

Attitudes Of Elementary School Students Toward Their Peers With Disabilities. Amman, Jordan

Nazem Qandeel¹, Anan Abumariam²

¹Assistant Professor, Special Education Al-Ahliyya Amman University Amman, Jordan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6369-1652>

²Assistant Professor, Special Education Al-Ahliyya Amman University Amman, Jordan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8712-2059>

Abstract: The objective of this paper is to examine the attitudes of elementary school students toward their disabled peers. The sample consisted of (421) students without disabilities in the eighth to tenth grades who attended public and private inclusive schools in Amman. The (Students' attitudes scale was administered to evaluate student 'attitudes toward inclusion, the validity and reliability were confirmed for the scale. The study's findings indicated that students' attitudes toward this category of peers are more positive if it was a female student, if they attend a public school, if one of his or her family members has a disability, and finally, if the student is older. Logistic regression analysis was used to examine the predictors of attitudes, results showed that the gender and class grade dimensions can be used to predict the attitudes of students toward their peers who have disabilities. Further recommendations were provided including the use of structured interviews and observations to assess student attitudes in a more natural setting.

Keywords: attitude, inclusion, special needs.

I. Introduction

Inclusion of disabled children in regular schools has been one of the most significant advancements for disabled children in the preceding decades. Students with disabilities who attend regular schools, rather than special education institutions, are meant to have a greater opportunity to interact and make friends with typically developing classmates. While the majority of kids with disabilities thrive socially in normal schools, some struggle to find acceptance and company; This demonstrates that ensuring proper inclusion is not a simple process. This requires positive experiences for children with disabilities in general education settings, where their peers value and befriend them. As a result, it is necessary for ordinary pupils to maintain a positive attitude toward their disabled colleagues. (Alnahdi, 2019; De Boer et al., 2012)

Many aspects play a role in the process of including disabled students in regular schools, such as teachers' attitudes, class size, and the type of student's disability. Another aspect that

is described as important is the attitudes of ordinary students towards this group of students. Negative attitudes may be hindering, such as physical barriers, which limit persons with disabilities from fully participating in schools and communities. As a result, one of the most significant challenges in inclusive education is students' attitudes toward their peers who have disabilities. (Kim et al., 2015)

Children in inclusive environments must be encouraged to be responsive to their peers with disabilities; the optimal age for this is early childhood, particularly given that older children may demonstrate negative behaviors toward other children with disabilities. Due to certain fears associated with interacting with peers who have disabilities, these students may have fewer opportunities for social interaction and integration with their typically developing peers; therefore, acceptance of other children must be developed to prevent early rejection of children with disabilities. (Ostrosky et al., 2015)

1.1. Inclusion:

In many countries, inclusion is a major concern in educational policies. In schools, inclusion includes a holistic perspective for students and emphasizes their active participation in school and social activities, considering the pace of their academic, social, emotional and personal development. (Reis et al., 2020)

The inclusion of children with disabilities in the internationally dominant educational milieu has been approved and encouraged through research over the past decades. After decades of excluding children with developmental disabilities from regular schools, Arab countries have joined the global movement toward a more inclusive education for these children. However, despite the policies that encourage inclusive education and the pervasiveness of the discourse of full inclusion in these countries, the practical translation of this policy and discourse into inclusive classroom-level practice remains a formidable challenge. (Alkhateeb et al., 2016)

The basic principal of an inclusive school is that children should learn together, no matter how possible, regardless of the difficulties or differences that they may have, and the inclusive school must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of its students, and accommodate all the different styles and learning levels they face. (Reis et al., 2020)

Inclusion has advantages including academic success, social and emotional growth, self-esteem, and peer recognition will all benefiting from careful preparation and provision of inclusive education. Stigma, stereotyping, bigotry, and isolation can all be avoided by including minority students in conventional classes and colleges. (United Nations Educational & Organization, 2020)

1.2. Attitude:

Attitudes refer to a person's proclivity to behave in a particular manner, and they are often affected by a person's personality and impressions gained from personal interactions as a part of a community or society. (Lee et al., 2020)

Attitudes towards persons with disabilities vary greatly from country to other, from culture to another, and even within the community itself. Attitudes towards these persons were and are still negative in most societies, passing through

the Egyptian, Greek, and Chinese civilizations to the present time. (Munyi, 2012)

