

Research Article

Leaders' Knowledge and Awareness on Creating Inclusive Learning Environment Through Technology Integration for Students with Disabilities: Jimma University in Focus

Habtamu Debasu Belay* , Muluken Tesfaye Kabtyimer 

Department of Special Needs and Inclusive Education, Arba Minch University, Arba Minch, Ethiopia

Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to investigate university leaders' knowledge and awareness of creating inclusive learning environment through technological integration for SWDs in Jimma University. The study employed a mixed research design (QUAN→qual) with an explanatory sequential design. The key findings revealed that there is a low level of understanding of leaders. The correlation result among leaders' understanding and creating inclusive learning environment was (0.838**). This result suggested that there is a strong positive correlation. The p-value is <0.01, which means a statistically significant. Moreover, the result of multiple regression (p=.00) proved that the predictor and residence variable had strong relationship. Furthermore, training, sharing experience, collaboration with SWD services of accessibility are the strategies which adopt to enhance leaders knowledge and awareness. Finally, it is recommended that all university leaders work in collaborate with disability support services to create an inclusive learning environment for SWDs by integrating technology.

Keywords

Creating Inclusive Learning Environment, Leaders' Awareness, Leaders' Knowledge, Students with Disabilities, Technology Integration, University Leaders'

1. Background of the Study

Technology has great potential for students in terms of providing access to all learning. In particular, assistive technology is a broad concept that covers virtually all things that may be used to meet the needs of those with a lack of certain abilities [13]. According to UNICEF's (2014) estimation, 90% of children with disabilities in low-income countries have never attended any educational institution, and those who do enroll often face higher dropout rates compared to their peers without disabilities. With an increase in the number of SWDs enrolled in HEIs worldwide, it is necessary to create an in-

clusive learning environment that meets their diverse needs [3]. For instance, Canada has implemented various assistive technologies and digital tools in classrooms to support students with disabilities (UNESCO, 2015). In Africa, a significant number of SWDs face barriers to accessing education, including inadequate resources and lack of support [23]. Leaders should be aware of these challenges and actively work towards mitigating them. Training programs should focus on understanding disabilities, utilizing assistive technologies, and creating accessible course materials [14].

*Corresponding author: debasuhabtamu@gmail.com (Habtamu Debasu Belay)

Received: 7 February 2025; Accepted: 11 April 2025; Published: 14 May 2025



In Ethiopia context, a country striving to improve its education system and has also recognized the importance of inclusive education. The Higher Education Proclamation No.650/2009 article 40 of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia mandates that institutions of higher education make their facilities and programs accessible to physically challenged students as much as possible. The design of buildings, campus landscapes, computers, and other infrastructures must also consider the interests of physically challenged students. Additionally, institutions must provide academic assistance, such as tutorial sessions, exam time extensions, and deadline extensions, to physically challenged students when necessary and feasible (Federal Negarit Gazeta, 2009). However, this research aims to provide valuable insights into the current state of technology integration in Ethiopian higher education institutions and to suggest strategies for improving the accessibility and inclusion of SWDs. Thus, the researcher focused on university leaders' understanding on creating an inclusive learning environment through technological integration for students with disabilities, with Jimma University as the focal point.

2. Statement of the Problem

Providing comprehensive support services positively impacts student retention, graduation rates, and overall satisfaction with the institution [5]. The use of assistive technology, such as speech recognition software or electronic textbooks, can significantly improve the academic performance and independence of SWDs. SWDs are still underrepresented in post-secondary education, although inclusive higher education can support them in maintaining their entitlement to an education [38]. Moreover, [37] faculty personal beliefs have the most direct influence on the provision of reasonable accommodations; knowledge of legal responsibilities and perceived institutional support directly influence personal beliefs. As [36] revealed, there is a low extent of technological integration at Ambo University. Therefore, as far as the researcher has been reading, there is still gaps related to this study but most of these studies address the bestiality of technology. However, Mohammed conducted a research mainly focused on the academic roles on creating inclusive learning environment. However, the current study attempted to show the understanding and practices of university leaders on creating inclusive learning environment through technological integration for SWDs. At Jimma University SWDs, including those who are hard-of-hearing, partially sighted, or physically disabled, face significant challenges, leading many to drop out due to unmet needs. Pre-observations revealed issues such as university administrators' lack of awareness, inadequate inclusive learning environments, poor teaching strategies, inaccessible classroom arrangements, and limited resources. These barriers, both physical and attitudinal, inspired the researcher to study this issue, having observed these challenges since 2013 E.C. The situation highlights the criti-

cal role of university leaders in ensuring inclusion, prompting the need for this research.

3. Research Questions

This research aimed to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What is the current awareness of university leaders in creating an inclusive learning environment for SWDs through technology integration?
- 2) What is the association between leaders' knowledge and awareness on the creation of an inclusive learning environment through technology integration for SWDs?
- 3) In what extent university leaders aware assistive technology which integration for SWDs?
- 4) What strategies can university leaders adopt to enhance their knowledge on creating an inclusive learning environment for SWDs through technology integration?

4. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

The range of necessary creativity therefore risks being highly determined by the evolution of technology [25]. Moreover, Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, and Redefinition (SAMR) model provides a framework for knowledge and awareness the levels of technology integration in education. When creating an inclusive learning environment through technology integration for SWDs, university leaders can use this model to guide their decision-making process. The SAMR model encourages educators to move beyond simply substituting traditional tools with digital tools and instead focuses on transforming teaching to provide meaningful and accessible experiences for all students, including those with disabilities [28]. Furthermore, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) guidelines offer specific strategies and recommendations for providing multiple means of representation, action, expression, and engagement to meet the diverse needs of students, including those with disabilities. University leaders can refer to the UDL Guidelines to ensure that technology integration supports the principles of UDL and promotes equitable access to education [7]. Generally, the relationship between these theories and the variables is that university leaders, through implementing the SAMR model, university leaders can guide instructors in progressing from basic technology integration to advanced practices, thus expanding opportunities for diverse learners. Additionally, university leaders can leverage UDL principles to ensure that learning materials and assessments are accessible and customization for all students, promoting a learning environment that proactively attends to diverse learner needs. In fact, the objectives of this framework are to improve accessibility, ensure equal opportunities for all students, enhance student engagement and participation, and promote independent learn




Figure 1. Conceptual Framework (Source: Researcher).

5. Research Design and Methodology

5.1 Research Method and Design

Mixed methods research is a procedure for collecting, and ‘mixing’ both quantitative and qualitative methods. More specifically, the researcher used an explanatory sequential mixed research design consisting of collecting quantitative data and then gathering qualitative data to help explain or elaborate on the quantitative results [9]. This design was implemented to obtain leaders’ knowledge and awareness on creating inclusive learning environments through technology integration for SWDs at Jimma University.

5.2. Population of the Study

The total population in this study has 71. It encompassing the academic staff includes 21 directors, 6 coordinators, 6 college deans, 5 team leaders, and 33 department heads. Participants included leaders at BU, such as department heads, directors, college deans, team leaders, and coordinators.

5.3. Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The researcher used a comprehensive sampling technique. According to [27] this type of sampling is useful when the

population under study is small and well defined and when the research question requires a complete representation of the population.

5.4. Data Collection Instruments

Interviews, observation and questionnaires were used as data-gathering tools.

5.5. Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The instruments were developed with an advisor’s guidance to ensure alignment with research objectives. Feedback from researchers, lecturers, and experts refined the tools for clarity and relevance, particularly the Amharic interview version. Subject matter experts validated the content, confirming the instruments comprehensively addressed the research domain and objectives. According to [32], referring to piloting an instrument, noted that for a project with 100 people as the sample, a pilot study participation of 10-30 subjects should be a reasonable number. Therefore, this study is provided to include 10 participants. To ensure the reliability of the instruments, the researcher distributed a pilot questionnaire to leaders of Bonga University a nearby university which has similar characteristics with the main study site. The following table shows the reliability coefficients for each measured variable.

Table 1. Reliability Measurement of leaders Knowledge, Awareness and creating inclusive learning environment.

Reliability Statistics of the items in the instrument			
No-	Variable	N of Items	Cronbach's α
1	Leaders knowledge	7	0.730
2	Leaders Awareness	6	0.820
3	Creating Inclusive Learning Environment	12	0.944
	Total Cronbach's α Value	36	.936

N=Number of Items, α = Alpha, CILE=Creating Inclusive Learning Environment

As shown in the Table 1, A Cronbach's alpha value of leaders knowledge is 0.8730 indicates a strong correlation among the items in the measurement instrument, demonstrating good reliability. Similarly, the reliability statistics for leaders' awareness show high internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.820 indicating close relationships among the items. For the status of the inclusive learning environment, Cronbach's alpha value of 0.944 confirms the high internal consistency and close relationship among the items. Overall, the Cronbach's alpha result of 0.936 indicates high internal consistency, affirming the reliability of the scale. This value, close to 1, suggests a strong correlation among the scale items, signifying its reliability and consistency.

5.6. Data Collection Procedures

The researcher collected data from coordinators, directors, deans, and department heads at Jimma University using primary and secondary sources. Official research objectives were presented to participants, and questionnaires were distributed after explaining their purpose and confirming consent. Completed questionnaires were collected and reviewed within a week. For interviews, participants were briefed on the study, consented, and responded in writing during 45-minute sessions. Observations focused on classrooms, libraries, dormitories, and inclusive practices, with photos taken to document the environment. Data from interviews, questionnaires, and observations were cross-checked for consistency.

