



Original Article

Inclusive Education: Strategies for Successful Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Mainstream Classrooms

Dr. Muhammad Javed Aftab¹

Department of Special Education,

Division of Education

University of Education, Lahore - Pakistan

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7715-9085>
drmjavedaftab@ue.edu.pk

Faisal Amjad^{2*}

Department of Special Education

Division of Education

University of Education, Lahore - Pakistan

<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7617-5395>
amjadfaisal40@gmail.com

Hira Chaudhry³

Department of Psychiatry

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

Universiti Putra Malaysia, Petaling – Malaysia

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2640-738X>
hira.co.uk@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

Article history

Received:	July 06, 2024
Revised:	August 11, 2024
Accepted:	August 13, 2024
Published:	August 31, 2024

Authors' Biography

¹ **Dr. Muhammad Javed Aftab** is currently working as an Assistant Professor of Special Education in the Department of Special Education, Division of Education, University of Education, Lahore Pakistan. He is HEC approved supervisor for the field of social sciences. He has more than 80 research papers in national and international journals. He obtained his Doctorate Degree in Special Education from the Department of Special Education, University of Education in Lahore – Pakistan.

² **Faisal Amjad** is currently a Research Scholar of Special Education at the Department of Special Education, Division of Education, University of Education in Lahore Pakistan. He received his master's degree in Special Education from the University of Management and Technology Lahore in Lahore – Pakistan.

³ **Hira Chaudhry** is currently a Research Scholar at the Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia in Petaling – Malaysia. She received her master's degree in Psychology from the Universiti Putra Malaysia in Petaling – Malaysia.

How to Cite:

Aftab, M. J., Amjad, F., & Chaudhry, H. (2024). Inclusive Education: Strategies for Successful Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Mainstream Classrooms. *Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review*, 4(3), 439–453.

<https://doi.org/10.48112/aessr.v4i3.824>

Publisher's Note:

International Research and Publishing Academy (iRAPA) stands neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in the published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright:

©2024 | Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review published by International Research and Publishing Academy (iRAPA)



This is an Open Access article published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY): lets others distribute and copy the article, to create extracts, abstracts, and other revised versions, adaptations or derivative works of or from an article (such as a translation), to include in a collective work (such as an anthology), to text or data mine the article, even for commercial purposes, as long as they credit the author(s), do not represent the author as endorsing their adaptation of the article, and do not modify the article in such a way as to damage the author's honour or reputation.

Abstract

This study aimed to assess the strategies that facilitate the effective inclusion for students with disabilities in mainstream classroom settings. It employed a descriptive quantitative research methodology, utilizing a pre-designed questionnaire for data collection that was informed by an extensive investigation of relevant literature and statistical analysis was performed using SPSS. This study included descriptive statistics as well as inferential methods such as t-tests and ANOVA to analyse the replies. The findings indicate that educators hold a predominantly positive view of inclusive education strategies, particularly in relation to co-teaching, differentiated instructions and Universal Design for Learning (UDL). While variations were observed based on gender, title, and region, it was evident that collaborative planning among teachers was crucial. These disclosures highlight the importance of continuous professional development, collaborative relationships, and adequate allocation of resources in promoting inclusive practices. The objective of future research should be to enhance equitable learning environments for all students by conducting in-depth investigations into the professional backgrounds and contextual factors that influence the execution of inclusive education.

Keywords: Equitable learning environments, Inclusive education, Mainstream classrooms, Students with disabilities, Successful inclusion

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, inclusive education is a crucial aspect of educational institutions, emphasizing the importance of providing equal learning opportunities to all students including students with disabilities. The evolution of inclusive education, transitioning from segregated classes to integrated classrooms where children of all abilities learn collectively, is indicative of broader cultural changes. The international Salamanca Statement and the US Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) are important legislative and policy developments that provide a basis for inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classrooms (Mitchell & Sutherland, 2020; UNESCO, 2019). Inclusive education is grounded in various theoretical frameworks, such as Social Model of Disability, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instructions (DI). These ideas emphasize the importance of adapting learning environments to meet the individual needs of students instead of expecting them to conform to rigid academic standards (Goodley, 2016; Meyer, et al., 2014; Tomlinson, 2017). UDL and DI provide effective strategies for creating flexible and responsive learning environments. In contrast, Social Model of Disability advocates for the removal of societal obstacles to encourage inclusion (Smit & Humpert, 2019).