One of the main issues of inclusive education is regular students' attitudes toward students with disabilities. Peer exclusion, fewer friendships, and even rejection can all result from a negative attitude. This can have a significant impact on the lives of young children with disabilities, leading to struggles of participation in social events, low academic achievement, school dropout, and/or problem behavior. Rejection and abuse may, in the worst cases, have long-term harmful effects, such as depression and other mental health problems. (De Boer et al., 2012)

As can be seen from the preceding, that working on changing negative attitudes towards students and individuals with disabilities requires great effort from all societies. Excluding them from communities and schools has negative consequences for them. Instead, teachers and leaders must work hard to include them in schools and communities. They are a part of the community, communicating with them and interacting with them frequently will give them a better result. (Alorani & AL-labadi, 2020)

2. Method:

2.1. Research Design:

This is quantitative research that use a survey approach to collect data on Jordanian students' attitudes about the inclusion of their disabled classmates in regular school settings.

2.2. Procedure & Sample:

Before conducting the research, ethical approval were obtained from the Jordanian Ministry of Education for the ethical consideration of participants. The selection of schools were the first step in the participant recruiting process. sex inclusive schools (3 public schools, and 3 private schools), were selected based on the availability of the target grades in the study (grades 8th, 9th, and 10th) with at least an educational channel of communication between teachers and students (e-learning platform or one of the social media). The study sample included (421) male and female students in Amman schools from elementary grades (8 to 10), reflecting both private, and public schools, Table (1) provides the details of the sample:

Table 1: study sample

	Private schools			Public schools			
	8th grade	9th grade	10th grade	8th grade	9th grade	10th grade	
male	38	38	42	34	32	34	218
female	36	34	33	31	35	34	203
total	74	72	75	65	67	68	421

The student sample were randomly chosen, by sending a questionnaire to the principals of the schools participating in the study sample, and they were the ones who sent it to their students through their teachers and student counsellors. Before distributing questionnaires, Consent from parents was obtained for their children's participation in the study, as was consent from students who decided to engage in this research (Through their teachers and student counsellors). Researchers utilized a script to describe the purpose of the study, the response key for the questionnaire, the term disability, and examples of the many types of disabilities to students (Following the non-categorical approach to disability, we classified children with disabilities in the questionnaires given to the students as "children who have difficulties in their everyday activities due to impairment or a chronic disease."). All participants were given total confidentiality and voluntary involvement.

Due of the quarantine imposed during the Covid-19 pandemic, the participants completed the questionnaire via Google Form. During the school year 2020-2021, the survey was completed in 6 schools, from September 2020 to December 2020.

2.3. Research Questions:

To accomplish the objectives, this research sought to address the following questions:

Q1. What are the students' attitudes towards their peers with disabilities?

Q2. Are there significant differences between the attitudes towards students with special needs and demographic variables (gender, school type, class grade, and having a disability in your family)?

Q3. What are the most predictive variables (gender, school type, class grade, and having a disability in your family) of the variation of students' attitudes towards disabled peers?

2.4. Instrument:

To Achieve the Study's Objectives, the researchers developed (Students' attitudes scale

towards inclusion of their peers with special needs in schools). Literature review was achieved by reviewing multiple scales such as The Chedoke-McMaster Attitudes Toward Children with Handicap (CATCH) (Rosenbaum et al., 1986), The Interaction with Disabled Persons (IDP) Scale (Gething & Wheeler, 1992), and The Multidimensional Attitudes Scale toward Persons with Disabilities (MAS) (Findler et al., 2007). They also reviewed articles related to the same topic as (Alorani & AL-labadi, 2020),(Alnahdi, 2019), and (Tsakiridou & Polyzopoulou, 2019). Accordingly, the scale consisted of 44 items and based on 3 subscales, 1st the affective subscale containing 17 items, second, the cognitive subscale that contains 12 items and 3rd the behavioral subscale containing 15 items. The scale is calculated by giving numerical values of the item scale using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The following equation was used to classify the different responses into three categories: The highest value - the lowest value of the answer alternatives divided by the number of levels, $(5-1) \div 3 = 1.33$ and this value is equal to the length of the category. Thus, the low level is from $1.00 + 1.33 = 2.33$ (1.00 - 2.33), The average level is from (2.34 - 3.67) And the high level is from 3.68 - 5.00.

