

## AWARENESS AND OPINION OF PRIMARY TEACHERS TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Aparajita JAISWAL<sup>1</sup>, Anju AGARWAL<sup>2</sup>, Yash PAL SINGH<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Dept. of Education, M. J. P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly (U. P.) - 243006

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Dept. of Education, M. J. P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly (U. P.) - 243006

<sup>3\*</sup> Professor, Dept. of Education, M. J. P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly (U. P.) - 243006

\*Corresponding Author: Email: yashpalsingh23@gmail.com

---

### Abstract

India has signed and ratified “United Nations Convention on Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD)” in the very year 2008 when United Nations opened it for signing. UNCRPD makes it mandatory for all nations to implement inclusive education at all levels and in all institutions. Hence, it is compulsory for our country, India, to implement inclusive education throughout the country, at all levels and in all institutions. In-fact, Government of India claims at all national and international forums that it has implemented inclusive education at all levels in all institutions since 2009. However, our observations and experiences in the field infer that inclusive education is still not realized to its true potential in our country at any level. To verify/refute our claim of non-implementation of inclusive education at primary level, we conducted small research among teachers of Government primary schools in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh. We targeted to assess awareness and opinion of these teachers towards inclusive education by employing descriptive survey method of research. The results obtained and inferences drawn during our research endeavour suggest that a lot of work is required to effectively implement inclusive education in our primary schools.

*Keywords:* Awareness, Opinion, Primary Teachers, Inclusive Education

---

### Introduction

India has signed and ratified “United Nations Convention on Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD)” in the very year 2008 when United Nations opened it for signing. UNCRPD makes it mandatory for all nations to implement inclusive education at all levels and in all institutions. Hence, it is compulsory for our country, India, to implement inclusive education throughout the country, at all levels and in all institutions. In-fact, Government of India claims at all national and international forums that it has implemented inclusive education at all levels in all institutions since 2009. The commitment to implement inclusive education throughout the country, at all levels and in all institutions further got emphasised by the enactment of Right to Education Act, 2009 which again made it mandatory to provide education to all kinds of children. The recent “Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 again reiterated the mandatory need of implementing inclusive education. The recent thrust to promised act of implementing inclusive education throughout the country, at all levels and in all institutions has been derived from National Education Policy, 2020 which in its article 6 on “Equitable and Inclusive Education: Learning for All” states that:

*“Education is the single greatest tool for achieving social justice and equality. Inclusive and equitable education - while indeed an essential goal in its own right - is also critical to achieving an inclusive and equitable society in which every citizen has the opportunity to dream, thrive, and contribute to the nation. The education system must aim to benefit India’s children so that no child loses any opportunity to learn and excel because of circumstances of birth or background. This Policy reaffirms that bridging the social category gaps in access,*

*participation, and learning outcomes in school education will continue to be one of the major goals of all education sector development programmes.”*

*In fact, the fundamental principles that will guide both the education system at large, as well as the individual institutions within it as enumerated in NEP (2020) include “full equity and inclusion as the cornerstone of all educational decisions to ensure that all students are able to thrive in the education system”. It speaks volumes about the promise being continuously put forward by our governments to implement inclusive education throughout the country, at all levels and in all institutions. However, our observations and experiences in the field infer that inclusive education is still not realized to its true potential in our country at any level.*

### **Background of the study**

As we aimed at assessing awareness and opinion of primary teachers towards inclusive education, it was necessary to search for available evidences if any. In the process, we located a few studies as listed below. Maheshwari & Shapurkar (2015) revealed that teachers had some amount of awareness but an inadequate amount of information on disabilities and inclusive education. Disability to most (37) teachers meant “an inability to do something”. The difference between disability and handicap was stated by most as former being cognitive while handicap being physical in nature. With regard to Inclusive education, a large number (46) stated that they were unaware of the term and did not know what it meant. Majority (52) of them perceived maximum challenges for themselves in an inclusive set up, and emphasized on the role of teacher training courses in the area of providing knowledge (49) and training in teaching methodology (53). Although, 83.3% of teachers held a moderately positive attitude towards inclusive education, a large percentage (61.6%) of participants felt that being in inclusive set up would be very challenging for both children with special needs and without special needs. Though, most (49) of the teachers stated that children with special needs should be educated in regular classroom but they further clarified that only those should be in a regular classroom who have physical impairments of mild or moderate degree.

