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Abstract
In the South African context, children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities are not accommodated in the compulsory education system, although steps are being taken in this direction in acknowledgement of their right to education. Critical to this development is the training of educators and caregivers. There is a paucity of studies from South Africa addressing the training of educators and caregivers. The Teacher Empowerment for Disability Inclusion (TEDI) project developed a course on the education and care of children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities to facilitate and empower teachers to provide quality education for these learners. This paper explores, through a qualitative analysis, the ways in which 30 participants attending this course developed professionally and personally. The findings show that there was personal as well as professional learning in the areas of disability approaches, collaboration, advocacy, self-care, and confidence. These findings are discussed and future implications are addressed.
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Introduction
Many children with intellectual disabilities in South Africa remain excluded from education. Educating children with disabilities in special schools is a highly contested practice, as, among other reasons, it is seen as perpetuating the oppression of children with disabilities by denying them...
the right to participate as equal human beings with other children. This has prompted many international organisations, policy-makers, and researchers to argue for the abandonment of the practice, and for the adoption of inclusive education (Goodley, 2011; Rieser, 2012).

Internationally, educational provision for children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities has received attention only relatively recently in the development of compulsory education (McKenzie et al., 2017). The implementation of inclusive education for this group remains a challenge that is underexplored and consequently many parents and teachers query the feasibility and desirability of inclusion (de Boer and Munde, 2014).

The Constitution of South Africa states that all children have a right to basic education. Generally, the policy towards provision of right to education in the country is progressive, but the transformation of policy to practice lags behind. For example, as recently as 2010, the government of South Africa defended their lack of provision of education for children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities on the grounds of limited resources and the notion that these children are ineducable (Murungi, 2011). The idea of ineducability has been debunked in the scientific literature (Molteno, 2006) and the fact that children with severe to profound disabilities are capable of learning and therefore have a right to education has been acknowledged in a High Court judgement in South Africa (McKenzie et al., 2017). The judgement delivered by the High Court found that the National Government and the Western Cape Government were in breach of the constitutional rights of children with severe to profound intellectual disability to basic education, protection from neglect, equality and basic human dignity (International Network for Economic, Social & Cultural Rights, 2011). In this ruling the Court instructed government to provide for children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities in the educational provision areas that had previously been neglected. The affidavit that followed set out guidelines and responsibilities for all stakeholders. However, the shift to include these children into the education system is slow and requires an investment in human and other resources (McKenzie et al., 2017). The challenge of sufficient resources is particularly significant due to high poverty rates and pronounced economic inequality within South African society. This has seen a lack of access to education services in general, let alone for children with intellectual disabilities.

There is a global move towards inclusive education (Donohue and Bornman, 2015), despite the problems with its implementation. Inclusive education entails identifying and removing barriers, and providing reasonable accommodation to enable every child to participate and achieve within mainstream educational settings (World Health Organization, 2011). According to the World Health Organization (WHO), although inclusion is gaining roots in Western countries, the move towards inclusive education is in the early stages of adoption and implementation in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). This is despite academic attention having been focussed on inclusive education for a number of years (Shorgen et al., 2012). Furthermore, inclusive rather than segregated education has been argued for in international declarations over the last two decades (McConkey et al., 2016). However, children with intellectual disabilities seem to be disproportionately excluded from mainstream education.

Despite evidence that inclusive education practices support the academic and social achievements of children with disabilities, stakeholders in many LMICs around the globe continue to face major challenges in its implementation (Geldenhuys and Weavers, 2013; Srivastava et al., 2015). Children with intellectual disabilities are at greater risk of being excluded from mainstream education, and even from education entirely, and they are more likely to be educated in special schools or in special classes within mainstream schools (Inclusion International, 2009).

The demands and tensions of teaching learners with severe intellectual disabilities highlight the complexity and challenges teachers must deal with, with repeated evidence that teachers and future
teachers feel somewhat or completely unprepared (Weiss et al., 2018). This is especially true of regular teachers in inclusive settings, who complain of insufficient insight related to a lack of knowledge, skills and strategies (de Boer et al., 2010; Savolainen et al., 2012). Special education teachers also express concern with regard to issues such as handling emotional and behavioural disturbances (Hinds et al., 2015; Kokkinos and Davazoglou, 2009). Inclusive education will increase the number of children with disabilities in regular classrooms and there is thus a consequential increase in the need for teaching personnel to be trained for this context (Lancaster and Bain, 2010; McHatton and Parker, 2013).