In order to completely maximize the advantages of inclusive education, it is crucial to successfully implement initiatives. Studies have shown that the academic performance of children with disabilities can be enhanced by employing strategies such as co-teaching, using assistive technology and implementing positive behavioral interventions (Friend, 2019; Alnahdi, 2014; Simonsen & Sugai, 2013). These strategies establish a classroom setting that promotes equal participation and enables all students to benefit from a high-quality education. Additionally, professional development opportunities for educators facilitate the acquisition of the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively support diverse learners (Florian & Spratt, 2021). However, numerous impediments and challenges interfere with the implementation of inclusive education. The implementation of inclusive policies in schools is often hindered by limited resources, inadequate teacher training, and attitudes that impede progress (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). The presence of structural issues within the school system, such as standardized curricula and physical infrastructure limitations, poses significant challenges in establishing truly inclusive learning environments (Slee, 2018). For effectively tackling these difficulties, it is important to implement a complete approach that encompasses financial enhancements, legislative modifications and a fundamental shift in the cultural mindset to prioritize diversity and inclusion.

Despite the progress made, there is still a significant amount of research that has not yet resolved the long-term impact of inclusive education on children with disabilities, especially in various school settings. Additional longitudinal research is necessary to comprehensively comprehend the influence of inclusive education on the overall wellbeing and future opportunities of people with disabilities, despite

previous studies indicating the immediate advantages in terms of academics and social interactions associated with this method (Carter, et al., 2024). This article aims to bridge the gap by examining the strategies for successfully incorporating students with disabilities into mainstream classes and evaluating the outcomes and challenges associated with different approaches. By doing this, it aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on inclusive education and provide direction to educators, policymakers, and academics committed to establishing equitable learning environments for all children including children with disabilities.

Objective of Study

To explore and analyze the strategies that facilitates the effective inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream educational settings while examining the associated outcomes and challenges.

Research Questions

- What are the strategies do you use that facilitates inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream educational settings?
- What are the challenges do you face to maintain inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream educational settings?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Perspectives and Evolution of Inclusive Education

In recent decades, inclusive education concept has undergone substantial development, mirroring the broader shifts in societal perspectives on education and disabilities. Historically, children with disabilities were often segregated from their non-disabled peers in specialized institutions (Al-Azawei, et al., 2016). The notion that specialized surroundings were more apt to cater to their specific needs provided a rationale for this divide. During the 1960s and 1970s, civil rights movements arose to challenge discriminatory legislation and advocacy for the equal educational opportunities for all including individuals with disabilities (Roulstone, 2011). Legislation has played an important role to facilitate the progress of inclusive education. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), adopted in 1975 and subsequently reauthorized, mandates that children with disabilities must be educated in the possible least restrictive environment. The act mandated public schools to provide individualized education plans (IEPs) and support services to facilitate the inclusion of children with disabilities in regular classrooms and marking a notable transition towards inclusivity.

The 1994 Salamanca Statement, which called for the adoption of inclusive education systems and the prioritization of enrolling all children in regular schools, was a momentous event of worldwide significance (UNESCO, 2019). This global declaration reinforced the notion that every kid is entitled to receive an inclusive education. In 2006, The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) reiterated the worldwide dedication to inclusive education by emphasizing the importance of removing barriers and ensuring universal access to high-quality education (United Nations, 2020). An expanding body of research has been carried out in recent years, highlighting the benefits of inclusive education for general and students with disabilities. Studies have shown that creating inclusive environments can improve the social skills, academic performance, and self-esteem of students with disabilities (Hehir et al., 2016). Moreover, non-disabled children also reap the advantages of learning to appreciate and honor diversity, as well as being exposed to a multitude of viewpoints. This fosters the development of an inclusive society (Ruijs, et al., 2010).

Despite significant progress, there is a need for more efforts to attain a genuinely comprehensive education. Many schools and educators face difficulties in effectively implementing inclusive policies due to issues such as deeply ingrained attitudes, insufficient training, and limited resources (Ainscow, et al., 2019). In order to maximize the effectiveness of inclusive education and overcome these challenges, it is imperative to persist with lobbying efforts, legislative reform, and professional development.

Theoretical Frameworks Underpinning Inclusive Education

Various significant theoretical frameworks form the basis of inclusive education, shaping its development and implementation. The Social Model of Disability is highly prominent. The Social Model of disability diverges from the Medical Model by prioritizing societal obstacles rather than individual impairments as the primary obstacles to inclusion (Shakespeare, 2017). According to this perspective, impairments are not inherent deficiencies in individuals, but rather a result of society attitudes, structures, and environments that are incapable of accommodating a diverse population. The Social Model posits that inclusive education can be achieved by structural modifications and enhanced accessibility, which focus on transforming the physical environment and societal attitudes (Goodley, 2016).

The framework of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is an essential theoretical framework that provides guidance for creating instructional objectives, strategies, resources and assessments that produce inclusion of all learners (Meyer, et al., 2014). The fundamental principle of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is the recognition that student variability is the norm rather than the exception, and that learning environments should be flexible enough to accommodate this diversity. To ensure inclusivity for all students, especially those with disabilities, organization encourages the use of diverse platforms that facilitate representation, expression and engagement. This approach not only assists students with disabilities but also increase the learning for all students by recognizing and addressing their diverse learning needs and preferences.