5.7. Data Analysis Procedures

The study analyzed leaders' knowledge and awareness toward creating inclusive learning environments through technology integration for SWDs using quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data, including demographic variables and Likert scale items, were analyzed using descriptive statistics (percentages, means, and standard deviations) and inferential statistics (Pearson correlation and multiple linear regressions) with SPSS version 20. Qualitative data from interviews and observations were categorized, transcribed, coded, and grouped into themes aligned with research questions. Observations were used to identify patterns and construct themes, with qualitative findings supporting the quantitative results in the discussion.

6. Results and Findings

This research aimed to assess university leaders' knowledge and awareness of creating inclusive learning environments through technology integration for SWDs, with major findings clearly described in this chapter.

University Leaders' Knowledge on Creating Inclusive Learning Environment Through Technology Integration

This table examines leaders' knowledge towards using assistive technology for creating inclusive learning environment to support students with various disabilities. The items for university leaders' understanding on creating of an inclusive learning environment consisted of 7 items which measured by a Likert scale.

Table 2. Leaders' knowledge on creating inclusive learning environment through technology integration.

S. N	Items	Respond of the Subjects					M	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1	I foster students with visual impairment have a	23	29	6	3	-	1.82	.806

S. N	Items	Respond of the Subjects					M	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
	significant engagement in their education with the help of assistive technology.	(37.7%)	(47.5%)	(9.8%)	(4.9%)	-		
2	I exhibit students with hearing impairment have a good time at university with the help of Sign Language videos and books.	29 (47.5%)	22 (36.1%)	6 (9.8%)	2 (3.3%)	2 (3.3%)	1.79	.985
3	I maintain Students with physical disabilities can reduce their academic burden by using assistive technology.	28 (45.9%)	20 (32.8%)	10 (16.4%)	1 (1.6%)	2 (3.3%)	1.84	.986
4	I believe that students with partial sighted can follow their education using Magnification Lens.	33 (54.1%)	18 (29.5%)	5 (8.2%)	5 (8.2%)	-	1.69	.937
5	I understand the importance of braille for blind students.	33 (54.1%)	16 (26.2%)	10 (16.4%)	2 (3.3%)	-	1.70	.867
6	I know the importance of magnification Lens for students with partial sighted.	31 (50.8%)	21 (34.4%)	8 (13.1%)	1 (1.6%)	-	1.66	.772
7	I know the importance of sign language books and videos for deaf students.	35 (57.4%)	20 (32.8%)	4 (6.6%)	2 (3.3%)	-	1.56	.764
	Grand mean						1.72	.523

Note. %=Percentage, 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree, SD=Standard deviation

As expressed in Table 2, the grand mean result is 1.72. So, it indicates that there is low understanding among university leaders regarding understanding to creating inclusive learning environment through technological integration for SWDs. This is consistent with According to [29] described the scoring range of Likert scale of the survey is strongly disagree 1.00-1.80, disagree 1.81-2.60, neither 2.61-3.40, agree 3.41-4.20 and strongly agree 4.21-5.00. Additionally, the standard deviation result ranging from 0.523, indicates that there is some variability in the perceptions but it has high consistence and reliable between the data and responses of leaders regarding these aspects. This variability suggests that differing opinions or levels of emphasis among respondents. But the range is very close to each other. So, this indicates that the data is more consistent.

In light with the above descriptive result, the interview result is described accordingly. The researcher delves into these thematic categories, shedding light on the collective sentiments expressed by the interviewees. Participant CD1 (Engineering and Technology College Dean) he acknowledged limited understanding of creating technology-integrated inclusive environments for SWDs. He emphasized the need for foundational knowledge, such as ramp construction standards, and admitted to being unaware of how to support SWDs effectively. Similarly, participant CD2 (Social Science and Humanities College Dean) has recognized the potential of technology to improve SWDs' learning

outcomes but expressed confusion about appropriate tools due to a lack of interaction with these students and understanding of their needs. Additionally, Participant S1 (Special Needs and Inclusive Education Department), he reported strong awareness and understanding of inclusive learning and technological integration due to his professional background. Participant ID (Inclusive and Diversity Study Center) he said that admitted to no prior knowledge or experience in creating inclusive environments for SWDs, as this was his first leadership role. He acknowledged his lack of understanding of SWD rights and needs. Participant TTCS (Technology Transfer and Community Service Directorate) reported that insufficient training and professional support as barriers to understanding. He expressed a low attitude towards integrating technology for creating inclusive environment for SWDs.

Both data sources indicate that most university leaders lack the understanding, engagement, and training needed to create inclusive learning environments for SWDs through assistive technologies. This reflects a systemic issue where insufficient knowledge, skepticism about technology, and limited training hinder effective support for SWDs. Addressing these gaps through professional development and greater engagement with SWDs could improve the integration of assistive technologies and create more supportive educational settings. This would enhance the academic experience for SWDs and align with inclusive education frameworks advocating equal opportunities for all students.