While there are various factors that contribute to the challenges expressed by regular and special education teachers in the implementation of inclusive education, the attitudes of the teachers may be one of the most important aspects, since teachers ultimately have the opportunity to choose whether or not to embrace an educational policy (Pecek et al., 2008). According to Donohue and Bornman (2015), teachers’ attitudes and beliefs are varied and are influenced by many factors – including learners, teachers, schools, culture and society.

Despite the general consensus that inclusive education is the optimal approach and that it has been adopted in South Africa, it is not being implemented effectively – especially for children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities. These children are mainly accommodated in Special Care Centres (SCCs) (McKenzie et al., 2017). The fight for more effective education has resulted in limited progress in terms of placing children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities in mainstream schools. Inherent in this slow progress is that there is no training for mainstream teachers (McKenzie et al., 2018) and no formal qualification for teaching children with severe to profound disabilities as the children have mainly been supported in care environments rather than more formal educational settings (McKenzie et al., 2017). This requires an approach where the care and education of these children can be facilitated and managed (McKenzie et al., 2017).

It is therefore imperative that both teachers and carers are trained to manage this classroom context and to provide them with the necessary support systems to encourage the inclusion process (Shorgen et al., 2015). Research has shown that teachers with more positive attitudes towards inclusive education are more likely to practice inclusion (Campbell et al., 2003; Sharma et al., 2006, 2008) while teachers with negative attitudes may reduce the number of learning opportunities for children with disabilities within inclusive classrooms (Campbell et al., 2003). Teachers thus play a critical role in successful implementation of inclusion and thus researchers need to focus more on professional learning of teachers.

However, it is important to note that research in this area is not conclusive (Rakap et al., 2017) and provides a complex and confusing picture (De Boer et al., 2011). More evidence is needed to understand the role of teachers and how teachers can be most effective in the classroom. As Kuntz and Carter (2019) have suggested, instruction and support for learners with intellectual disability in general education classes should be informed by research-based interventions.

The current study set out to explore the experiences of educators of children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities and issues around their confidence and attitudes. The Teacher Empowerment for Disability Inclusion (TEDI) project focuses on teachers and caregivers in SCCs to build capacity for inclusion as an ongoing process.

**Methodology**

The TEDI project was created in response to a call to address the exclusion and poor quality education of children with disabilities in South Africa. Drawing on our research into learner and
teacher education needs (McKenzie et al., 2018), TEDI developed a suite of short, face-to-face courses and accompanying massive open online courses (MOOCs) for educators, focusing on the following areas: disability studies in education; the education and care of learners with severe to profound intellectual disabilities; teaching learners with visual impairment; and teaching learners who are D/deaf or hard of hearing. This paper is based on a qualitative evaluation of the face-to-face course on the education and care of learners with severe to profound intellectual disabilities.

**Participant demographics**

All 30 participants were women, with 7 (23.3%) aged between 20–30 years, 11 (36.7%) 31–40 years, 5 (16.7%) 41–50 years, and 7 (23.3%) 51–60 years. None of the participants lived with disability, and 3 (10%) were employed as regular/full service educators, while 27 (90%) were employed as educators in a care centre setting.

Ninety per cent of our participants work in SCCs. This is the most common form of education setting for children with severe to profound intellectual disability in South Africa. While many SCCs are initially informal, some have developed and become well established with the support of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (McKenzie et al., 2017). Government support is thus very limited. This South African context is important to remember.

**Teacher Empowerment for Disability Inclusion (TEDI) project**

A three stage method was employed in this study: 30 educators and carers attended 1) a 5-day short course, 2) a post-course completion of Portfolio of Evidence, and 3) a 6 week follow-up contact meeting and focus group discussion.