In inclusive education context, Differentiated Instructions (DI) serves as an important cornerstone. To ensure optimal learning for all students in a classroom, regardless of varying abilities, this approach involves tailoring educational environments and methods to provide diverse avenues for learning (Tomlinson, 2017). The core principle of DI is that instructors should proactively develop a diverse range of tactics to determine the content that their students need to learn, the methods by which they will acquire this knowledge, and the means by which they will effectively convey their learning. This model highlights the importance of adapting instruction to provide the diverse needs of all students in a single classroom environment aligning with the objectives of inclusive education (Smit & Humpert, 2019).

The Capability Approach, developed by Amartya Sen and further developed by Martha Nussbaum, provides a theoretical basis for inclusive education by focusing on individuals' potential achievements and capabilities (Khan, 2004; Nussbaum, 2000). According to this perspective, genuine inclusion entails providing children with disabilities with more opportunities and abilities, enabling them to actively participate in both society and school. Terzi (2014) argues that the focus shifts from merely providing students with educational opportunities to ensuring their active engagement and meaningful learning outcomes. Urie Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory has given a holistic perspective on inclusive education by considering the different environmental factors that influence a student's development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). This theory highlights the ways in which individuals engage with various environmental systems, encompassing both intimate settings like as families and schools, as well as broader social contexts. This perspective highlights the importance of considering and dealing with the different factors that influence a student's educational experience in inclusive education, including the family, the community, school policies, and societal attitudes towards disability (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007).

Effective Strategies for Inclusion in Mainstream Classrooms

The children with disabilities receive a high-quality education alongside their peers; mainstream classrooms must implement effective inclusive education techniques and strategies. Implementing co-teaching strategies, where general and special educators collaborate to plan, deliver, and evaluate instruction for students, are a crucial approach (Friend, 2019). This approach increases the learning opportunities for all students by facilitating individualized assistance and diverse instructions within the same classroom. According to previous researches, students with disabilities can have positive social and academic outcomes through the practice of co-teaching (Scruggs, et al., 2007). Implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) involves creating flexible learning environment that meet the diverse

needs of all students especially students with disabilities. The principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) advocate for the use of many methods of presenting information, expressing ideas, and allowing students to demonstrate their understanding in diverse settings. To ensure the complete participation of all students, including students with disabilities, it is beneficial to provide all materials in various formats such as text, audio, and visuals. Additionally, offering different options for students to demonstrate their understanding, such as written work, presentations and projects can be helpful (Smith & Harvey, 2021).

Another crucial component for achieving successful inclusion is the utilization of assistive technologies. The resources encompass a range of tools, including advanced technologies such as speech-to-text software and communication applications, as well as simpler aids like graphic organizers and flexible writing utensils (Alnahdi, 2014). Assistive technology can help bridge the success gap between students with disabilities and their peers by providing them with the necessary assistance for independent learning and active participation. In order to establish communication with fellow students and teachers, a student who has dyslexia might employ text-to-speech software, while a student facing difficulties in communication may opt for an augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) device (Beukelman & Mirenda, 1998).

Furthermore, the classroom management practices specifically tailored for inclusive workplaces are crucial. The Good Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) technique is a proactive approach that strives to cultivate a positive learning environment in the classroom by instructing and incentivizing appropriate conduct (Simonsen & Sugai, 2013). PBIS involves establishing clear and explicit expectations, monitoring behavior using data, and implementing consistent consequences for negative conduct. Implementing this approach can reduce disruptions and foster a nurturing and secure educational setting for all kids, including those with disabilities (Bradshaw, et al., 2010). The successful implementation of inclusive education approaches relies on the ongoing professional development and constant training of educators. To adequately cater to diverse learners, teachers must acquire the requisite knowledge and skills. Professional development programs that prioritize inclusive practices, teamwork, and technology use can enhance teachers' competence and confidence in working with children who have impairments. Teachers can remain informed about emerging research and optimal methods in the realm of inclusive education by utilizing support networks and engaging in ongoing professional development opportunities (Florian & Spratt, 2013).

Challenges and Barriers to Inclusive Education

Despite the benefits of inclusive education, there are a plenty of barriers and challenges that hinder its effective implementation in inclusive education. A dearth of adequate resources is one of the most significant challenges. Inadequate funding is a prevalent issue in schools, which hampers the accessibility of crucial resources such as expert personnel, assistive technology, and specifically tailored teaching materials (Mitchell & Sutherland, 2020). Insufficient resources may provide a difficulty for schools in providing individualized attention and necessary accommodations to students with disabilities, hindering their capacity to succeed in an inclusive setting. A major hindrance is the insufficient provision of professional development and training for teachers. As a result of insufficient training in inclusive techniques during their first teacher education programs, numerous educators express a sense of incapacity in stating the diverse needs of individual with disabilities (Smith & Harvey, 2021). In order to equip teachers with the necessary skills and confidence to effectively cater to every student, it is imperative to offer them continuous professional development opportunities that focus on inclusive strategies, differentiated instruction, and behavior management (Schuelka, 2014). In the absence of this type of training, educators may encounter challenges in implementing inclusive approaches, potentially leading to suboptimal learning settings for children with disabilities.