Galaterou (2017) reported in a study that Teachers in Greece demonstrated marginally positive attitudes towards inclusion, which were correlated with their age. Specifically, younger teachers expressed more positive attitudes than their older colleagues. However, no differences were detected between men and women. Furthermore, relatively high levels of stress were observed, while the specific stressors were detected. Finally, teachers’ attitudes were partly correlated to occupational stress, as less positive attitudes towards inclusive education were associated with increased levels of stress. Thomas & Uthaman (2019) in a study entitled “Knowledge and Attitude of Primary School Teachers Towards Inclusive Education of Children with Specific Learning Disabilities” reported that 63% of participants have an average level of knowledge and 51% of the participants have a positive attitude towards inclusive education of children with specific learning disabilities. The study found out that there is a significant correlation between teachers' knowledge and their attitude towards inclusive education.

Amjad *et al* (2020) in a study conducted among teachers teaching classes 1 to 10 revealed that teachers’ overall awareness about Inclusive Education (IE) was at moderate level. Their awareness about the importance of implementing IE was at higher level, but their awareness about policies and projects related to IE was at lower level. Surprisingly, 67.8% participants had no knowledge about the term of IE. Almost all the teachers never participated in any workshop/seminar related to IE (99%). while 99.5% never got any training to teach inclusive students. The study recommended that a massive awareness campaign may be launched in schools. Refresher courses or workshops may be conducted to train teachers about the concept and importance of inclusive education and a special and separate policy for IE was suggested

to be formulated. Gandhi *et al* (2020) in their study entitled “Attitude of Primary School Teachers towards Inclusive Education: Variation by Gender, Locale” found out that there was significant difference between private and government primary school teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education. Private teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education was more positive as compared to their government primary teachers. No significant difference was found in the attitudes of primary school teachers towards inclusive education for both the schools with respect to gender and locale of schools.

Jones (2020) in her study found that primary school teachers in Belize had varying attitudes towards the inclusive education of children with special needs. Such results provide many implications for further development in inclusive practices in the country. However, a few teachers indicated negative or neutral attitudes towards the process. The latter attitudes were influenced by various factors related to the student, teacher, and educational environment. The findings also indicate chief challenges that hinder the implementation of quality inclusive education such as the lack of knowledge by the teachers, the lack of educational resources and the lack of parental involvement in the children’s education. The author concludes that primary school teachers in Belize have varying attitudes towards including students with special needs into their classrooms. There is still much more work to be done in improving the attitudes of some teachers and creating more effective inclusive educational environments. The results of the study by Pérez-Jorge *et al* (2021) do not allow us to affirm that the teachers showed positive attitudes towards inclusion, expressing concern about offering a correct and adequate response to the students with hearing disabilities. They considered that educational inclusion requires important improvements focused on the training and specialization of teachers in the field of inclusion.

Radojlovic *et al* (2022) found that one in three teachers (32.8%) thought that inclusion was useful for children with disabilities (29.7%), of them thought that schools did not have the conditions for inclusive education, whereas one in four teachers (25.0%) believed that inclusion was not good. No statistically significant differences were found in the attitudes of professors, when observed in terms of their gender, age and length of service. They concluded that investing more resources and time in developing and implementing special education policies can promote successful inclusive education. As stated earlier, our observations and experiences in the field also infer that inclusion is still a far-fetched dream in our country, India, as well at any level. To verify/refute our claim of non-implementation of inclusive education at primary level, we conducted small research among teachers of primary schools in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh.

### **Statement of the problem**

“Awareness and Opinion of Primary Teachers Towards Inclusive education”

### **Operational definitions**

#### **Awareness**

The term ‘awareness’ refers to the degree of knowing facts related to and understanding the concept of inclusive education. In the present study, the primary teachers’ conceptual understanding (awareness) towards inclusive education is the concern.

## **Opinion**

The term ‘opinion’ refers to concerted thoughts possessed by individuals towards some phenomenon. In the present study, opinion of primary teachers towards implementing inclusive education at primary level is targeted for observation.

## **Primary Teachers**

The term ‘primary teachers’ refers to the individuals engaged in the act of teaching from classes one (1) to eight (8) in schools. In the present study, the primary teachers imparting education at primary level are targeted for observation.