6.1. University Leaders' Awareness on Creating Inclusive Learning Environment Through Technology Integration

Table 3. University Leaders Awareness on creating inclusive learning environment through technology integration.

S. N	Items	Respond of the Subjects					M	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1	I aware the importance of hearing aids for students with hard of hearing.	18 (29.5%)	19 (31.1%)	4 (6.6%)	15 (24.6%)	5 (8.2%)	2.51	1.362
2	I understand the importance of wheel-chairs for students with physical disability.	15 (24.6%)	22 (36.1%)	10 (16.4%)	12 (19.7%)	2 (3.3%)	2.41	1.160
3	I comprehend how cochlear implants can enhance student engagement for students with hard of hearing.	27 (44.3%)	23 (37.7%)	8 (13.1%)	3 (4.9%)	-	1.79	.859
4	I understand how a talking calculator can facilitate active learning for blind students.	13 (21.3%)	23 (37.7%)	9 (14.8%)	15 (24.6%)	1 (1.6%)	2.48	1.134
5	I absorb that assistive technology can create an environment where all students can achieve academic success.	19 (31.1%)	21 (34.4%)	7 (11.5%)	11 (18%)	3 (4.9%)	2.31	1.232
6	I understand how to effectively use smart boards for students with partial sight in the classroom.	22 (36.1%)	12 (19.7%)	10 (16.4%)	11 (18%)	6 (9.8%)	2.46	1.397
	Grand mean						2.453	.5924

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree, SD=Standard deviation, M=mean

The grand mean and standard deviation of university leaders awareness on crating inclusive learning environment for SWDs through technological integration is 2.453 and 0.5924 respectively, which indicated that the respondents are disagreement on the statements and the data were consistency and reliable to the mean. As the interview result revealed that most of the respondents shows that less awareness on the issue of using a wheelchair for students with physical disabilities, the importance of hearing aids for students with hard of hearing, comprehending how cochlear implants can enhance student engagement for students with hard of hearing, understanding how a talking calculator can facilitate active learning for blind students, absorbing assistive technology can create an environment where all students can achieve academic success and understanding how to effectively use smart boards for students with partial sight in the classroom. University leaders show limited awareness of how assistive technologies, like

sign language videos, magnification lenses, and braille, can support SWDs. They lack awareness of the importance of wheelchairs, hearing aids, and smart boards for SWDs in the campus. Additionally, leaders are not well-informed about how assistive technologies like talking calculators and cochlear implants can enhance the learning experience for SWDs.

6.2. Status of the University in Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment Through Technology Integration for SWDs

The following table has 12 items whereas each item represents a specific aspect of inclusion learning environment, such as the availability of assistive technological devices, services for deaf and blind students, and accessibility features in various facilities. It rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 5.

Table 4. Status of the university in creating an Inclusive Learning Environment through technology integration.

S.N	Items of Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment	Scales					M	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1	Classrooms are supported by various assistive technological devices.	30 (49.2%)	23 (37.7%)	6 (9.8%)	2 (3.3%)	-	1.67	.790
2	Laboratories provide services to deaf students with the assistance of Sign Language Videos and Books.	32 (52.5%)	22 (36.1%)	6 (9.8%)	1 (1.6%)	-	1.61	.737
3	Laboratories provide services to blind students with the assistance of braille printed instructions.	32 (52.5%)	18 (29.5%)	10 (16.4%)	1 (1.6%)	-	1.67	.811
4	Recreational areas have braille-assisted signage for students with visual impairment	39 (63.9%)	18 (29.5%)	4 (6.6%)	-	-	1.43	.618
5	Dormitories provide Braille-assisted services for blind students.	36 (59%)	14 (23%)	10 (16.4%)	1 (1.6%)	-	1.61	.822
6	Dormitories provide well organized signage's services for deaf students.	33 (54.1%)	20 (32.8%)	8 (13.1%)	-	-	1.59	.716
7	The offices are easily accessible for students with physical disabilities.	42 (68.9%)	17 (27.9%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	-	1.36	.606
8	Smart boards/LCD are available in every class-room for partial sighted students.	22 (36.1%)	18 (29.5%)	3 (4.9%)	15 (24.6%)	3 (4.9%)	2.33	1.326
9	Slate and styles are delivered to blind students in the university.	22 (36.1%)	21 (34.4%)	14 (23%)	2 (3.3%)	2 (3.3%)	2.03	1.016
10	Canteens have accessible ramps for students with physical disability.	28 (45.9%)	25 (41%)	8 (13.1%)	-	-	1.67	.701
11	The instructors provide technological support for students with disability during examination (for e.g., by adjusting time)	13 (21.3%)	22 (36.1%)	12 (19.7%)	13 (21.3%)	1 (1.6%)	2.46	1.104
12	Student with physical disability has crunch and wheelchair which delivered by university.	18 (29.5%)	21 (34.4%)	9 (14.8%)	10 (16.4%)	3 (4.9%)	2.33	1.207
	Average/ Grand mean						1.812	.460

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree, SD=Standard deviation, M=mean

According to the data revealed from Table 4, the result of average/grand mean of statements related to creating inclusive learning environment is 1.812. This indicates that a disagreement to the statements. And the result of standard deviation is .460. This suggesting that there is some variability in responses, but they are not highly dispersed around the mean.