**Stage 1: The 5-day short course.** A 5-day contact short course was delivered with a pre- and post-test survey. The course was aimed at individuals working with learners with severe to profound intellectual disabilities, including carers, caregivers, community workers, facilitators, classroom assistants and programme implementers. Adopting a practical skills based approach, the purpose of the course was to:

- Provide participants with the basic foundation of knowledge and skills needed to teach and care for learners within a SCC setting;
- Teach participants the skills needed in implementing the South African Department of Basic Education’s draft learning programme for the implementation of the right to education for children with severe to profound intellectual disability;
- Provide participants with the basic knowledge for disability inclusive development on both a theoretical and practical level.

The post-test survey following the completion of the short course was given to the participants to complete. This survey included the collection of quantitative and qualitative data of which the analysis of the latter formed part of the data for this paper.

**Stage 2: Portfolio of Evidence (PoE).** Participants completed a series of activities within their own educational contexts that supported the education and care of children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities. They had to capture their reflections and learning activities within a PoE. The PoE method was designed to create an experiential learning opportunity for participants. This PoE involved the four core steps of the experiential learning cycle process which includes: feeling,
thinking, watching and doing. The activities relied on the participant drawing on the key learnings from the short course and experientially applying it within their own context. The PoE consisted of writing up a case study on a learner with severe to profound intellectual disability in their classroom or SCC, highlighting the rights of this learner and the policies that support these rights, evaluating the levels of development of the learner (physical, communication and mental), creating a poster focusing on intellectual disability, developing an inclusive play activity, developing a story, describing an interaction with a learner’s family and actions taken from this interaction to support the learner, answering questions related to the support needs of a learner with severe to profound intellectual disability, and writing up a daily programme and completing a positioning checklist.

Stage 3: Follow-up meeting (6 weeks post-course). A meeting was scheduled with each carer/educator to follow up on the PoE. The meeting was held within the participants’ educational context. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the experiential learning derived from completing the PoE. The participants and course convenors systematically went through the PoE tasks, reflected on challenges and discussed potential solutions to them. The PoE assessment was not used directly as a data source but rather informed further discussion.

Stage 4: Focus group. A focus group was held with participants to explore their experience of participating in the Education and Care of Learners with Severe to Profound Disabilities course.

The data from the open-ended questions in the post-test surveys and from the focus group discussions were analysed using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a process of methodically classifying, putting together, and giving an understanding of the themes (patterns) in a dataset (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

This study was given ethical approval by the Human Research Ethics Committee within the Faculty of Humanities, University of Cape Town (HREC REF: 398/2018). Ethical issues were addressed throughout the research process by implementing the standards of the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants in the study were informed of the ethical issues around the study and completed an informed consent form before participating on a voluntary basis where confidentiality was maintained at all times. They were free to withdraw at any time without any penalisation.

Results

Six main themes emerged out of our analysis of the qualitative data: Understanding disability and implementing inclusion, Collaboration, Self-care, Advocacy, Confidence and Professional Growth. These all dealt with development and empowerment issues of educators subsequent to attending the course, as will be shown.

Understanding disability and implementing inclusion

The course participants sought to understand what disability meant to not only the individual but also with regards to inclusive education. Course participants developed a better and more comprehensive understanding of disability. This included a number of issues. For example, course participants became more knowledgeable of human rights and social justice issues. It was highlighted that strategies should be specific to different impairments but that there are also general disability issues. They also identified the struggle with parent and family perspectives on disability.
and that they need to work more closely with these stakeholders. Lastly, they had a better understanding of how educators are ultimately able to more effectively facilitate approaches for inclusion in the classroom.

To start with, some participants adopted a human rights approach to disability in the pursuit of inclusion of learners in the learning environment. Within this approach for instance, one participant now believed ‘that every disabled child is unique and wants to be seen as an individual’ (IDP13).