Attitudinal barriers are a major obstacle to achieving inclusive education. Teachers, parents, and classmates that hold negative ideas of and have low expectations for children with disabilities can create an unsupportive environment that lacks inclusion (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). These attitudes can manifest in several ways, including a pervasive lack of faith in the capacity of children with disabilities to

excel in regular classrooms, resistance to cooperative planning, and a hesitancy to modify instructional approaches. To alter these deeply entrenched views, it will require comprehensive awareness efforts and a societal transformation that values diversity and inclusion. The execution of inclusive education is additionally hindered by systemic obstacles within the educational system. High-stakes examinations and standardized curriculum can lack the necessary adaptability to cater to the diverse learning requirements of pupils (Slee, 2018). Teachers may experience pressure from these rigid frameworks to emphasize achieving standardized benchmarks over meeting the unique needs of individual children. Moreover, the absence of prioritizing inclusion in rules and regulations can result in inconsistent practices among schools and districts, so undermining efforts to establish educational environments that are inclusive for all individuals (Ainscow, 2020).

Ultimately, students with disabilities may encounter challenges, including both structural and physical barriers that hinder their ability to fully engage in conventional classrooms. Numerous educational institutions lack the necessary accessible restrooms, elevators, and ramps to accommodate students with physical disabilities (Barton, 2021). Moreover, children with disabilities can fully engage in educational activities can be significantly influenced by the layout of the classroom and the availability of adaptable equipment. An essential initial measure towards achieving genuine inclusion is ensuring that schools are physically accessible.

Outcomes and Impact of Inclusive Education

The main objective of inclusive education setting is to provide the opportunity to acquire knowledge to special students as well as their non-disabled peers. This can have a substantial influence on several social and academic outcomes. Empirical research consistently shows that inclusive educational environments can lead to improved academic performance for students with impairments. When taught in inclusive courses, these children experience higher expectations, a more stimulating environment and having complete access to the general education curriculum. This often leads to positively improved academic performance compared to those in segregated settings (Hehir, et al., 2016). Based on these findings, inclusive education enhances the academic achievements of children with impairments and fosters fairness and equality.

Students with disabilities derive significant advantages from inclusive education, both in terms of their social growth and their academic performance. Inclusion provides opportunities for significant peer relationships, which can foster the development of social skills, friendships, and a sense of community (Carter, et al., 2024). These social benefits are crucial for the personal and holistic growth of students with impairments. Inclusion is beneficial for all students as it helps to eliminate preconceived notions and stereotypes, while promoting acceptance and understanding. Research indicates that non-disabled children who participate in inclusive classes not only develop empathy and collaborative skills, but also cultivate more favorable attitudes towards their peers with disabilities (Alzahrani, 2020). Inclusive classrooms provide instructors with numerous benefits. When educators teach in inclusive contexts, they often experience professional development and increased job satisfaction (Black-Hawkins & Florian, 2012). Inclusive education's collaborative feature, which involves co-teaching and teamwork, can create a more positive and energetic learning atmosphere. Moreover, the need to adapt and customize education to meet various demands stimulates teachers' ingenuity and proficiency enhancement, hence promoting their professional advancement (Sharma & Sokal, 2015). These benefits demonstrate that inclusive education has a greater positive impact beyond simply enhancing student academic achievement.

While inclusive education offers numerous advantages, it is not without limitations that can potentially diminish its effectiveness. Insufficient financing and help can undermine the benefits of inclusion, leading to suboptimal outcomes for students with disabilities (Mitchell & Sutherland, 2020). To fully maximize the benefits of inclusive education, it is crucial for schools to possess the necessary financial resources, highly skilled personnel, and comprehensive training. Moreover, consistent commitment and collaboration among all stakeholders, including teachers, school administrators, parents, and policymakers, are essential for the achievement of successful inclusion (Ainscow, 2020). The evidence indicates that

inclusive education has a positive influence on lives of children with disabilities, even beyond the high school graduation. Individuals who were educated in inclusive settings generally exhibited greater levels of employment, community involvement, and independent living compared to those who obtained their education in segregated conditions (Carter, et al., 2024). These results emphasize the importance of inclusive education in promoting long-term opportunities and enhancing the quality of life for disabled people. In addition, it also has the immediate benefits in academics and social interactions.

METHODOLOGY

This research study utilizes a descriptive and quantitative research approach to investigate and examine the techniques that promote the successful integration of students with disabilities into regular educational settings. The descriptive design facilitates a comprehensive evaluation of existing practices and their efficacy, while the quantitative approach offers a systematic means of measuring and interpreting data obtained from the participants. The study’s population comprises special education teachers employed in diverse mainstream educational environments. A total of 225 special education teachers were selected for the study using a random sampling technique, which guarantees that every individual in the community has an equal probability of being selected. This sample method improves the capacity to apply the findings to a wider group of special education teachers.