## **Inclusive education**

The term ‘inclusive education’ refers to providing equity in educational opportunities. It demands *zero exclusion* in our schools on any grounds. Further, inclusive education refers to *no discrimination* on any grounds in the schools with respect to environmental conditions, pedagogy, and all other kinds of educational practices. In the present study, the status of implementing inclusive education at primary level is targeted for observation.

## **Research methodology**

The present study has been conducted with the aim of realizing following objectives:

1. To assess the awareness towards inclusive education among primary teachers.
2. To ascertain opinion of primary teachers with respect to initiatives needed on the part of governments to implement inclusive education at primary level.

As the purpose of the study was to ascertain the status of awareness and opinion of primary teachers with respect to inclusive education, descriptive survey method was employed in the present study.

### **1. Tool Used**

A questionnaire was developed for data collection. It consists of a total of four questions. The first three questions are closed items aiming to assess awareness. The fourth question is open ended and elicits opinion of the teachers.

### **2. Sample and Sampling**

Purposive sampling was used for the study. The simple target was to collect data from 50 rural and 50 urban male teachers as well as 50 rural and 50 urban female teachers. However, a total sample of 42 male teachers was collected from rural area and 46 male teachers from urban area. Hence, a total of 88 male teachers were included in the sample. Further, a sample of 34 female teachers from rural area and 49 female teachers from urban areas was also collected. Overall, a total of 83 female teachers were included in our sample. Thus, the total number of teachers included in the sample of the present study were 171 (Please see Table-1).

**Table-1: Sample**

	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Male</b>	42	46	<b>88</b>
<b>Female</b>	34	49	<b>83</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>171</b>

### 3. Data-collection

The researchers contacted most of the sample teachers directly-individually for getting the questionnaire filled by them. However, some of them were also requested to contact their colleagues, get our questionnaires filled by them and then return these filled questionnaires to the researchers.

### 4. Statistical Treatment

The data was analysed with the help of percentages only.

### Results: analysis and discussion

The questionnaire used in the study consisted of four questions, first three being objective-type, closed and aiming to assess awareness of teachers about basic concepts of inclusive education. The fourth and last question was open-ended & qualitative, and aimed at assessing the opinion of teachers towards implementation of inclusive education.

The first question tried to assess awareness of teachers about types of children benefitted by inclusive education. The responses of teachers have been analysed and presented in Table-2 as below in terms of numbers and percentages. One thing must be noted here that the teachers were asked to choose as many categories of children as they wished. There was not a restriction to choose only one category.

**Table-2: Responses of Teachers about Types of Children targeted in Inclusive Education**

	<b>Rural</b>			<b>Urban</b>			<b>Total</b>		
	<b>Male (42) N(%)</b>	<b>Female (34) N (%)</b>	<b>Total (76) N(%)</b>	<b>Male (46) N(%)</b>	<b>Female (49) N (%)</b>	<b>Total (95) N(%)</b>	<b>Male (88) N(%)</b>	<b>Female (83) N (%)</b>	<b>Total (171) N(%)</b>
<b>Physically Disabled Children</b>	40 (95.2)	32 (94.1)	<b>72 (94.8)</b>	45 (97.8)	47 (95.9)	<b>92 (96.8)</b>	85 (96.5)	79 (95.1)	<b>164 (95.9)</b>
<b>Socially Marginalized Children</b>	04 (09.5)	03 (08.8)	<b>07 (09.2)</b>	05 (10.8)	05 (10.2)	<b>10 (10.5)</b>	09 (10.2)	08 (09.6)	<b>17 (09.9)</b>
<b>Financially Deprived Children</b>	05 (11.9)	04 (11.7)	<b>09 (11.8)</b>	05 (10.8)	06 (12.2)	<b>11 (11.5)</b>	10 (11.3)	10 (12.0)	<b>20 (11.6)</b>
<b>Scheduled Cast Children</b>	03 (07.1)	04 (11.7)	<b>07 (09.2)</b>	04 (08.6)	04 (08.1)	<b>08 (08.4)</b>	07 (07.9)	08 (09.6)	<b>15 (08.7)</b>
<b>Scheduled Tribe Children</b>	03 (07.1)	05 (14.7)	<b>08 (10.5)</b>	05 (10.8)	04 (08.1)	<b>09 (09.4)</b>	08 (09.0)	09 (10.8)	<b>17 (09.9)</b>
<b>Slow Learners</b>	21 (50.0)	24 (70.5)	<b>45 (59.2)</b>	30 (65.2)	33 (67.3)	<b>63 (66.3)</b>	51 (57.9)	57 (68.6)	<b>108 (63.1)</b>
<b>Intellectual Disabled Children</b>	35 (83.3)	30 (88.2)	<b>65 (85.5)</b>	42 (91.3)	44 (89.7)	<b>86 (90.5)</b>	77 (87.5)	74 (89.1)	<b>151 (88.3)</b>
<b>Learning</b>	30	26	<b>56</b>	29	35	<b>64</b>	59	61	<b>120</b>