The learning and better understanding of disability by course participants in general was also evident. They understood disability on its different levels. For instance, they became aware of the importance of understanding the nature of impairments and of developing more relevant strategies of intervention:

I can now work out programmes for the whole class, even if it is a class with different types of children. All children are now made a part of the class. (IDP25)

While participants became more aware of disability rights and issues, parents were perceived by course participants as not always understanding disability appropriately:

What parents have to go through to find out what is wrong with their children. I see it at school myself, how parents are unable to process that their children are disabled. (IDP22)

Course participants felt better equipped to talk to parents even though the parents were still perceived by them to be in denial:

I sit down with parents one-on-one meetings and help them to understand and know their children. (IDP5)

Parents are more willing to hold hands if you listen to them and show respect in regard to their children. It was also important to show them that I value their opinions and we should work together to get positive outcomes. It became easier to model activities so that parents can carry over at home. They also understood why their children should come to school and be stimulated as well as play and interact with their peers. (IDP6)

The understanding of disability in general translates into better understanding of their learners, with subsequently more effective implementation of care and education. When it came to accepting learners with severe to profound intellectual disability, another participant mentioned that,

in the beginning I was a bit afraid of disabled children, or I did not know how to work with them, but now it is like a normal child to me. I no longer see them as strange, or think strangely. (IDP24)

The participants went ahead to show an appreciation for the challenges faced by learners with disabilities in class. For example, a participant stated that, ‘I can now identify the different levels of challenges in my class’ (IDP5).

Understanding disability is important in order to implement inclusion in the classroom. The findings have shown course participants have a better understanding of disability subsequent to their attendance at the courses on primarily four levels: (i) human rights and social justice issues, (ii) understanding the specific knowledge of disability as well as the general issues of disability,
(iii) parents and family networks, and (iv) how to ultimately implement inclusive education more effectively.

**Collaboration with one another**

Collaboration was an important theme to be identified. There was a general sense of belongingness and togetherness amongst the course participants. For example, one participant said,

...you think you’re in a situation, then you meet people who are in the same situation or different situations. And then just the connection you have...here is really a support system. You are not alone in the situation (IDP13).

The participants did not feel that they were alone or isolated and this was very encouraging for them for the future. They now believed that there was ‘teamwork’ (IDP20) and that they were now in the process of ‘building relationships’ (IDP3) and giving each other ‘support’ (IDP6). This culminated in the participants using social media to form a WhatsApp group where they could remain in contact and support each other through this medium. As one participant summarised, ‘the friendships that I have formed will not end with this workshop but will go on a long time’ (IDP6). It means that the ‘space’ (IDP3) that was provided for the participants during the course facilitated collaboration and connection with each other. So the collaboration was not only felt during the course but was expected to last beyond the course into the future.

**Self-care issues**

A strong theme that came out was bringing into awareness issues of self-care in the midst of the work that the participants do in terms of working with children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities. They realised that they experience much stress in their work. Through the course they learnt that their work in supporting and educating these children needed to be counterbalanced with time for self-care. For some this was a very significant realisation. This has powerful implications for the quality of support and education that they provide.

A participant mentioned, ‘I have also learnt to look after myself and to care for myself so that I am better able to care for and support the learners’ (IDP24). The participant added that they had ‘learnt much about the importance of caring for yourself as a person’ (IDP24). Another participant concluded, ‘I truly enjoyed the whole course, but if I have to choose something that stood out for me, it was the confirmation that we, as carers, also have to care for ourselves’ (IDP13).

**Advocacy issues**

The participants felt the need to advocate for disability inclusion in a variety of social spaces, which included their own centres. One participant stated that, ‘It was very informative and we are going home with new inspiration, to take this whole course to our day care centre and apply it there’ (IDP3).

Social spaces also included immediate spaces outside the participants’ centres. For example, a participant summarised:

I know it’s difficult for a centre that only operates separately on their own as a disability centre, but like with us, we are an inclusive centre so we have the mainstream on one premises... and the reason those children from the mainstream accepted them easily is because we let them play with each other every
day. They sometimes do activities together, and when we have an awareness we do it together so that those children can accept them. They are so overwhelmed by those children, no one can come and say that that child is different. For them it’s nothing. (IDP20)

Advocacy also moved beyond the classroom to even broader social spaces such as the community. A participant explained:

So we train them. We have a mental health day (awareness day) for the community so that the community can see there what those children can do for the community. They are different, but they can do something. So we look at their ability and what they can do . . . We invited all the carers and supporters who support that disabled child at home to come and be part of it so that we can . . . we’ve started to teach the community and even the parents at home to come and we get in someone from the department of health, mental health issues, and come and talk to them so that they can feel that these people care about them . . . So we as centres who have these children in our place, we must go and start to do something because no one will do it for you. (IDP20)

Advocacy even happened in life in general, as exemplified by a participant who stated that, ‘I will certainly go and put back what I learnt and experienced here; not only in my work place, but also in my personal life’ (IDP29).