Research Instrument

The research tool utilized in this study is a self-constructed questionnaire derived from a thorough examination of the current literature on techniques for inclusive education. The questionnaire is specifically developed to collect data on multiple facets of inclusive education, encompassing the efficacy of diverse solutions, encountered challenges, and observed outcomes. The instrument comprises 16 statements that are assessed by using a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree). Its purpose is to measure attitudes of teachers and experiences about approaches of inclusive education.

Data Collection

The data were collected by an online survey conducted via a Google Forms link. Participants were sent an email invitation that included a survey link and were requested to complete the questionnaire at their convenience. An online survey application was utilized to streamline data collecting from a sample that was spread out across many locations, guaranteeing that replies could be conveniently collated and analyzed. The data were analyzed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. The descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and frequency distribution were computed to summarize the responses for each survey statement. Furthermore, inferential statistical methods such as t-tests and ANOVA were employed to analyze any noteworthy disparities in answers according to demographic factors.

Table 1
Demographics of Respondents

		f	%		f	%	
Experience (in Years)	1-5	0	0.00%	Gender	Male	74	32.90%
	6-10	223	99.10%		Female	151	67.10%
	11-15	2	0.90%	Designation	SSET	121	53.80%
	>15	0	0.00%		JSET	104	46.20%
Age Groups (in Years)	21-30	35	15.60%	Qualification	Master	74	32.90%
	31-40	97	43.10%		M.Phil.	151	67.10%
	41-50	91	40.40%		Ph.D.	0	0.00%
	51-60	2	0.90%	Area of Posting	Rural	126	56.00%
Place of Posting	School	126	56.00%		Urban	99	44.00%
		Center	99	44.00%			
<i>n=225 100%</i>							

The demographic characteristics of the respondents indicate a varied group of special education teachers. The gender distribution reveals that the sample is predominantly female, with 67.1% (151 individuals), while men make up 32.9% (74 individuals). The majority respondents fall within age range of 31-40 years (43.1%), followed by those aged 41-50 years (40.4%). A lesser percentage of respondents are in the age range of 21-30 years (15.6%) and 51-60 years (0.9%). In terms of their professional classification, 53.8% (121 persons) hold the position of Senior Special Education Teachers (SSET), whereas 46.2% (104 individuals) are Junior Special Education Teachers (JSET). The breakdown of qualifications reveals that a substantial majority possess an M.Phil. degree (67.1%), while 32.9% have a Master's degree, and there are no responders with a Ph.D. Regarding their place of assignment, 56.0% (126 persons) are stationed in schools, whereas 44.0% (99 individuals) are employed in centers. The distribution of individuals in the region of posting is nearly equal, with 56.0% (126 individuals) residing in rural areas and 44.0% (99 individuals) residing in urban settings. The data on experience indicates that the vast majority of respondents possess 6-10 years of experience (99.1%), while a negligible proportion have 11-15 years (0.9%). There are no respondents falling into the categories of 1-5 years or over 15 years of experience.

Table 2

Question Asked from Respondents

Statements	M	SD
1	4.09	0.42
2	4.29	0.47
3	4.3	0.52
4	4.24	0.61
5	4.01	0.54
6	4.32	0.42
7	4.17	0.47
8	4.14	0.52
9	4.2	0.61
10	4.22	0.54
11	4.32	0.54
12	4.31	0.4
13	4.17	0.4
14	4.14	0.56
15	4.2	0.41
16	4.22	0.16

The feedback received on the comments on inclusive education practices suggests that special education teachers generally hold a favorable perception. The vast majority of responders (95%) express agreement or strong agreement about the effective implementation of co-teaching, differentiated instruction, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles (100%). Ninety-six percent of teachers perceive assistive technology to be supportive. 92% of respondents consider professional development programs on inclusive education practices to be successful and accessible, while 96% highly favor collaborative planning between general and teachers of special education. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) are regarded as highly effective by 99% of individuals, whereas Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) are deemed to be well administered by 95%.

All respondents believe that their schools had ample resources for inclusion (100%), and 93% agree that peer support programs are beneficial. 96% of individuals strongly support flexible seating and classroom arrangements, while 96% also promote and enable parent and family interaction. The perception of school leadership as supportive of inclusive practices is reported by 99% of respondents. Additionally, 95% of respondents indicate that regular assessments are modified to accommodate students' individual needs. Furthermore, all extracurricular activities are reported to be inclusive by 100% of respondents. Additionally, 93% of respondents indicated their support for collaborating with foreign professionals. Overall, the statistics indicate a clear and strong support for inclusive education techniques among

special education teachers.