2.4.1. Validity and reliability:

Cronbach alphas have been calculated to examine scale reliability (Table 2). The results indicated good reliability across the three subscales, affective, behavioral, and cognitive (0.887, 0.703 and 0.835, respectively). Cronbach's alpha reliability for the full score on the scale (44 items) was calculated to be 0.918, suggesting good internal consistency. the structure validity of the scale was calculated by correlations between the three subscales and the overall scale were all significant at .01 level (see Table 2).

Table 2. Subscale Internal Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient).

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Correlation with the scale (overall)
Behavioral	0.703	15	0.790
Affective	0.887	17	0.771
Cognitive	0.835	12	0.821
Overall	0.918	44	-

2.5. Statistical analysis:

Means and standard deviations for the overall scale and its components were calculated. Additionally, a multiple regression analysis was used to determine the predictability of demographic variables associated with attitude. All statistical analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 26). We also utilized Jefferies' amazing statistics software (JASP) to calculate the variance ratio (eta squared).

3. Result:**3.1. Attitudes toward disabled peers:**

The mean values of students' attitudes toward peers with disabilities are shown in Table (3). Students' overall attitudes mean was (3.02), with a standard deviation of (0.28). The behavioral component had the highest mean score (4.12), with a standard deviation of (0.51), while the cognitive component had the lowest mean score (3.37), with a standard deviation of (0.44). The Affective component's mean score was (3.98), with a standard deviation of (0.54).

Table 3. Mean Scores for Participants by Component.

Component	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Behavioral	421	4.12	0.51
Affective	421	3.98	0.54
Cognitive	421	3.37	0.44
Overall	421	3.02	0.28

3.2. Demographic characteristics:

(Table: 4) shows that Public School students are slightly higher on the scale (M=3.04) than those of Private schools (M=3.00), and the effect size shows small effect ($\eta^2=0.004$). In other words, public school students expressed more positive attitudes towards disabled peers than private schools.

The same table also shows that female student scored higher on the Scale (M=3.12) than Male students (M=2.93), that means that female students expressed higher positive attitudes towards peers with disabilities than Male students. The effect size shows medium effect ($\eta^2=0.11$), and the effect size on behavioral subscale show also medium effect ($\eta^2=0.061$).

The mean of 10th grade students was (3.07) comparing with 9th grade (M=3.00) & 8th Grade (M=3.00), which means older students expressed higher positive attitudes towards peers with disabilities than younger students. Also, the effect size shows small effect ($\eta^2=0.018$).

3.3. Having a disability in your family:

Of the (421) participants, 55 students (13.1%) had relatives with disabilities. (Table:4) indicates that Students who had a relative with a disability scored slightly higher on the Scale (M=3.03) than those who did not (M=3.01). However, this difference was statistically significant. Which ($\eta^2=0.001$) small effect size.

Table 4. Overall Mean Scores of Participants and Statisticians by Independent Variables

Variables	N (%)	Behavioral			Affective			Cognitive			Overall		
		M (SD)	T/F	η^2	M (SD)	T/F	η^2	M (SD)	T/F	η^2	M (SD)	T/F	η^2
gender													