Additionally, the data obtained from interviews typically provides rich, qualitative insights that can be analyzed to reveal patterns, themes, and narratives relevant to the research objectives. The direct answers provided by the participants during the interview. They often contain subjective opinions,

explanations, and personal experiences relevant to the research question. Verbal responses are typically recorded, transcribed, and coded for analysis. This helps to better understand the perspective from which the interviewee is answering.

Respondent CD1 has stated regarding with creating inclusive learning environment at Jimma University and he emphasizes that Jimma University is deeply has not committed to fostering a inclusive learning environment. So, he replied that

From what I observe on the ground, SWDs have not yet received assistive devices to support their education. In fact,

some students with severe disabilities have had to leave and return home due to the lack of accessible facilities on campus. I recall one student with a severe physical disability who did not have a wheelchair.

One of the informants from directorate “(ID)” has claimed the above idea and also he adds as directorate he observe many things but everything hasn’t convenient for SWDs in this campus. The material which is bought for these students is not provided till now. He pushed and raised questions in every conference and meeting. CD2 also said that creating a welcoming environment for SWDs in HEIs requires more funding, but our university provides little attention to delivering supportive academic equipment. The resource room is filled with materials, but they are not distributed to students. Essential items like hearing aids, contact lenses, and headphones are also unavailable for SWDs.

The other participant TTCS added that the laboratory, classroom, and library have not equipped with special device. IT labs have not considered SWDs. Mean that IT labs have not headphone, tap record, JAWs, and other assistive device which help for these students. Informant CD4 has reported that as college dean, he noticed that while technological integration benefits many students, there is a notable gap in the resources provided to SWDs. Despite the progress in making education more accessible, many SWDs do not have sufficient assistive technologies, such as screen readers, adaptive software, or specialized hardware that could support their educational needs.

In addition, Observation data at JU revealed three main themes: the physical environment's accessibility, utilization of assistive resources, and leaders' contributions to creating an inclusive learning environment for SWDs. The physical environment posed significant barriers, including long distances between facilities, lack of ramps, steep stairs without handrails, narrow doorways unsuitable for wheelchairs, and poorly

maintained pathways. Classrooms lacked SMART boards and LCDs, and resource rooms contained outdated materials. The campus also lacked clear signage and accessible facilities such as restrooms and dining areas, further hindering mobility and independence for SWDs. Assistive technologies like screen readers, text-to-speech software, and ICT tools were underutilized, leaving SWDs without adequate support for academic participation. The lack of accessible infrastructure and assistive technology undermines inclusion, limiting SWDs' ability to fully engage in campus life and academic activities.

The findings reveal significant gaps in support for SWDs at the university. Classrooms lack assistive technologies like SMART boards, and laboratories fail to accommodate deaf and blind students. Recreational areas have no braille signage, and mobility aids like crutches or wheelchairs are unavailable. Instructors lack technological support during exams, and inconsistencies in providing tools like slates and styluses further hinder SWDs. The university's stated commitment to inclusivity does not align with the lack of assistive technologies, facilities, and services, impeding SWDs' academic and personal development.

6.3. The Association Between Leaders' Knowledge, Awareness, and the Status of Creating Inclusive Learning Environment

One way to assess the relationship between leaders' knowledge and awareness and the status of creating an inclusive learning environment is through correlation testing. Correlation tests allow researcher to examine the degree of association between variables, in this case, leaders' understanding and practice and creating an inclusive learning environment were tested.

Table 5. Correlation Result of Leaders Knowledge, Leaders awareness, and CILE.

Correlation result		CILE	Leaders Knowledge	Leaders Awareness	
Pearson Correlation Coefficient	CILE	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.705**	.583**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	61	61	61
	Leaders Knowledge	Correlation Coefficient	.705**	1.000	.750**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	61	61	61
	Leaders Awareness	Correlation Coefficient	.583**	.750**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	61	61	61

Correlation result

CILE

Leaders Knowledge

Leaders Awareness

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. N=Number of respondents, CILE=Creating Inclusive Learning Environment

Table 5 presents the correlations between three variables: Leaders Understanding, Leaders Practice, and CILE (Creating Inclusive Learning Environment). Pearson correlation coefficient test measures relations between two continuous variables in order to evaluate the strength and direction of the variables. Therefore, the data revealed that the correlation between leader knowledge and leader Awareness was 0.750^{**} , indicating a strong positive correlation between them. Similarly, the data

revealed that the correlation between leaders knowledge and CILE is 0.705^{**} , indicating a strong positive correlation. Moreover, the correlation between Leaders' Awareness and CILE is 0.583^{**} , indicating an extremely strong positive correlation. The significance level (p-value) associated with these correlation coefficient is 0.000, which is $p < .01$, indicating a significant and meaningful relationship between leaders knowledge, leader awareness and CILE.

