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Findings from studies.

- There has been a steady rise in inclusive learning environments in early childhood education nationally and internationally (Selvaraj, 2016).
- Inclusion principles are not enough, it requires inclusion practices.
- There has been an identified need for greater consistency of good inclusive practices (Education Review Office, 2012) as the benefits of inclusion for both children with disability and without disability are recognised. For example research reports attitudes toward children with disability by their peers without disability are generally more positive as a result of inclusive practices in education settings.
- The early years has been identified as the key time children start to develop attitudes about others but these attitudes are malleable (Diamond and Hesternes, 1994).
Findings from studies

- Physical disabilities rather than non-physical disabilities more likely to be recognised as a disability by children without disabilities.

- Causes of disability- Mainly descriptive (they can’t use their legs) with only some research on the content of their ideas. Often a specific disability type has been a focus (hearing loss). Some research on what children might think are causes.

- Diamond and Hesternes (1994). Historically children attribute disability to accident, immaturity/age or adaptive equipment itself (these are usually existing ideas about physical differences) . They often have conceptualised disability at a concrete level. Some children do show awareness to linguistic differences and are known to adjust their patterns accordingly when with the child with a disability. Some studies argue pre-school children do have more causal understanding of disability than previously known.
Findings from studies

- Children’s attitudes and ideas about disability are influenced by the significant adults in their lives. Especially parents, teachers and care-givers. (Innes & Diamond, 1999).
- Dyson, (2005) interviewed 75 kindergarten children without disability, 88% described children with disabilities as different to themselves because they looked and acted differently. 91% not afraid, 83% liked them.
- Children often express an attitude and perception of the peer with a disability based on the quality of that peer as a play partner (Nowicki, 2006).
Methods of data generation

Participant observations (social interactions, who where and with whom).
Mosaic approach (Clark & Moss, 2001)
Story creation (scenarios)
Story- telling
Drawings
Picture promoted discussion.
Video revisiting

Semi-structured interviews (children, family/Whaanau).
Ethical considerations (1).

- Non disabled children talking about disability in relation to a specific person they know (for example, a peer at their centre with a disability, maybe a research participant). A challenge? Protecting the reputation of the other.

- ‘Frank and honest’ language and conversation. What to do as a researcher?

- Acknowledging and responding to non-interest by children. (part of the data?).

- Children with and without disability sharing their thinking and attitudes together in the research? A Sensitive line to walk?
Ethical considerations (2).

- Researcher role in co-constructing thinking and attitudes about disability with participants. Language and behaviour.

- Inviting children without disability to imagine what a disability might be like and mean (abstract thinking).

- Sensitivity when talking to a child with a disability about disability. (thinking about identity).

- Cultural bias and sensitivity to other notions and views of disability and identity (Bevan-Brown, 1989).

- Talking to family and whaanau about disability. (disabled and non disabled family members).
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