Male	218 (51.78 %)	4.00 (0.5 2)	-	0.0	3.88 (0.5 5)	-	0.0	3.37 (0.4 6)	0.0	0.0	2.93 (0.3 0)	-	0.1
Female	203 (48.22 %)	4.25 (0.4 6)	5.1 98	0.0 61	4.09 (0.5 1)	4.0 60	0.0 38	3.36 (0.4 1)	0.0 86	0.0 0	3.12 (0.2 2)	7.2 8 3	0.1 1
school													
Public	221 (52.49 %)	4.20 (0.5 0)	-	0.0	4.03 (0.5 6)	-	0.0	3.42 (0.4 7)	-	0.0	3.04 (0.2 3)	-	0.0
private	200 (47.51 %)	4.06 (0.5 0)	2.7 79	0.0 18	3.93 (0.5 1)	2.1 97	0.0 11	3.31 (0.4 0)	2.4 89	0.0 15	3.00 (0.3 1)	1.2 93	0.0 04
grade													
8 th	139 (33.02 %)	4.10 (0.4 8)			3.94 (0.5 2)			3.41 (0.4 1)			3.00 (0.2 5)		
9 th	139 (33.02 %)	4.16 (0.5 0)	0.6 47	0.0 03	4.99 (0.5 3)	0.3 87	0.0 02	3.38 (0.4 1)	2.4 99	0.0 12	3.00 (0.2 2)	3.8 94	0.0 18
10 th	143 (33.96 %)	4.10 (0.5 4)			3.98 (0.5 6)			3.30 (0.4 7)			3.07 (0.3 2)		
Have you a relative with a disability?													
Yes	55 (13.06 %)	4.13 (0.5 0)	-	0.0	3.96 (0.5 5)	-	0.0	3.38 (0.4 3)	-	0.0	3.03 (0.2 8)	-	0.0
No	366 (86.94 %)	4.06 (0.5 6)	1.0 48	0.0 03	4.10 (0.4 9)	1.7 31	0.0 07	3.28 (0.4 7)	1.5 58	0.0 06	3.01 (0.2 6)	0.4 78	0.0 01

0.01 < small < 0.06 < medium < 0.14 < large (Field, 2018)

3.4. Predictive Validity:

The logistic regression analysis results in (Table: 5) show that gender was significantly associated with high overall scale scores (B = 3.408, 95%ci: 2.406 to 4.410), and more than the tenth grade was associated with high overall scale scores (B = 1.173, 95%ci: 0.244

to 2.102), but school and disability demographic variables were not. The results also show that the gender variable explained (34.809 %) of the variance in the total scale and (65.191 %) of the variance due to other factors, whereas the grade variable explained (2.974 %) of the variance in the total scale and (97.026 %) of the variance due to other factors.

Table 5. Results of logistic regression analysis to characterize the association between students' attitudes and scale (overall)

Variables	N (%)	Overall				
		R-Squared (R ²)	Regression Coefficient b(i) (95% CI)	OR Exp(b(i)) (95% CI)	Wald	Percent Correctly Classified
Gender:						
Male	218 (51.78%)	0.34809	6.667***	30.216 (11.094 – 82.292)	3.408 (2.406 – 4.410)	66.055%
Female	203 (48.22%)					59.606%

Grade:							
8 th	139 (33.02%)	0.02974	Reference	Reference	Reference	10.072%	38.955%
9 th	139 (33.02%)		-0.019	0.992 (0.432 – 2.275)	-0.008 (- 0.838 – 0.822)	47.482%	
10 th	143 (33.96%)		2.475*	3.232 (1.276 – 8.182)	1.173 (0.244 – 2.102)	58.741%	
School:							
Public	221 (52.49%)	0.01585	1.272	1.593 (0.777 – 3.263)	0.465 (- 0.252 – 1.183)	55.656%	52.257%
Private	200 (47.51%)					48.5%	
Have you a relative with a disability?							
Yes	55 (13.06%)	0.00061	0.453	1.257 (0.466 – 3.390)	0.229 (- 0.763 – 1.221)	49.091%	50.119%
No	366 (86.94%)					50.273%	

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The logistic regression analysis results in (Table: 6) showed that gender was significantly associated with high emotional subscale scores ($B = 0.750$, 95%ci: 0.376 to 1.125), and more than school was associated with high emotional subscale scores ($B = 0.398$, 95%ci: 0.038 to 0.758), while the demographic variables grade and disability

were not associated with emotional subscale degrees. The results also demonstrate that the gender variable accounted 11.495 % in the emotional subscale and 88.505 % owing to other factors, whereas the school variable explained (4.771 %) of the variance in the emotional subscale and (95.229 %) due to other factors.

Table 6. Results of logistic regression analysis to characterize the association between students' attitudes and Emotional Subscale.