Table 6. Auto-Correlation test.**Auto-Correlation test**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.845 ^a	.714	.704	.25032	1.901

a. Predictors: (Constant), awareness, knowledge

b. Dependent Variable: CILE

Note: CILE-Creating Inclusive Learning Environment, R-the association of independent and dependent variable.

The above table 6 outputs represent the results of a regression analysis for a model that aims to predict the dependent variable CILE using the predictors' leaders' knowledge and leaders awareness. The results for checking autocorrelation using the Durbin-Watson and Standard Error of the Estimate measures the accuracy of the predictions made by the model,

with a value of 0.19065 indicating a relatively low error. Besides, the Durbin-Watson statistic is a test for autocorrelation in the residuals of a regression analysis. The value of 1.901 falls close to 2, which suggests that there is autocorrelation present in the independent variable (leaders' knowledge and leaders' awareness).

Table 7. Multi-collinearity test of independent variables.**Coefficients^a**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta				Tolerance	VIF
	(Constant)	-.027	.161		-.168	.867		
1	knowledge	.545	.063	.620	8.683	.000	.967	1.034
	awareness	.367	.055	.473	6.626	.000	.967	1.034

a. Dependent Variable: CILE

Note. B-beta value, VIF- variance inflation factor, t-test

Looking at the VIF values for the variables understanding and practice:

The VIF value of leaders' knowledge is 1.034 and Tolerance value is .967, it suggests that there is suffer from severe multi-collinearity issues associated with the knowledge var-

iable. Similarly, the VIF value for leaders' awareness is also 1.034 and Tolerance value is .967, indicating no multi-collinearity problem. Therefore, there is no serious multi-collinearity problem between leaders' knowledge and leaders' awareness.

Table 8. Model Summary (R & R²).

Model Summary ^b									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.845 ^a	.714	.704	.25032	.714	72.368	2	58	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), awareness, knowledge
b. Dependent Variable: CILE

Note: R= the relationship between the variable, R²=the total effect of all independent variable on dependent variable, sig.F=Significant factor, df=Degree of freedom

The above table, [table 8](#) revealed that the correlation coefficient (R) value of 0.845 (84.5%) indicates a strong positive linear relationship between the independent variables (leaders awareness and leaders knowledge) and the dependent variable (creating inclusive learning environment). The coefficient of determination (R²) value of 0.714 suggests that approximately 71.4% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables in the model (creating

inclusive learning environment is explained by Leaders Knowledge and Leaders Awareness). Here, the adjusted R² is .704 (70.4%), slightly lower than the R² but still high, indicating a good fit despite the inclusion of predictors. The p-value associated with the F test statistic is less than 0.001, indicating that the improvement in model fit is statistically significant.

Table 9. ANOVA Result.

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.069	2	4.535	72.368	.000 ^b
	Residual	3.634	58	.063		
	Total	12.704	60			

a. Dependent Variable: CILE
b. Predictors: (Constant), Awareness, Knowledge

Note. CILE=creating inclusive learning environment, df=degree of freedom, sig=significant, ANOVA=Analysis of Variance

This table ([Table 9](#)) shows the results of an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test. The model includes a regression analysis with two degrees of freedom. The sum of squares for the regression is 9.069 and for the residual are 3.634. The p-value is .000. The F-statistic for the regression is 72.368, and

then from the above table show that the statistical value is greater than the tabulated value there is a statically significant between the independent variables and the dependent variable. So, the ANOVA results suggest that the regression model is a good fit.

6.4. Strategies to University Leaders' While Creating Inclusive Learning Environment Through Technology Integration for SWDS

Table 10. Strategies to be Improve.

1. Strategies can university leaders adopt to enhance their knowledge and awareness of creating an inclusive learning environment for SWDs through technology integration?		
	Frequency	Percent
Valid		
training, collaboration with SWDs services, evaluate and improve accessibility	25	41.0
competency, frequently follow up,	2	3.3
providing assistive technology	9	14.8
sharing experience	25	41.0
Total	61	100.0

Table 10 shows that majority of the respondents 25 (41%) respond that training and collaboration with SWD services and the evaluation and improvement of accessibility and Sharing experiences have ways to enhance leaders' knowledge and awareness for creating inclusive learning environments through technology integration for SWDs.

