

Velmi souhlasím	☐
Souhlasím	☐
Nesouhlasím	☐
Velmi nesouhlasím	☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 3. NENÍ pro mne povzbudivé, když mne učitel označuje jako "handikepovaného žáka".

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 4. NEMYSLÍM si, že mentálně retardovaný žák je termín, kterého by se mělo pou   žívat ve škole.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 5. Je vhodnější, aby učitel používal označení "žák s fyzickým postižením" než

"mrzák" nebo "žák na kolečkovém křesle".

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

S 6. Cítím se špatně, když učitel používá označení "pomalý žák".I feel bad

when teachers use the term 'slow learner'.

Velmi souhlasím ☐

Souhlasím ☐

Nesouhlasím ☐

Velmi nesouhlasím ☐

Zdůvodněte, prosím, Váš názor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix E: Sample Questionnaire Response - Students with Disability

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT WITH DISABILITY

Note: Put a cross beside your choice to each statement and briefly explain your choice in the space provided below.

I feel good as a person when teachers call me by my real names.

X Agree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice.

In spite of my handicap I am person like other students. I think that handicap is not important when we speak with handicapped person. I feel better when teachers call me by real names because handicap isn´t important, they speak with me as other students „they do not see my handicap" and i am person with positive and negative characters as other people.

I prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'

Agree

X Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice.

I am student as other students and teachers say me „student", they have never said me „disable". My teachers called me by my real name or said me student but they did not call me „blind" or „disable".

I am not comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'.
Agree

Strongly agree

X Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice.

There are important different situations. When teachers speak with me, they call me by my real names but the fact is, that I am handicapped student and I do not mind when teachers in some situations call me handicapped student for example when teachers do not know my name (in the school there are many students so teachers do not know students´names) so they call me handicapped or blind and other student and me know that teachers speak to me or about me. When teacher do not know my name and want speak with me and say me: „blind student" I think It is OK.

I do not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in school.

Agree

X Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice.

I think that people with small mental handicap know very well what this term mean and they are stigmatized by this term. People think that they are as child and there is not equality between mental handicapped and intact.

It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple

person' or 'wheel chair student'

X Agree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice.

Term „student with physical disability" mean that first is here student, person and secondary is there some specific character- disability. In my opinion cripple person is absolutely unsuitable term but wheel chair student is specific term- I think that it is same for example as term „student with visual handicap" (to this group belong blind, low vision,....) and the term „student with physical disability" is general (there are many people who need sticks but not wheel chair). I think that is important to have this term „wheel chair person" because if we know that it is wheel chair student we will know that this person will need for example ramp which do not need student with sticks but both of them students are physical disability.

I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'.

X Agree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice.

I think that teacher would accent student´s positive characters and handicapped students are many a time slow but it does not mean that they learn slowly but handicap slows down for example reading, writing,... but students are not slow learners - they need only more time on working with informations.

Notes:

We have many terms that mean handicap. I think that majority of this terms are OK and handicapped person do not mind (but when they are not meant pejorative). For example in czech we distinguish these words of visual impairment:

1) **Blind- slepý**- this term some handicapped people mind

2) **Nevidomý** (I do not know equivalent term in english - may be unseeing?) - these term is most suitable and is not pejorative

3) visually handicapped (here are people with different visual defects- blind, low vision,…)

In some situations I do not mind that other people call me blind, because the fact is I do not see and in other czech words we use only blind (slepý) not nevidomý:

Blind stick- **slepec**ká hůl

Deaf blind- hluchoslepý

Braille- **slepecký** tisk

I think that when speak intact people with handicapped person, they would use terms that are most suitable so not say that the person is blind but that is nevidomý (in english unseeing?), because some handicapped people term blind do not mind and they use each other this term but some handicapped would this term mind.

In some situations intact people do not know how call handicapped person, often they do not call him „blind, handicapped,…..“and there is problem with communication. For example when I get into bus, people do not know how call me, so the say „ sit down“ and blind person do not know that they speak with her (there may be old man too), so it would be better in this situation when they would use term „blind“

APPENDIX F: TALLY SHEET IN TABLES FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

Tally sheet for Inclusive Education Professionals

T. QUESTION 1. It is appropriate to call students with disabilities by their given names

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
TQ1	Strongly Agree	////	4		Agree	7	100 %
	Agree	///	3				
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree		
	Disagree						
	Total	7	7				

T. QUESTION 2. Principle of 'people first' eg. people/student with disability is appropriate to use.

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
TQ 2	Strongly Agree	///	3		Agree	7	100%
	Agree	////	4				
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree		
	Disagree						
	Total	7	7				

T. QUESTION 3. It is appropriate to use 'disabled student' to describe students

with special needs

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
TQ 3	Strongly Agree				Agree		
	Agree						
	Strongly Disagree	///	3		Disagree	7	100%
	Disagree	////	4				
	Total	7	7				

T. QUESTION 4. Intellectual / mental disability is an appropriate term to use than mentally retarded.

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
TQ 4	Strongly Agree	//	2		Agree	4	57
	Agree	//	2				
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree	3	43
	Disagree	///	3				
	Total	7	7				100

T. QUESTION 5. Cripple person is an appropriate term to use to describe people with physical disability

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
TQ 5	Strongly Agree				Agree		
	Agree						
	Strongly Disagree	////	4		Disagree	7	100%
	Disagree	///	3				
	Total	7	7				

T. QUESTION 6. It is important that teachers use positive and inclusive disability   language.

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
TQ 6	Strongly Agree	///	3		Agree	6	86
	Agree	///	3				
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree	1	14
	Disagree	/	1				
	Total	7	7				100

APPENDIX G: TALLY SHEET IN TABLES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY

Tally sheet for Students with Disability

S. QUESTION 1. I feel good as a person when teachers call me by my real names.

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
SQ1	Strongly Agree				Agree	1	
	Agree	/	1				
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree		
	Disagree						
	Total	1	1				

S. QUESTION 2. I prefer my teachers call me 'student' and not 'disable'

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
SQ 2	Strongly Agree	/	1		Agree	1	
	Agree						
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree		
	Disagree						
	Total	1	1				

S. QUESTION 3. I am not comfortable when teachers call me 'handicap student'

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
SQ 3	Strongly Agree				Agree		
	Agree						
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree	1	
	Disagree	/	1				
	Total	1	1				

S. QUESTION 4. I do not think that mentally retarded term is appropriate to be used in   school.

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
SQ 4	Strongly Agree	/	1		Agree	1	
	Agree						
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree		
	Disagree						
	Total	1	1				

S. QUESTION 5. It is appropriate for teachers to use the term 'student with physical disability' than 'cripple person' or 'wheel chair student'.

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
SQ 5	Strongly Agree				Agree	1	
	Agree	/	1				
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree		
	Disagree						
	Total	1	1				

S. QUESTION 6. I feel bad when teachers use the term 'slow learner'

Items	Attitude Strength	Tally	Frequency	Percentage	Attitude Strength	Total	%
SQ 6	Strongly Agree				Agree	1	
	Agree	/	1				
	Strongly Disagree				Disagree		
	Disagree						
	Total	1	1				