<b>Disabled Children</b>	(71.4)	(76.4)	<b>(73.6)</b>	(63.0)	(71.4)	<b>(67.3)</b>	(67.0)	(73.4)	<b>(70.1)</b>
<b>Any Other</b>	05 (11.9)	02 (05.8)	<b>07</b> <b>(09.2)</b>	04 (08.6)	03 (06.1)	<b>07</b> <b>(07.3)</b>	09 (10.2)	05 (06.0)	<b>14</b> <b>(08.1)</b>

The Table-2 displays the trends in beliefs of primary teachers about the type of children they think as beneficiary of inclusive education. Most of the rural male primary teachers believe that inclusive education is beneficial to physically disabled children (N=40, 95.2%). Second best numbers (N=35, 83.3%) of these teachers believe that inclusive education is beneficial for intellectually disabled children and third position as per the beliefs of rural male primary teachers is occupied by learning-disabled children (N=30, 71.4%). In case of rural female primary teachers, the rankings are the same, first being physically disabled (N=32, 94.1%), second intellectually disabled (N=30, 88.2%), and third learning-disabled children (N=26, 76.4%).

As far as urban male primary teachers are concerned, the trends vary a little. In their opinion, the most beneficiary are physically challenged (N=45, 97.8%), intellectually-disabled children are at second rank (N=42, 91.3%), and third place is taken by slow learners (N=30, 65.2%). In the opinion of urban female primary teachers, the rankings are like those for rural teachers, physically disabled being first (N=47, 95.9%), second being intellectually disabled children (N=44, 89.7%) and learning-disabled children at third position (N=35, 71.4%).

If we take rural and urban primary teachers together, the trends are the same. We find that for males, females, and for total teachers (male and female taken together), the physically-disabled children are considered most beneficiary, intellectually-disabled children occupy the second rank, and learning-disabled children have taken the third rank.

We know inclusive education does not discriminate among children on any grounds and all kinds of children benefit equally from inclusive education. Hence, it can be simply inferred that:

- i. All types of primary teachers have confusion with respect to type of children benefitting from inclusive education.
- ii. The primary teachers are not aware of basic concepts related to inclusive education.

These results are in consonance with findings reported by Maheshwari & Shapurkar (2015) and Amjad *et al* (2020).

To further assess their awareness, the second question in our questionnaire solicited responses about the types of teachers required to implement inclusive education in the primary schools. The responses received have been presented in Table-3.

**Table-3:** Responses of Teachers about Types of Teachers Needed in Inclusive Education

	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male (42) N (%)	Female (34) N (%)	Total (76) N (%)	Male (46) N (%)	Female (49) N (%)	Total (95) N (%)	Male (88) N (%)	Female (83) N (%)	Total (171) N (%)
<b>General Teacher</b>	07 (16.6)	06 (17.6)	<b>13</b> <b>(17.1)</b>	06 (13.0)	05 (10.2)	<b>11</b> <b>(11.5)</b>	13 (14.7)	11 (13.2)	<b>24</b> <b>(14.0)</b>
<b>Special Educator</b>	31 (73.8)	27 (79.4)	<b>58</b> <b>(76.3)</b>	37 (80.4)	40 (81.6)	<b>77</b> <b>(81.0)</b>	68 (77.2)	67 (80.7)	<b>135</b> <b>(78.9)</b>
<b>Any other</b>	04 (09.5)	01 (02.9)	<b>05</b> <b>(06.5)</b>	03 (06.5)	04 (08.1)	<b>07</b> <b>(07.3)</b>	07 (07.9)	05 (06.0)	<b>12</b> <b>(07.0)</b>

A perusal of Table-3 reveals that majority of rural male primary teachers believe that implementing inclusive education requires special teachers in schools (N=31, 73.8%). Only a few (N=07, 16.6%) believed that we need general teachers to implement inclusive education whereas another few (N=04, 9.5%) thought that other types of teachers are required for implementing inclusive education. The trends were the same for rural females, urban males, urban females, total males (urban plus rural), and total female teachers (urban plus rural). It means that overall, all the primary teachers in majority think that

- i. Special Teachers are required for implementing inclusive education which is not true.
- ii. Very few teachers know that general teachers are in fact supposed to implement inclusive education.