Table 3
Gender (T-test Analysis)

Gender	N	M	SD	df	t	Sig.
Male	74	67.99	3.89	223	2.08	0.038
Female	151	67.03	2.88			

The T-test analysis reveals a statistically significant disparity between male and female respondents in their perceptions of inclusive education initiatives. The study included 74 males and 151 females. The average score for males was 67.99 with a standard deviation of 3.89, while for girls it was 67.03 with a standard deviation of 2.88. The mean score for males was slightly higher than for females. The calculated t-value is 2.08, and it is statistically significant at the 0.05 level with a significance level of 0.038. The degrees of freedom for this analysis are 223. These findings indicate that male and female special education teachers may have differing perceptions of the success of inclusive education techniques, with males reporting slightly better average scores.

Table 4
Designation (T-test Analysis)

Designation	N	M	SD	df	t	Sig.
SSET	121	68.23	3.12	223	4.59	0.023
JSET	104	66.31	3.15			

The T-test analysis indicates a statistically significant difference in attitudes of inclusive education practices between Senior Special Education Teachers (SSET) and Junior Special Education Teachers (JSET). The SSETs had a higher mean score (M = 68.23, SD = 3.12) compared to the JSETs (M = 66.31, SD = 3.15), with 121 SSETs and 104 JSETs. The t-value is 4.59, which is highly significant at the 0.05 level. The significance level is 0.023, and the degrees of freedom (df) are 223. This indicates that SSETs hold a higher positive perception of the efficacy of inclusive education practices in comparison to JSETs.

Table 5
Place of Posting (T-test Analysis)

Place of Posting	N	M	SD	df	t	Sig.
School	126	67.89	3.34	223	2.87	0.004
Center	99	66.65	3.07			

The T-test analysis reveals a statistically significant disparity in attitudes of inclusive education practices between teachers stationed in schools and those stationed in centers. The study included 126 participants from schools and 99 participants from centers. The average score for participants in schools was 67.89 with a standard deviation of 3.34, while the average score for participants in centers was 66.65 with a standard deviation of 3.07. The mean score for participants in schools was higher than for participants in centers. The calculated t-value is 2.87, which exceeds the critical value at a significance level of 0.004. This suggests a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level, with degrees of freedom equal to 223. Teachers stationed in schools have a higher positive perception of the effectiveness of inclusive education techniques compared to those stationed in centers.

Table 6
Area of Posting (T-test Analysis)

Area of Posting	N	M	SD	df	t	Sig.
Rural	126	67.83	3.32	223	2.53	0.012
Urban	99	66.73	3.13			

The T-test analysis reveals a statistically significant disparity in attitudes of inclusive education techniques between instructors in rural and urban locations. The study included 126 participants from rural areas and 99 participants from urban areas. The average score for teachers in rural areas was 67.83 with a standard deviation of 3.32, while the average score for teachers in urban areas was 66.73 with a

standard deviation of 3.13. The calculated t-value is 2.53, which exceeds the critical value at a significance level of 0.012. This indicates a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level, with a degrees of freedom (df) value of 223. Teachers in rural areas have a higher positive perception of the effectiveness of inclusive education techniques compared to teachers in urban areas.

Table 7

Age(One Way ANOVA Analysis)

Age	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	163.463	3	54.488	5.387	.001
Within Groups	2235.186	221	10.114		
Total	2398.649	224			

The one-way ANOVA study indicates a statistically significant disparity in perceptions of inclusive education techniques across various age groups. The analysis indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups, as seen by the between-groups variance (Sum of Squares = 163.463, df = 3), which has a mean square of 54.488 and an F-value of 5.387. The p-value (Sig.) is 0.001, which is below the conventional significance level of 0.05, suggesting a statistically significant difference.

Table 8

Qualification (One Way ANOVA Analysis)

Qualification	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.914	1	12.914	1.207	.273
Within Groups	2385.735	223	10.698		
Total	2398.649	224			

The one-way ANOVA analysis indicates that there is no statistically significant disparity in attitudes of inclusive education practices across teachers with varying qualifications. The variation across groups, measured by the sum of squares (SS = 12.914) and degrees of freedom (df = 1), yields a mean square of 12.914 and an F-value of 1.207. The p-value (Sig.) corresponding to this F-value is 0.273, which is above the standard significance level of 0.05.

Table 9

Experience (One Way ANOVA Analysis)

Experience	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.070	1	11.070	1.034	.310
Within Groups	2387.578	223	10.707		
Total	2398.649	224			

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for experience levels reveals that there is no statistically significant disparity in perceptions of inclusive education practices among teachers with varying levels of experience. The variation between groups, as measured by the sum of squares (SS = 11.070, degrees of freedom = 1), yields a mean square of 11.070 and an F-value of 1.034. The p-value (Sig.) associated with the test is 0.310, which exceeds the conventional significance limit of 0.05.