Confidence issues

The participants observed that the course had been a facilitator in building their confidence in their skills, abilities and influence. For example, one participant mentioned that, ‘It is actually good, that confirmation, to know that what I did was good and right’ (IDP20), while another stated that, ‘I can feel confident in what I do and know that I have a team that supports me’ (IDP6). Other participants also highlighted that, ‘we shouldn’t underestimate ourselves’ (IDP3), ‘I can now confidently apply in my work what I learnt from the course’ (IDP17), and ‘It was very nice for me in that sense of I can really appreciate and implement all of the skills that I’ve learnt in my work and feel confident that I’m making a difference in a child’s life’ (IDP22).

Professional growth

It appeared that the course had given many participants a sense of professional growth where they had ‘learnt new things’ (IDP2), ‘different skills’ (IDP24) and their ‘knowledge . . . [had] been renewed and refreshed’ (IDP2). They also felt ‘more equipped’ (IDP24) and could apply what they had learnt as they could ‘now use the training with the children in future’ (IDP12). As stated before, they also grew in terms of self-care. A concrete example of how one participant had grown is when they stated that, ‘I am not just giving the child an activity – I am asking why am I giving that activity’ (IDP1).

The crux of how well the course worked can be summarised in the statement by one participant who highlighted that the course had given them ‘fresh courage’ where they ‘will be able to tackle (their) work with more passion’ (IDP9).

Discussion

The results of this qualitative study show that there was both personal and professional learning in the educators who attended the Education and Care of Learners with Severe to Profound
Disabilities Course. This course facilitated a positive change in their attitudes towards the education of these learners.

The critical role that teachers’ attitudes and beliefs play in the education of children with severe to profound disabilities has been highlighted by Rakap et al. (2017). We join Rakap et al. (2017) in calling on researchers to pay closer attention to the professional learning of future inclusive education educators with the goal of nurturing positive attitudes. Apart from the experiences during training programmes, this study supports the suggestion that the participation of teachers in courses on disability inclusion may positively influence the attitudes of educators and caregivers (Campbell et al., 2003; Carroll et al., 2003; Lancaster and Bain, 2007, 2010). Despite macro systems such as declarations and policies being in place, developing positive attitudes in educators at a grassroots level is equally important when it comes to the inclusion of children with severe to profound disabilities (Moberg et al., 2020). Therefore, development of positive attitudes in teachers towards children with disabilities and inclusion is crucial in pre-service stages (Campbell et al., 2003; Sharma et al., 2008; Tait and Purdie, 2000). The development of such positive attitudes can also be achieved in in-service stages of teacher training, as this study has shown.

Additionally, the study has established that this specific training course can allow participants an empowering understanding of disability, a factor that lessens their fears and anxieties regarding inclusive education. Studies on teacher attitudes in the United States revealed that a lack of knowledge of disabling conditions increased teachers’ anxiety and fear of inclusion (Avramidis et al., 2000; Cook et al., 2000). Forlin et al. (2008) have also suggested that educators’ anxiety over their competency is related to their doubts in the adequacy of their training. The professional growth and development of self-care skills exhibited by the participants who underwent the training in this study could indicate the success of the approach in addressing the competency-related anxiety of the participants.

This study has equally shown that teachers often feel unprepared to implement inclusive education and that educators often feel completely unprepared when having to deal with students with intellectual disability (de Boer et al., 2010; Savolainen et al., 2012). In the current study, the unpreparedness of the teachers is counteracted by participant reports that they feel they have grown professionally and learnt new skills. These findings are supported by the study of Savolainen et al. (2012) which was a comparative study of Finland and South Africa of teachers attitudes and self-efficacy in implementing inclusive education, their findings indicate that a gradual positive change in teachers attitudes is facilitated through training and collaboration with other teachers and parents. Our study has also shown that participation in the course on disability inclusion can grow the confidence of educators, which in turn helps to address the concerns of incompetence and lack of confidence in teachers of pupils with various disabilities (de Boer et al., 2011).