Variables	N (%)	Emotional Subscale					Percent Correctly Classified
		R-Squared (R^2)	Regression Coefficient b(i) (95% CI)	OR Exp(b(i)) (95% CI)	Wald		
Gender:							
Male	218 (51.78%)	0.11495	0.750 (0.376 – 1.125)	2.118 (1.456 – 3.081)	3.924***	55.046%	56.532%
Female	203 (48.22%)					58.128%	
Grade:							
8 th	139 (33.02%)	0.00429	Reference	Reference	Reference	47.482%	31.829%
9 th	139 (33.02%)		0.185 (- 0.250 – 0.619)	1.203 (0.779 – 1.858)	0.832	48.921%	
10 th	143 (33.96%)		0.145 (- 0.285 – 0.576)	1.156 (0.752 – 1.779)	0.661	0%	
School:							
Public	221 (52.49%)	0.04771			2.165*	52.036%	53.444%

Private	200 (47.51%)		0.398 (0.038 – 0.758)	1.489 (1.038 – 2.134)		55%	
Have you a relative with a disability?							
Yes	55 (13.06%)	0.00933	-0.480 (- 1.029 – 0.068)	0.619 (0.358 – 1.071)	-1.715	38.182%	52.969%
No	366 (86.94%)					55.191%	

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The results of logistic regression analysis in (Table: 7) revealed that gender was significantly associated with high scores for the behavioral subscale ($B = 1.026$, 95 percent CI: 0.617 to 1.436), and more than school was associated with high scores for the behavioral subscale ($B = 0.540$, 95% CI: 0.154 to 0.926), while the demographic variables grade and disability were not associated with behavioral

dimension degrees. The findings also show that the gender variable explained 32.266 % of the variance in the emotional subscale and (67.734 %) of the variance due to other factors, whereas the school variable explained (11.170 %) of the variance in the emotional subscale and (88.830 %) of the variance due to other factors.

Table 7: Results of logistic regression analysis to characterize the association between students' attitudes and Behavioral Subscale.

Variables	N (%)	Behavioral Subscale					Percent Correctly Classified
		R-Squared (R^2)	Regression Coefficient $b(i)$ (95% CI)	OR Exp($b(i)$) (95% CI)	Wald		
Gender:							
Male	218 (51.78%)	0.32266	1.026 (0.617 – 1.436)	2.790 (1.853 – 4.202)	4.913***	57.798%	59.145%
Female	203 (48.22%)					60.591%	
Grade:							
8 th	139 (33.02%)	0.00667	Reference	Reference	Reference	46.763%	32.067%
9 th	139 (33.02%)		0.245 (- 0.220 – 0.711)	1.278 (0.803 – 2.035)	1.033	50.36%	
10 th	143 (33.96%)		0.016 (- 0.440 – 0.472)	1.016 (0.644 – 1.603)	0.069	0%	
School:							
Public	221 (52.49%)	0.11170	0.540 (0.154 – 0.926)	1.716 (1.167 – 2.525)	2.743**	53.394%	54.632%
Private	200 (47.51%)					56%	
Have you a relative with a disability?							
Yes	55 (13.06%)	0.00339	0.296 (- 0.253 – 0.844)	1.344 (0.777 – 2.326)	1.056	61.818%	54.157%
No	366 (86.94%)					53.005%	

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The logistic regression analysis in (Table: 8) revealed that school is significantly associated with high cognitive subscale scores ($B = 0.565$, 95 % Ci: 0.115 to 1.015), and more than the tenth grade is

associated with low cognitive subscale scores ($B = -0.598$, 95 % Ci: -1.133 to -0.045), while gender and disability were not associated with cognitive subscale degrees. The findings also suggest that the school variable explained 7.668 % in the cognitive subscale (92.332 %). It is because of other factors, whereas the grade variable accounted (2.859 %) of the variation in the cognitive subscale and (97.141 %) of the variance in the other factors.

Table 8: Results of logistic regression analysis to characterize the association between students' attitudes and Cognitive Subscale.

Variables	N (%)	Cognitive Subscale					Percent Correctly Classified
		R-Squared (R2)	Regression Coefficient b(i) (95% CI)	OR Exp(b(i)) (95% CI)	Wald		
Gender:							
Male	218 (51.78%)	0.00007	-0.021 (-0.460 – 0.418)	0.980 (0.632 – 1.519)	-0.092	54.128%	51.306%
Female	203 (48.22%)					48.276%	
Grade:							
8th	139 (33.02%)	0.02859	Reference	Reference	Reference	58.993%	37.530%
9th	139 (33.02%)		0.857 (0.496 – 1.482)	-0.154 (-0.702 – 0.393)	-0.552	0%	
10th	143 (33.96%)		0.555 (0.322 – 0.956)	-0.589 (-1.133 – 0.045)	-2.120*	53.147%	
School:							
Public	221 (52.49%)	0.07668	0.565 (0.115 – 1.015)	1.760 (1.122 – 2.760)	2.463*	49.774%	52.732%
Private	200 (47.51%)					56%	
Have you a relative with a disability?							
Yes	55 (13.06%)	0.00754	0.517 (-0.128 – 1.163)	1.678 (0.880 – 3.200)	1.571	34.545%	57.245%
No	366 (86.94%)					60.656%	