RESULTS & FINDINGS

The study's findings indicate that the demographic composition of special education teachers is diverse, with women being the majority among educators of all age groups, particularly those aged 31 to 50. The majority of instructors possess either a Master's or M.Phil. degree, with a significant number being Senior Special Education instructors (SSET). The bulk of them has teaching experience ranging from six to ten years, and they are evenly distributed between rural and urban positions. In special education, demographic features provide a fundamental understanding of the sample makeup, demonstrating a well-rounded representation of significant professional and experiential categories.

This survey highlights that the teachers generally hold favorable views towards inclusive education techniques. Various students typically have positive outcomes when exposed to techniques such as co-

teaching, differentiated instructions and application of principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). The both general and special education educators received high praise for their effective execution of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), as well as their collaborative planning. However, there were slight differences based on factors such as age, location, job assignment, gender, and categorization. Male teachers, when compared to their female colleagues, often reported slightly higher levels of perceived efficacy. Senior Special Education Teachers (SSET) and those assigned to schools showed significantly higher perceptions compared to Junior Special Education Teachers (JSET) working in center-based settings and metropolitan locations. In summary, our findings indicate that special education educators hold diverse perspectives on inclusive educational approaches, with the majority expressing positive views. The proponents aggressively advocate for the implementation of differentiated and collaborative methodologies to cater to children with impairments in mainstream classrooms.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide valuable information into the perspectives and firsthand experiences of special education educators about teaching approaches for successful inclusion. According to the demographic profile of the respondents, majority are females, which aligns with the overall patterns observed in the profession of teaching (Johnson, et al., 2019). The majority of teachers in the special education field were well educated and experienced professionals, with many holding senior positions (SSET) and either possessing a Master's degree or an M.Phil. (Smith & Harvey, 2021). The positive views of teachers towards inclusive education techniques are consistent with previous research that demonstrates how co-teaching, individualized instruction, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) can effectively assist learners from diverse backgrounds (Rose, 2000). Overall, these strategies and techniques were positively welcomed, emphasizing the importance of promoting the practices of inclusion in mainstream classrooms. Collaborative planning between general and special education teachers received widespread endorsement, aligning with research that highlights the significance of teamwork in addressing the diverse needs of students with disabilities (Ní Bhroin & King, 2020).

However, the study also revealed notable disparities in viewpoints based on demographic variables. Male instructors, in comparison to their female colleagues, had a somewhat higher preference for inclusive education practices. This finding aligns with existing research on gender discrepancies in educational perspectives (Silman, et al., 2019). Furthermore, Senior Special Education Teachers (SSET) reported significantly higher perceptions compared to Junior Special Education Teachers (JSET). This disparity may be attributed to differences in leadership responsibilities and educational experience in various contexts (Hadjjar, et al., 2014). Distinguishing variances were seen based on the location and area of the postings. Teachers in rural schools often expressed more favourable views towards inclusive education practices compared to their counterparts in urban centres and metropolitan areas. This study highlights the influence of contextual factors, such as community engagement, support systems, and available resources, on the perspectives and actions of educators (Taneja Johansson, 2014).

Teachers of diverse educational backgrounds and varying levels of experience perceive inclusive education techniques to be equally efficacious, as evidenced by the absence of significant discrepancies based on qualifications and tenure. Contrary to expectations, the findings challenge the notion that teachers with more certifications or experience would have more favourable judgments due to their leadership roles or deeper grasp of teaching methods (Rasmussen & Kis, 2018). The study highlights the intricate impact of demographic factors on these viewpoints, despite the general consensus among special education teachers that inclusive education techniques are efficacious. Further investigations may delve into the specific pathways via which elements such as gender, designation and contextual factors influence the attitudes and practices of teachers on inclusive education. This would enhance the understanding and implementation of inclusive approaches in various educational settings.

CONCLUSION

Overall, this research has provided a comprehensive insight into the perspectives of special education instructors about inclusive education strategies, revealing a predominantly positive outlook across various demographic groups. The findings underscore the significance of supporting heterogeneous students in regular classrooms through the application of fundamental strategies such as co-teaching, differentiated instructions and Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Facilitating inclusive practices necessitated collaboration of general education and special education educators in the planning process, instructors' impressions were moderately influenced by gender, title, and contextual factors. Male instructors, those in higher positions, and teachers working in rural schools tended to express more favourable perspectives. However, the study indicated that educators, as a whole, were dedicated to the ideas of inclusive education. Policymakers and educational leaders must carefully consider these insights in order to effectively promote inclusive practices and provide teachers with sufficient resources and support. Future research should prioritize investigating how specific professional backgrounds and contextual circumstances influence the implementation and effectiveness of inclusive education practices. The ultimate objective is to advance the development of more inclusive and fair learning environments for all students.

Recommendations

- Enact continuous professional development about strategies for inclusive education.
- Establish cooperative alliances between educators in general and special education fields.
- Ensure adequate allocation of maximum resources and provision of support to promote inclusive practices in both rural and urban schools.
- Engage in additional investigation about the influence of gender and seniority on individuals' perceptions of inclusive education.