The importance of addressing educators’ work-based stress is also highlighted in this study. Educators in both inclusive and special education settings report high levels of stress and a number of stress-inducing factors that adversely affect their wellness, job performance and, ultimately, student outcomes (Billingsley, 2004; Emery and Vandenberg, 2010; Hinds et al., 2015; Jennings and Greenberg, 2009). In the current study, self-care issues feature extensively, with most educators talking about how the course has provided them with self-care skills that will improve how they address work-based stress which would lead to better support of the learners with severe to profound disabilities. This finding underlines the importance of imparting stress management skills to teachers in inclusive settings.

The course has thus been an important component in the development and empowering of educators of children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities. But there are still gaps that
need to be filled by other parties. These include parents, families and communities. For instance, Kelly and McKenzie (2018) claim that the valuable participation of parents and persons with disabilities cannot be overlooked in this education context. They go on to say that partnerships also need to be built with the Department of Basic Education and the Department of Higher Education and Training. Collaboration between all stakeholders therefore is still very necessary to make education more effective and inclusive in South Africa. This short course is but only one platform to develop and nurture this approach.

**Future implications**

The sustainable development goals (SDGs) are underlined by a core principle ‘that the dignity of the human person is fundamental . . . And we will endeavour to reach the furthest behind first’ (United Nations, 2015, Declaration: Introduction para. 4). This course is responding specifically to SDG 4, which is ‘to ensure inclusive and quality education and to promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’ (United Nations, 2015). The implications of empowering educators with the knowledge, skills and attitudes required to deliver quality education to learners with severe to profound disabilities will allow for a transformation of how education is delivered to these learners in South Africa. Jamieson et al. (2017) recommend that, as academic and research institutions, we can be part of the call to action for all South African children to thrive. In prioritising vulnerable children with disabilities, it must be done at a systems, cultural and process level (Jamieson et al., 2017). The innovative course show-cased in this study has given the participants an opportunity to develop processes and skills that have transformed their attitudes and beliefs and thinking about disability, which will allow them to be inclusive in their approach to education.

A study in Nigeria argues that an investment in human capital through education and skill development facilitates inclusive development (Oluwadamilola et al., 2018). This course has the potential to be a type of educational investment in carers and educators of learners with severe to profound disabilities and has great potential to facilitate inclusive education and accelerate the achievement of SDG 4. A study in Botswana exploring the experiences of key stakeholders with regard to inclusive education reflected that teachers requested additional professional development to train them on how to accommodate learners with disabilities and how best to facilitate optimal learning. The absence of such training would continue to be a barrier to the inclusion of learners with disabilities (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012).

The course offers an opportunity to advance inclusive education systems and responses by preparing educators and carers for inclusive education. The principles of adult education and andragogy should continue as an underpinning of courses of this nature (Kaufman, 2003). Additionally, an implication of this study is that it would be beneficial to adopt a critical pedagogical (Freire, 1990) approach using transformative learning as a teaching and learning approach (Mezirow, 1997). This course is a useful blueprint to use in other contexts and can be expanded on and tailored to be relevant to different learners and educational settings.

**Limitations of the study**

This study draws from only one short course offered in the TEDI project. The course, being short, had time constraints, resulting in the fact that justice to the topics that needed to be covered was not always achieved. More in-depth exploration of some topics may have been more beneficial. Further, due to time constraints the course approach and content had to be selective and this could have resulted in limiting different perspectives in the management and delivery of the course. Not
all the course content could be covered, thus limiting the scope of the course. The course may have been more beneficial had it covered a longer time period thus giving participants time to digest and process the content more. They would also have been able to attempt to apply what they had learnt on the course in their educational contexts and provide feedback at the next course session.

The course was selective in who was eligible for attending the course and this makes generalisations to all educators in all provinces in South Africa problematic. While it cannot in any way be representative of all educators in all provinces, we believe that it does give important insights for future policy, practice and research. Although a relatively small study, it has the potential to act as a springboard for further research studies in this area.

Further research needs to explore the long-term impact of this type of training and compare it to other forms of training in order to understand better what type of training works best and for what purpose. Future research should be able to help ascertain what will facilitate the training of teachers to be more empowered in offering quality education to children with severe to profound intellectual disabilities.
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