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

4. Discussion:

Attitude study is especially important because attitudes tend to lead to action, that is they significantly affect behaviors (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1977). The study's main objective was to examine students' attitudes toward peers with disabilities and the effect of four independent variables on such attitudes. Students, on average, expressed accepting attitudes, with a mean of 3.02 (neutral attitudes, not negative). This result is consistent with the study of (Alnahdi, 2019), where his study showed that students' attitudes towards their peers with Intellectual Disability in Saudi Arabia schools

with an overall mean of 24.5, CATCH scale was applied to the (grades 3-6) students in that study. Also, the study that held in Greece (Tsakiridou & Polyzopoulou, 2019) shows the same result, in which the participants were 1348 secondary students. The overall mean was 2.30 (the highest mean score was 2.34 for the behavioral component, the lowest mean score was 2.28 for the cognitive component, and the mean score was 2.29 for the affective component)., In Aurangabad, India (Surve, et al., 2017) the study was implemented on students their age between (5-17 years) the result shows positive attitude toward their peers

with special needs. Based on the percentage analysis, 60% of participants said they would not worry if a child with a disability sat beside them. While 73% would gladly carry out projects with disability students. We can attribute these results to the positive impact of social media on our attitudes, as it enabled people with disabilities to reach the public more easily and talk about their lives, needs and rights. Many individuals are utilizing social media to provide voice to others who do not have one. These individuals work to raise awareness about specific societal concerns. They assist those who are disabled. On the other hand, the results can be interpreted in another way that Participants are more likely to reply to self-report questions in a socially desirable manner (i.e., responding in a way that makes the responder seem good rather than responding accurately and truthfully). Other data collection approaches, such as teacher interviews, focus group discussions, and classroom observation, are strongly recommended for future studies.

Among personal characteristics, Gender has been demonstrated to have a statistically significant impact on students' attitudes about their peers with disabilities. Female students have higher positive attitudes than male students, however, this was only significant for behavioral and overall scores. Additionally, the regression analysis revealed that students' attitudes toward their peers with disabilities could be predicted by the gender variable either on an overall scale or on the behavioral and emotional subscales. Rosenbaum et al. (1986) shows those female students who participate in the study more positive attitude than male students towards students with disability. The same result was in (C. Vignes et al., 2009) in which (1135) students participate in this study, (612) female and (523) male, aged from 10 years and 8 months to 15 years. Which Females also had higher positive attitudes than males, but only for the behavioral and total scores. Also (Gonçalves & Lemos, 2014) show the same result, female students had higher positive global attitudes ($M=2.86$, $SE=.05$) and behavioral/affective attitudes ($M=2.86$, $SE=.06$) than boys ($M=2.73$, $SE=.05$, and $M=2.73$, $SE=.06$, respectively), Participants in this study were 200 Portuguese students from a public school in northern Portugal, ranging in age from sixth to twelfth grades, 48% female and 52% male. we can also see the same result in (Goreczny et al., 2011) It has been proposed

that females, who are frequently perceived as being of minority status, empathize with their disabled peers and hence have more favourable attitudes about them (Olkin & Howson, 1994). The type of preadolescent children's interaction may potentially explain some of the findings described here. Boys are more likely to be "physical" than girls, and as a result, they may be less interested in building a friendship with a classmate whose limitations prevent physical play.