These results again support findings reported by Maheshwari & Shapurkar (2015) and Amjad *et al* (2020).

The third question in our questionnaire aimed at assessing teachers' awareness about school areas where modifications are required in order to effectively implement inclusive education. The question was closed, objective-type and had eight (08) choices/options to choose from. One thing must be noted here that the teachers were asked to choose as many options as they wished. There was not a restriction to choose only one category. The responses received have been presented in Table-4 as below.

**Table-4:** Responses about Needed Modifications for Implementing Inclusive Education

	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male (42) N(%)	Female (34) N (%)	Total (76) N(%)	Male (46) N(%)	Female (49) N (%)	Total (95) N(%)	Male (88) N (%)	Female (83) N (%)	Total (171) N(%)
<b>Infrastructure</b>	40 (95.2)	33 (97.0)	<b>73</b> <b>(96.0)</b>	46 (100)	45 (91.8)	<b>91</b> <b>(95.7)</b>	86 (97.7)	78 (93.9)	<b>164</b> <b>(95.9)</b>
<b>Teachers</b>	30 (71.4)	33 (97.0)	<b>63</b> <b>(82.8)</b>	40 (86.9)	41 (83.6)	<b>81</b> <b>(85.2)</b>	70 (79.5)	74 (89.1)	<b>144</b> <b>(84.2)</b>
<b>Pedagogy</b>	32 (76.1)	32 (94.1)	<b>64</b> <b>(84.2)</b>	42 (91.3)	47 (95.9)	<b>89</b> <b>(93.6)</b>	74 (84.0)	79 (95.1)	<b>153</b> <b>(89.4)</b>
<b>Co-Curricular Activity</b>	20 (47.6)	19 (55.8)	<b>39</b> <b>(51.3)</b>	34 (73.9)	36 (73.4)	<b>70</b> <b>(73.6)</b>	54 (61.3)	55 (66.2)	<b>109</b> <b>(63.7)</b>
<b>Music</b>	05 (11.9)	07 (20.5)	<b>12</b> <b>(15.7)</b>	09 (19.5)	12 (24.4)	<b>21</b> <b>(22.1)</b>	14 (15.9)	19 (22.8)	<b>033</b> <b>(19.2)</b>
<b>Curriculum</b>	40 (95.2)	34 (100)	<b>74</b> <b>(97.3)</b>	44 (95.6)	47 (95.9)	<b>91</b> <b>(95.7)</b>	84 (95.4)	81 (97.5)	<b>165</b> <b>(96.4)</b>
<b>Books</b>	41 (97.6)	30 (88.2)	<b>71</b> <b>(93.4)</b>	45 (97.8)	48 (97.9)	<b>93</b> <b>(97.8)</b>	86 (97.7)	78 (93.9)	<b>164</b> <b>(95.9)</b>
<b>Any other</b>	05 (11.9)	06 (17.6)	<b>11</b> <b>(14.4)</b>	06 (13.0)	05 (10.2)	<b>11</b> <b>(11.5)</b>	11 (12.5)	11 (13.2)	<b>022</b> <b>(12.8)</b>

The Table-4 shows what changes/modifications, according to primary teachers, would be needed to effectively implement inclusive education in the schools. Most rural male primary teachers needed to modify 'books' (N=41, 97.6). 'Infrastructure' (N=40, 95.2) and the 'curriculum' (N=40, 95.2) were the second preference of teachers for modifications and third choice was 'pedagogy' (N=32, 76.1). In view of the rural female primary teachers, to implement inclusive education in schools, choices for the needed modifications were slightly different. Their joint first choice were 'infrastructure' and 'teachers' (N=33, 97.0); second was 'pedagogy' (N=32, 94.1) and third was the 'books' (N=30, 88.2).