Inline to this, the data obtained from interview regarding the strategies that adopt to enhance leader knowledge and awareness of creating inclusive learning environment for SWDs through technological integration, most of the respondents elaborated the same ideas. Participant CD1 has reported that most of the time, training and sharing experience is very important to enhance the knowledge and awareness level of leaders for creating inclusive learning environment for SWDs through technological integration. However, two informants "CD2" and "TTCS" has shared that training, competency, collaboration with disability support service and sharing experiences are pivotal components in fostering a deeper knowledge and proficiency among leaders in the realm of creating inclusive learning environment, particularly concerning SWDs. Similarly, respondent ID has also said that sharing experiences further enriches this process, allowing leaders to exchange best practices, troubleshoot challenges, and cultivate a collaborative community dedicated to fostering inclusivity. In addition, participant CD4 and S1 has responds the same concept. They reported that, ultimately, investing in training and sharing experiences equips leaders with the knowledge and skills needed to create inclusive learning environments where every student can thrive. Therefore, training and collaboration with SWD services support, the evaluation and improvement of accessibility, and sharing experiences are the most frequently adopted strategies for enhancing leaders' knowledge and awareness for creating inclusive learning environments for SWDs through technol-

ogy integration.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1. Conclusions

By aiming to assess university leaders' knowledge and awareness of creating inclusive learning environment through technological integration for SWDs, based on the findings the following conclusions are drawn for each basic question. Generally.

University leaders have absence of knowledge of how to effectively create inclusive learning environments through technological integration for SWDs.

The awareness of university leaders in creating inclusive learning environments through technological integration for SWDs are currently low extent.

The association between the three variables (leaders' knowledge, leaders' awareness and creating inclusive learning environment) demonstrates a strong positive correlation. The statistical significance of this correlation ($p < 0.05$) suggests that this relationship is not due to random variation but reflects a reliable and meaningful connection. The result of Pearson correlation coefficient indicates that the variable has strong positive relationship with each other. Furthermore, the result of regression analyses of the variable has revealed that statistically significant relationship with a p -value is .00. This underscores the critical role that informed leadership plays in shaping inclusive practices, particularly through the integration of technology to support SWDs.

The strategies to enhance leaders' knowledge and awareness in creating inclusive learning environments through technological integration for SWDs include comprehensive

training on assistive technologies and inclusive design, regular evaluation of their practices to ensure progress, and close cooperation with disability support services to address specific needs.

7.2. Recommendations

This recommendation emphasizes the importance of university leaders' knowledge and awareness which proactive engagement in creating an inclusive atmosphere that leverages technological advancements.

For top-level university leaders expected to take the lead in policy formulation, ensuring that institutional policies are regularly updated to comply with legal standards and reflect best practices in accessibility.

Middle-level university leaders better to promote collaboration between various departments, such as IT, disability services, and academic faculties, to ensure that assistive technologies are not only available but are effectively integrated into the curriculum.

At the lower administrative levels, department heads and academic leaders expected to focus on providing direct support to SWDs by actively identifying their individual needs and ensuring they have access to the appropriate technologies and promoting a culture of inclusion within departments.

The minister of education had better establish clear policies and guidelines that emphasize the importance of inclusivity and technological integration for students with disabilities.

Abbreviations

IT	Information Technology
SWDs	Students with Disabilities
CD1	College Dean of 1
CD2	College Dean of 2
CD4	College Dean of 4
TTCS	Technology Transfer and Community Services
ID	Inclusive Diversity
JU	Jimma University

Author Contributions

Habtam Debasu Belay: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Muluken Tesfaye Kabtyimer: Resources, Software, Visualization

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Bates, A. W., & Sangrà, A. (2011). *Managing technology in higher education: Strategies for transforming teaching and learning*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [2] Bekele, T. A., Amponsah, S., & Karkouti, I. M. (2023). African philosophy for successful integration of technology in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*.
- [3] Burgstahler, S. (2015). *Universal design in higher education: From principles to practice* (2nd ed.). Harvard Education Press.
- [4] Burgstahler, S., & Cory, R. (2008). The role of leaders in advancing disability equity in higher education. *Journal of Post-secondary Education and Disability*, 21(1), 5-15.
- [5] Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A., Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2014). Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students to college: A comparison between White students and African-American students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(5), 486-512.
- [6] Carter, E. W., Sisco, L. G., Brown, L., Brickham, D., Al-Khabbaz, Z. A., & Liu, R. Y. (2014). Peer interactions and academic engagement of youth with developmental disabilities in inclusive middle and high school classrooms. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 119(3), 257-275.
- [7] CAST. (2018). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. Retrieved from <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>
- [8] Chambers, D. (2020). Assistive Technology Supporting Inclusive Education: Existing and Emerging Trends. In D. Chambers (Ed.), *Assistive Technology to Support Inclusive Education* (International Perspectives on Inclusive Education, Vol. 14), 1-16. Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-36362020000014001>
- [9] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- [10] Dunn, R., et al. (2014). The Impact of Technology Integration on Student Engagement. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 19(3), 145-162.
- [11] Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2016). *Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals*. Pearson.
- [12] Getachew, W., & Zewdu, A. (2019). Technology Integration in Higher Education Institutions: The Case of Ethiopian Universities. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 14(20), 222-238.
- [13] Grönlund, Å., Lim, N., & Larsson, H. (2010). Effective use of assistive technologies for inclusive education in developing countries: Issues and challenges from two case studies. *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT*, 6(4), 5-26.
- [14] Harrison, C., O'Donovan, M., & Lawlor, B. (2017). The Role of University Leadership in the Development of Inclusive Education for Students with Disabilities: Perspectives from Ireland and the United States. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(6), 638-654.