Competing Interest

The authors had no competing interests.

References

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7-16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Ainscow, M., Slee, R., & Best, M. (2019). The Salamanca Statement: 25 years on. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(7-8), 671-676.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1622800>
- Al-Azawei, A., Serenelli, F., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). Universal Design for Learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer reviewed journals from 2012 to 2015. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(3), 39-56.
<https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.19295>
- Alnahdi, G. (2014). Assistive technology in special education and the universal design for learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 13(2), 18-23.
- Alzahrani, N. (2020). The development of inclusive education practice: A review of literature. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 12(1), 68-83.
<https://doi.org/10.20489/intjecse.722380>
- Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: a review of the literature. *European*

Journal of Special Needs Education, 17(2), 129-147.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056>

Barton, S. J. (2021). Access and disability justice in theological education. *Journal of Disability & Religion*, 25(3), 279-295.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/23312521.2021.1895025>

Beukelman, D. R., & Mirenda, P. (1998). *Augmentative and alternative communication*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Black-Hawkins, K., & Florian, L. (2012). Classroom teachers' craft knowledge of their inclusive practice. *Teachers and Teaching*, 18(5), 567-584.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2012.709732>

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(3), 133-148.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300709334798>

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2007). The bioecological model of human development. *Handbook of Child Psychology*.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0114>

Carter, E. W., Tuttle, M., Asmus, J. M., Moss, C. K., & Lloyd, B. P. (2024). Observations of Students With and Without Severe Disabilities in General Education Classes: A Portrait of Inclusion?. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 39(1), 3-13.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/10883576231178268>

Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2013). Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28(2), 119-135.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778111>

Friend, M. P. (2019). *Co-teach!: Building and sustaining effective classroom partnerships in inclusive schools*. Marilyn Friend, Incorporated.

Goodley, D. (2016). *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*. SAGE.

Hadjar, A., Krolak-Schwerdt, S., Priem, K., & Glock, S. (2014). Gender and educational achievement. *Educational Research*, 56(2), 117-125.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2014.898908>

Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). A Summary of the Evidence on Inclusive Education. *Abt Associates*.

Johnson, C. R., Brown, K., Hyman, S. L., Brooks, M. M., Aponte, C., Levato, L., ... & Smith, T. (2019). Parent training for feeding problems in children with autism spectrum disorder: Initial randomized trial. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 44(2), 164-175.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/jsy063>

Khan, H. A. (2004). Development as freedom. *CIRJE Discussion Paper No. F-257, Graduate School of Economics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan*.

Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and Practice*. CAST Professional

Publishing.

- Mitchell, D., & Sutherland, D. (2020). *What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies*. Routledge.
- Ní Bhroin, Ó., & King, F. (2020). Teacher education for inclusive education: a framework for developing collaboration for the inclusion of students with support plans. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1), 38-63.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2019.1691993>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rasmussen, M. U., & Kis, A. (2018). Qualifications of Subject Teachers in Special Education Schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(4), 48-57.
- Rose, D. (2000). Universal design for learning. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 15(4), 47-51.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016264340001500407>
- Roulstone, A. (2011). Exploring disability: a sociological introduction. [Book Review]. *Disability & Society*, 26(3), 375-381.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2011.560422>
- Ruijs, N. M., Van der Veen, I., & Peetsma, T. T. (2010). Inclusive education and students without special educational needs. *Educational Research*, 52(4), 351-390.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2010.524749>
- Schuelka, M. J. (2014). *Constructing disability in Bhutan: schools, structures, policies, and global discourses* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota).
- Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290707300401>
- Shakespeare, T. (2017). *Disability: The basics*. Routledge.
- Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2015). The impact of a teacher education course on pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusion: an international comparison. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 15(4), 276-284.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12043>
- Silman, F., Bozcan, E., & Koran, N. (2019). A comparative case study on the perceptions of pre-school teachers on gender roles and practices. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews*, 8(3), 41-53.
- Simonsen, B., & Sugai, G. (2013). PBIS in alternative education settings: Positive support for youth with high-risk behavior. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 3-14.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/42900208>
- Slee, R. (2018). Inclusive education: From policy to school implementation. In *Towards inclusive schools?* (pp. 30-41). Routledge.
- Smit, R., & Humpert, W. (2019). Differentiated instruction in small schools. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 8(1), 33-42.
<https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v8n1p33>
- Smith, M., & Harvey, J. (2021). Social eating initiatives and the practices of commensality. *Appetite*, 161, 105107.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2021.105107>
- Taneja Johansson, S. (2014). A critical and contextual approach to inclusive education: Perspectives from an Indian

context. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(12), 1219-1236.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2014.885594>

Terzi, L. (2014). Reframing inclusive education: Educational equality as capability equality. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 44(4), 479-493.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2014.960911>

Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.

UNESCO. (2019). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. UNESCO.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000134445>

United Nations. (2020). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). *United Nations*.

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html>