Also, our study shows that Public School students are slightly higher on the scale than private schools, but not statistically significant influence on students' attitudes towards their peers with disabilities. The school type variable could also predict students' attitudes toward disabled peers on behavioral, emotional, and cognitive subscales. This finding can be explained by the that most students with disabilities attend public schools due to their families' low socioeconomic level. According to studies, children who have significant interaction or a chosen connection with peers with disabilities may acquire a higher awareness of, and sensitivity toward, those peers and, as a result, see them more favourably. (McDougall* et al., 2004; Celine Vignes et al., 2009)

The result of our study shows that older student (10th grade) higher positive attitude toward peers with disabilities than younger student. Following the completion of the regression analysis, it was discovered that the class grade variable was capable of predicting the students' attitudes toward their peers with disabilities on both an overall scale and a cognitive subscale of the scale. A possible explanation for this that older student may have a better understanding of disabilities than younger students. This knowledge might have come from formal education (use information about disabilities—such as storytelling, books, posters and videos) or through informal education (experiences in different contexts and modeling). (Gonçalves & Lemos, 2014) we can see the same result in (Alnahdi, 2019), While the studies of (Armstrong et al., 2016; Blackman, 2016) found that the attitudes of the younger participants were more positive. On other side (Bossaert et al., 2011) shows in their research that age is not related to attitudes towards peers with disabilities.

Analysis of participants' responses shows that, having a relative with a disability was

significantly affect attitudes toward peers with disabilities (the result shows a small effect size). We may credit this to an increase in the student's interaction and awareness of people with disabilities, as well as their characteristics and needs. He will also identify the true and scientific reasons for disability, which will lead to developing good attitudes toward their classmates with disabilities. Our study did not agree with the results obtained by (Alnahdi, 2019), he found that there is no statistical significance to detecting students' attitudes by this variable. But (Blackman, 2016) show the similar result to our study. Nowicki and Sandieson (2002) discovered gender, age, and experience as relating variables in their meta-analysis. According to the findings of this study, also students become more accepting of their peers with disabilities as their knowledge and understanding of them grow.

5. Limitation:

Because anonymous communication in cyberspace allows students to explore and apply their self-concept differently than traditional face-to-face communication, students' reactions to a target peer offered over the Internet may not generalize to peers encountered in person (Zhao, 2005). This may be one of the limitations that we could not avoid in this research due to the quarantine during the period in which the study was applied due to Covid-19.

Because our participants were eager to participate in the study, they may represent a particularly prosocial sample of school students.

6. Conclusion:

Unfortunately, individuals with disabilities may be subjected to a variety of negative attitudes and barriers while pursuing their educational goals. One of the most significant difficulties that this category may encounter is the attitude of their peers. People with disabilities and those who live with them may have stereotypical ideas and misconceptions about them, including children. As a result, it is more difficult to integrate students with disabilities into regular education settings. Student attitudes toward their peers with disabilities were found to be somewhat positive in the current study; at the very least, they did not have negative attitudes toward this group of students, and the behavioral aspect of this group

of students was found to be most prominent in the study sample.

In the study sample, the attitudes of female students were more positive than those of male students, and the behavioral aspect was the most obvious factor. Students enrolled in public schools demonstrated more positive attitudes toward their peers with disabilities than students enrolled in private schools, and the findings of the study also revealed that the older the students were when they participated in the study, the more positive their attitudes toward individuals with disabilities.

Finally, the findings of the study revealed that the presence of a person with a disability in a student's family is associated with an increase in the student's positive attitudes toward students with disabilities.

Our research was also able to predict the students' attitudes toward their peers with disabilities on the overall scale as well as the three subscales. The gender variable was able to predict the students' overall attitudes, as well as the behavioral and emotional parts of the scale. While the type of school was the most accurate predictor of students' attitudes on the three sub-scales, the type of class was the most accurate predictor of students' attitudes on the scale as a whole and the cognitive dimension.

7. Recommendations:

Other assessment procedures, such as structured interviews, and observations, should be used to assess student attitudes in a more natural setting in order to obtain more reliable results.

Our findings can be replicated in the future with larger and more diverse school groups, including schools in governorates other than the capital, Amman.

Due to its good level of validity and stability, it is possible to rely on the study tool developed for this study to be applied to future studies on the Jordanian environment.