- [15] Hayes, A. M., & Bulat, J. (2017). *Disabilities Inclusive Education Systems and Policies Guide for Low-and Middle-Income Countries*. Occasional Paper. RTI Press Publication OP-0043-1707. RTI International.
- [16] Henderson, M., & Yeow, J. (2015). The role of leaders in enabling innovations in higher education. *Journal of Educational Change*, 16(3), 283-307.
- [17] Hitchcock, L., & Staker, H. (2012). Technology Integration: Fostering Collaboration and Social Interaction among Students with Disabilities and Their Peers. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(4), 301-315.
- [18] Hsieh, P.-H., & Cho, Y.-J. (2016). Creating a positive learning environment: The role of leadership style. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport Tourism Education*, 19, 44-53.
- [19] International Disability and Development Consortium. (2013). *Teachers for all: Inclusive education for children with disabilities*. Retrieved January 15, 2017, from https://www.unicef.org/disabilities/files/IDDC_Paper-Teachers_for_all.pdf
- [20] Karimi, A. (2017). Self-directed learning and technology integration in a blended learning environment. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 57(2), 157-174.
- [21] Kassa, B., Getahun, T., & Yigzaw, A. (2014). E-Learning Implementation in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions: Current Status, Opportunities, and Challenges. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 10(1), 4-22.
- [22] Machado, L. J., & Chung, C. J. (2015). Integrating technology: The principals' role and effect. *International Education Studies*, 8(5), 43.
- [23] Makoe, M. (2016). The role of technology in promoting inclusive education in South Africa: A case study of higher education institutions. *African Journal of Disability*, 5(1), 1-9.
- [24] National Center for College Students with Disabilities (NCCSD). (2021). *Annual Report on Disability Services in Higher Education*.
- [25] Opdebeeck, H. (2017). The Challenge of Transhumanism in Business. In M. T. N. Lang (Ed.), *Integral Ecology and Sustainable Business (Contributions to Conflict Management, Peace Economics and Development, Vol. 26)*, 251-260. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- [26] PNDR. (2014). "Promoting the Needs of the Disabled and Rehabilitation Act." *Educational Accessibility Reports*, 5(2), 78-91.
- [27] Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2017). *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice*. Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams Wilkins.
- [28] Puentedura, R. R. (2014). SAMR: A contextualized introduction. Retrieved from http://www.hippasus.com/rppweblog/archives/2014/05/22/SAMR_ContextualizedIntro.pdf
- [29] Sözen, E., & Güven, U. (2019). The Effect of Online Assessments on Students' Attitudes towards Undergraduate-Level Geography Courses. *International Education Studies*, 12(10), 1-8.
- [30] Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J., & Paas, F. (2019). Cognitive architecture and instructional design: 20 years later. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(2), 261-292.
- [31] Tiruneh, D. T. (2019). Inclusive Education and Technology in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities. In K. P. K. R. C. L. R. L. C. D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Emerging Practices and Methods for K-12 Online and Blended Learning* (pp. 1-18). IGI Global.
- [32] Treece, E. W., & Treece, J. W. (1982). *Elements of research in nursing* (3rd ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby
- [33] UNESCO. (2021). *UNESCO strategy for technological innovation in education (2022-2025)*.
- [34] USAID. (2015). *A guide for promoting gender equality and inclusiveness in teaching and learning materials*. Retrieved October 6, 2016, from <https://globalreadingnetwork.net/eddata/guide-promoting-gender-equality-and-inclusiveness-teaching-and-learning-materials-0>
- [35] Vaz, S., Wilson, N., Falkmer, M., Sim, A., Scott, M., Corider, R., & Falkmer, T. (2015). Factors associated with primary school teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities. *PLoS One*, 10(8), e0137002.
- [36] Yadavalli, P. K., & Mohammed, M. E. (2023). *Role of Academic Leaders in Creating Inclusive Environment through Technological Integration for Students with Disabilities: The Case of Ambo University*. (Unpublished MA thesis).
- [37] Zhang, J., & McCornac, D. C. (2013). A trilemma in higher education: Global competition, declining state support, and increasing accountability. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(3), 259-271.
- [38] Zhang, Y., Rosen, S., Cheng, L., & Li, J. (2018). Inclusive Higher Education for Students with Disabilities in China: What Do the University Teachers Think?. *Higher Education Studies*, 8(4), 104-115.