The sequence of these choices for urban male primary teachers were again different. Here, the first preference for modifications was given to ‘infrastructure’ (N=46, 100%), second preference was given to ‘books’ (N=45, 97.8%), and third preference was given to ‘curriculum’ (N=44, 95.6). Urban female primary teachers believed ‘books’ needed to be modified at priority (N=48, 97.9%), ‘curriculum’ & ‘pedagogy’ were given jointly second preference (N=47, 95.9%), and third preference was given to ‘infrastructure’ (N=45, 91.8%).

Male primary teachers (rural and urban combined) gave joint first preference to ‘infrastructure’ and ‘books’ (N=86, 97.9%), second to ‘curriculum’ (N=84, 95.4%), and third to ‘pedagogy’ (N=74, 84.0%). However, for the total female primary teachers, the choices were ‘curriculum’ (N=81, 97.5%), ‘pedagogy’ (N=79, 95.1%), and ‘infrastructure’ & ‘books’ jointly (N=78, 93.9%) as the first, second, and third choices respectively. For total teachers, males and females taken together, the first choice was ‘curriculum’ (N=165, 96.4%), second jointly was ‘infrastructure’ and ‘books’ (N=164, 95.9%), and third choice was ‘pedagogy’ (N=153, 89.4%). It is evident from the above data that the primary teachers have divided opinion with respect to their perceptions of school ingredients/processes where they think modifications are required in order to effectively implement inclusive education. From above data, it can be inferred that teachers are not very clear about the school ingredients/processes where modifications are required in order to effectively implement inclusive education. In fact, we need modifications in each aspect of school system. These results are again in consonance with findings reported by Maheshwari & Shapurkar (2015) and Amjad *et al* (2020).

The fourth and last question was open-ended and qualitative in nature. Here, teachers were expected to provide their opinion about the initiatives needed on the part of the government in order to effectively implement inclusive education in the primary schools. As the question was open-ended, many teachers did not provide any response to it (N=79, 46.1%) and only the remaining (N=92, 53.8%) teachers provided some response to it as shown in Table-5.1.

**Table 5.1:** Responding to Suggestions for Government Initiatives

	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male (42) N (%)	Female (34) N (%)	Total (76) N (%)	Male (46) N (%)	Female (49) N (%)	Total (95) N (%)	Male (88) N (%)	Female (83) N (%)	Total (171) N (%)
<b>No Response</b>	20 (47.6)	18 (52.9)	<b>38</b> <b>(50.0)</b>	21 (45.6)	20 (40.8)	<b>41</b> <b>(43.1)</b>	41 (46.5)	38 (45.7)	<b>79</b> <b>(46.1)</b>
<b>Responded</b>	22 (52.3)	16 (47.0)	<b>38</b> <b>(50.0)</b>	25 (54.3)	29 (59.1)	<b>54</b> <b>(56.8)</b>	47 (53.4)	45 (54.2)	<b>92</b> <b>(53.8)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>34</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>76</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>46</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>49</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>95</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>88</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>83</b> <b>(100)</b>	<b>171</b> <b>(100)</b>

The responses provided by these 92 teachers were analysed to search for trends and then the responses were quantified. These quantified responses have been presented in Table-5.2 as below.