8. References

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

2. Alnahdi, G. H. (2019). The positive impact of including students with intellectual disabilities in schools: Children's attitudes towards peers with disabilities in Saudi Arabia. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 85, 1-7.
3. Alorani, O., & AL-labadi, A. I. N. (2020). Effect of Field Training on the Attitude of Students towards Persons with Disabilities in Special Education Centers. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(2), 337-346.
4. Armstrong, M., Morris, C., Abraham, C., Ukoumunne, O. C., & Tarrant, M. (2016). Children's contact with people with disabilities and their attitudes towards disability: a cross-sectional study. *Disability and rehabilitation*, 38(9), 879-888.
5. Blackman, S. (2016). Barbadian Students' Attitudes towards Including Peers with Disabilities in Regular Education. *International Journal of Special Education*, 31(1), 135-143.
6. Bossaert, G., Colpin, H., Pijl, S. J., & Petry, K. (2011). The attitudes of Belgian adolescents towards peers with disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 32(2), 504-509.
7. De Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2012). Students' attitudes towards peers with disabilities: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 59(4), 379-392.
8. Field, A. P. F. A. P. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics.
9. Findler, L., Vilchinsky, N., & Werner, S. (2007). The multidimensional attitudes scale toward persons with disabilities (MAS) construction and validation. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 50(3), 166-176.
10. Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1977). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 10(2).
11. Gething, L., & Wheeler, B. (1992). The Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale: A new Australian instrument to measure attitudes towards people with disabilities. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 44(2), 75-82.
12. Gonçalves, T., & Lemos, M. (2014). Personal and social factors influencing students' attitudes towards peers with special needs. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 949-955.
13. Goreczny, A. J., Bender, E. E., Caruso, G., & Feinstein, C. S. (2011). Attitudes toward individuals with disabilities: Results of a recent survey and implications of those results. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 32(5), 1596-1609.
14. Kim, K. H., Lu, J., & Estrada-Hernandez, N. (2015). Attitudes toward people with disabilities: The tripartite model, social desirability, and other controversial variables. *Journal of Asia Pacific Counseling*, 5(1), 23-37.
15. Lee, J., Chang, S. H., & Haegele, J. A. (2020). Does service learning work? Attitudes of college students toward individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 43(4), 365-380.
16. McDougall*, J., DeWit, D. J., King, G., Miller, L. T., & Killip, S. (2004). High School-Aged Youths' Attitudes Toward their Peers with Disabilities: the role of school and student interpersonal Factors. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 51(3), 287-313.
17. Munyi, C. W. (2012). Past and present perceptions towards disability: A historical perspective. *Disability studies quarterly*, 32(2).
18. Nowicki, E. A., & Sandieson, R. (2002). A meta-analysis of school-age children's attitudes towards persons with physical or intellectual disabilities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 49(3), 243-265.
19. Olkin, R., & Howson, L. J. (1994). Attitudes toward and images of physical disability. *Journal of social behavior and personality*, 9(5), 81.
20. Ostrosky, M. M., Mouzourou, C., Dorsey, E. A., Favazza, P. C., & Leboeuf, L. M. (2015). Pick a book, any book: Using children's books to support positive attitudes toward peers with disabilities. *Young Exceptional Children*, 18(1), 30-43.
21. Reis, H., Silva, A., Simões, B., Moreira, J., Dias, P., & Dixe, M. (2020). Preschool Children's Attitudes Towards Their Peers with Special Needs. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 1-11.
22. Rosenbaum, P. L., Armstrong, R. W., & King, S. M. (1986). Children's attitudes

- toward disabled peers: A self-report measure. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 11(4), 517-530. <https://academic.oup.com/jpepsy/article-abstract/11/4/517/917839?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
23. Tsakiridou, H., & Polyzopoulou, K. (2019). Inclusion in the Greek Secondary School: Students' Attitudes Concerning Their Peers With Special Educational Needs in the General Education. *Journal of Psychology*, 7(1), 84-97.
24. United Nations Educational, S., & Organization, C. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education-All means all. 92310038.
25. Vignes, C., Godeau, E., Sentenac, M., Coley, N., Navarro, F., Grandjean, H., & Arnaud, C. (2009). Determinants of students' attitudes towards peers with disabilities. *Dev Med Child Neurol*, 51(6), 473-479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.2009.03283.x>
26. Vignes, C., Godeau, E., Sentenac, M., Coley, N., Navarro, F., Grandjean, H., & Arnaud, C. (2009). Determinants of students' attitudes towards peers with disabilities. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 51(6), 473-479.
27. Zhao, S. (2005). The digital self: Through the looking glass of telecopresent others. *Symbolic interaction*, 28(3), 387-405.