**Table 5.2: Suggestions for Government Initiatives**

	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male (42) N (%)	Female (34) N (%)	Total (76) N (%)	Male (46) N (%)	Female (49) N (%)	Total (95) N (%)	Male (88) N (%)	Female (83) N (%)	Total (171) N (%)
<b>Infrastructure</b>	22 (52.3)	16 (47.0)	<b>38</b> <b>(50.0)</b>	25 (54.3)	28 (57.1)	<b>53</b> <b>(55.7)</b>	47 (53.4)	44 (53.0)	<b>91</b> <b>(53.2)</b>
<b>Teacher Training</b>	17 (40.4)	15 (44.1)	<b>32</b> <b>(42.1)</b>	23 (50.0)	26 (53.0)	<b>49</b> <b>(51.5)</b>	40 (45.4)	41 (49.3)	<b>81</b> <b>(47.3)</b>
<b>Awareness Camps</b>	09 (21.4)	10 (29.4)	<b>19</b> <b>(25.0)</b>	18 (39.1)	22 (44.8)	<b>39</b> <b>(41.0)</b>	27 (30.6)	32 (38.5)	<b>59</b> <b>(34.5)</b>
<b>Clear guidance</b>	08 (19.0)	10 (29.4)	<b>18</b> <b>(23.6)</b>	15 (32.6)	20 (40.8)	<b>35</b> <b>(36.8)</b>	23 (26.1)	30 (36.1)	<b>53</b> <b>(30.9)</b>
<b>Funding</b>	06 (14.2)	09 (26.4)	<b>15</b> <b>(19.7)</b>	16 (34.7)	20 (40.8)	<b>36</b> <b>(37.8)</b>	21 (23.8)	29 (34.9)	<b>50</b> <b>(29.2)</b>
<b>Teaching Learning Materials (TLM)</b>	05 (11.9)	07 (20.5)	<b>12</b> <b>(15.7)</b>	14 (30.4)	18 (36.7)	<b>22</b> <b>(23.1)</b>	19 (21.5)	25 (30.1)	<b>44</b> <b>(25.7)</b>
<b>Curriculum</b>	05 (11.9)	06 (17.6)	<b>11</b> <b>(14.4)</b>	17 (36.9)	19 (38.7)	<b>36</b> <b>(37.8)</b>	22 (25.0)	25 (30.1)	<b>47</b> <b>(27.4)</b>
<b>Others</b>	05 (11.9)	07 (20.5)	<b>12</b> <b>(15.7)</b>	08 (17.3)	06 (12.2)	<b>14</b> <b>(14.7)</b>	13 (14.7)	13 (14.7)	<b>26</b> <b>(15.2)</b>

The Table 5.2 clearly depicts that, most rural male primary teachers (N=22, 52.3%) suggested that the government should upgrade ‘infrastructure’ in order to effectively implement inclusive education in the primary schools. ‘Teacher training’ (N=17, 40.4%) was the second preference and third choice was ‘awareness camps’ (N=9, 21.4%). Rural female primary teachers believed ‘infrastructure’ needed to be improved at priority (N=16, 47.0%). Second preference was given to ‘Teacher training’ (N=15, 44.1%) and third preference was given jointly (N=10, 29.4%) to ‘awareness camps’ & ‘Clear guidance’.

The urban male primary teachers suggested that to implement inclusive education the government should go for upgrading ‘infrastructure’ at the first place (N=25, 54.3%). Second best number (N=23, 50%) of these teachers believed to improve ‘Teacher training’ programme and third position was given to ‘awareness camps’ (N =18, 39.1%). In case of urban female primary teachers, the rankings are the same, first being ‘infrastructure’ (N=28, 57.1%), second ‘Teacher training’ (N=26, 53.0%) and third ‘awareness camps’ (N=22, 44.8%).

If we take rural and urban primary teachers together, the trends are the same. We find that for males, females, and for total teachers (male and female taken together), the ‘infrastructure’ (N=91, 53.2%) was considered most important, ‘Teacher training’ (N=81, 47.3%) occupied the second rank, and ‘awareness camps’ (N=59, 34.5%) have taken the third rank.

These results infer that the primary teachers have suggested some initiatives needed on the part of the government in order to effectively implement inclusive education in the primary schools. Somewhat consensus exists among them as they suggest changes in the following:

- i. Infrastructure
- ii. Teacher training
- iii. Awareness Camps
- iv. Clear Guidance
- v. Funding
- vi. Curriculum
- vii. Teaching-Learning Materials

It can be safely assumed on the basis of their responses that the teachers do not believe that inclusive education may be implemented effectively in our primary schools within existing conditions. It should be however noted here that our government claims that inclusive education has already been implemented at all levels and in all educational institutions since 2008.

## Conclusions

The results lead us to following conclusions:

- i. The primary teachers have confusion with respect to type of children benefitting from inclusive education.
- ii. The primary teachers are not aware of basic concepts related to inclusive education.
- iii. The primary teachers in majority think that Special Teachers are required for implementing inclusive education which is not true.
- iv. Very few teachers know that general teachers are in fact supposed to implement inclusive education.
- v. Teachers are not very clear about the school ingredients/processes where modifications are required in order to effectively implement inclusive education.
- vi. The teachers do not believe that inclusive education may be implemented effectively in our primary schools within existing conditions. They have suggested several initiatives needed on the part of the government in order to effectively implement inclusive education in the primary schools.

From the above findings, we may infer that a lot of work is required to effectively implement inclusive education in our primary schools.

## References

- [1] Amjad, A. I., Iqbal, H., & Manjar-Abbas, S. S. (2020). Teachers' Awareness about Inclusive Education in Punjab: A Descriptive Enquiry. *Journal of Inclusive Education*. 4(1), pp. 161-178. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349310798\\_Teachers'\\_Awareness\\_about\\_Inclusive\\_Education\\_in\\_Punjab\\_A\\_Descriptive\\_Enquiry](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349310798_Teachers'_Awareness_about_Inclusive_Education_in_Punjab_A_Descriptive_Enquiry) on Sept. 14, 2022
- [2] Galaterou, J. (2017). Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education: The Role of Job Stressors and Demographic Parameters. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION*. 32 (4), pp. 643-658. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1184123.pdf> on Sept. 14, 2022
- [3] Gandhi, A., Rani, K., & Rani, G. (2020). Attitude of Primary School Teachers towards Inclusive Education: Variation by Gender, Locale. *Wutan Huatan Jisuan Jishu Journal*. 16 (1), pp. 78-89. Retrieved from <http://wthtjss.cn/gallery/11-whjj-jan-2020.pdf> on Sept. 14, 2022
- [4] Jones, J. (2020). *Attitudes of Primary School Teachers Towards Inclusive Education in Belize: A Systematic Review*. Unpublished M. A. Dissertation, University of South Wales. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED612707.pdf> on Sept. 14, 2022
- [5] Maheshwari, P. & Shapurkar, M. (2015). Awareness and Attitudes of Primary Grade Teachers (1-4<sup>th</sup> Grade) towards Inclusive Education. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences*. 9(11), pp. 3959-3964. Retrieved from <https://publications.waset.org/10003021/awareness-and-attitudes-of-primary-grade-teachers-1-4thgrade-towards-inclusive-education> on Sept. 14, 2022
- [6] National Education Policy (2020). Government of India: Ministry of Education. [https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/NEP\\_Final\\_English\\_0.pdf](https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf) Retrieved on Oct. 15, 2021
- [7] Pérez-Jorge, D., Rodríguez-Jiménez, M. D. C., Ariño-Mateo, E., & Sosa-Gutiérrez, K. J. (2021). Perception and Attitude of Teachers towards the Inclusion of Students with Hearing Disabilities. *Education Sciences*. 11, 187. Retrieved from <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/11/4/187/pdf> on Sept. 14, 2022
- [8] Radojlovic, J., Kilibarda, T., Radevic, S., Maricic, M., Ilic, K. P., Djordjic, M., Colovic, S., Radmanovic, B., Sekulic, M., Djordjevic, O., Niciforovic, J., Vukomanovic, I. S., Janicijevic, K., &

- Radovanovic, S. (2022). Attitudes of Primary School Teachers Toward Inclusive Education. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 13, May 2022. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.891930/full> on Sept. 14, 2022
- [9] Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009). Government of India: Ministry of Education. [https://legislative.gov.in/sites/default/files/A2009-35\\_0.pdf](https://legislative.gov.in/sites/default/files/A2009-35_0.pdf) Retrieved on Oct. 15, 2021
- [10] The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016). Government of India: Ministry of Education. [https://legislative.gov.in/sites/default/files/A2016-49\\_1.pdf](https://legislative.gov.in/sites/default/files/A2016-49_1.pdf) Retrieved on Oct. 15, 2021
- [11] Thomas, E. K. & Uthaman, S. P. (2019). Knowledge and Attitude of Primary School Teachers Towards Inclusive Education of Children with Specific Learning Disabilities. *Journal of Social Work Education and Practice*. 4(2), pp. 23-32. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344167041\\_Knowledge\\_and\\_Attitude\\_of\\_Primary\\_School\\_Teachers\\_Towards\\_Inclusive\\_Education\\_of\\_Children\\_with\\_Specific\\_Learning\\_Disabilities](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344167041_Knowledge_and_Attitude_of_Primary_School_Teachers_Towards_Inclusive_Education_of_Children_with_Specific_Learning_Disabilities) on Sept. 14, 2022
- [12] *UNCRPD* (2008). United Nations: Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/article-24-education.html> Retrieved on Oct. 15, 2021