



## PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS OF STUDENTS WITHOUT DISABILITIES ABOUT INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

*Dr. Satish Chandra*

*Principal, Society for Institute of Psychological Research and Health, Amroha, Uttar Pradesh*

### Abstract:

*Inclusive education gives an opportunity to all the children to learn together in a regular school and parents can play a major role in educating their children as well as in implementing inclusive education in the country. This study focuses (i) to know the perception of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their - (a) gender (b) locality (ii) to examine the perception of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their - (a) dependents (b) educational qualification (c) occupation (d) family income. A sample of 60 parents of children without disabilities was selected randomly whose children were studying in SSA-run regular inclusive schools of Gwalior district, Madhya Pradesh. Findings of the study are summarised as (i) No significant difference was found among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their gender (mother and father), locality (rural and urban) and the number of dependents in the family and however (ii) Significant difference was found among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education according to their educational qualifications, occupations, and family income and (iii) Fathers, urban parents, parents with higher educational qualifications, parents from service category, and parents from above average income category showed more favourable perceptions about over their categories about inclusive education.*

**Key words:** *Perception, Students without Disabilities, Parents, Inclusive Education*

**Copyright © 2022 The Author(s):** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

### Introduction

Perceptions or attitudes of stakeholders of inclusive education may influence the quality of implementation of inclusive education i.e. general teachers, parents, community members, and other professionals' attitudes. Parents of students without disabilities can also play a major role in including the students with disabilities in regular schools. If parents motivate their children to support other students with disabilities this may help in enhancing the social acceptance of children with disabilities in schools and classrooms. Positive perception of parents of students without disabilities has a great deal in implementing inclusive education because it can put their children on the line of the philosophy of inclusive education. Many research studies have revealed a varied nature of perceptions/attitudes among parents. Therefore, it is very necessary to understand the perceptions of parents about inclusive education because this will lead to further planning

of inclusive education.

Ravindranadan and Raju (2007) concluded in their study on 'Adjustment and attitude of parents of children with mental retardation' that (i) the parental attitude shows the significant difference among the subjects grouped on the basis of religion (ii) meanwhile there was no significant difference among the groups of subjects on the basis of education in all the variables (iii) the results also imply that there exists a significant difference between rural and urban parents only in social adjustment and parental attitude and not in other variables and (iv) the subjects of lower and higher income did not show any significant difference in none of the variables. Rural and urban parents show attitude differences towards the child with retardation and their social adjustment also gets affected. Similarly, Kumar and Rao (2008) conducted a 'Parental attitudes towards children with hearing impairment' and the objective of the study was to examine parental attitudes towards children with hearing impairment. Findings of the study are (i) fathers exhibit more favourable attitudes in comparison to mothers and (ii) Fathers and mothers exhibit more favourable attitudes towards their hearing-impaired sons than towards their daughters. However, this attitudinal bias is statistically significant in the case of fathers, but not so with mothers. As education levels improve, parental attitudes also become more favourable.

Further, Lakshmi, Geetha and Krishnamurthy (2009) revealed in their study on 'Parental perspectives towards the education of visually impaired children'; and objective of the study was to examine parental perspectives towards the education of visually impaired children. Findings of the study were (i) there is a significant difference in the attitude of parents towards the concept of special education (ii) parents of visually impaired children attending special school opined that special education is better than the regular programme (iii) there is a significant difference in the attitude of parents towards the concept of special education (iv) the parents of visually impaired children attending special school opined that special education is better than the regular programme and (v) there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the parents towards the concept of integrated education. Chandra, Satish and Bhadoria, V.S. (2017) also conducted a study titled as 'Parents' Perception about Inclusive Education'. Objectives of the study were (i) to compare parents of CWSN on their perception about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators in terms of their - (a) Gender (b) Locality (ii) to study perception/opinion of parents of CWSN about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators in terms of their - (a) Dependents (b) Educational qualifications (EQ) (c) Occupation (d) Family income. Method: In this present study a survey-based research approach is being adopted to study the variations in perception of Parents of CWSN about inclusive education in rural and urban Govt. schools run under SSA. Sample: A sample of 60 parents of CWSN comprised of 36 (60 per cent) male and 24 (40 per cent) females were chosen using purposive sampling technique with the help of teachers, from government schools located in Gwalior district of Madhya Pradesh. Findings of the study concluded that (i) Parents of CWSN were not found significantly different on their perception about inclusive education according to their gender ( $p = .329$ ), locality ( $p = .220$ ) and according to the number of dependents ( $p = .828$ ). (ii) There was a significant difference among parents of CWSN on their perception about inclusive education according to their educational qualifications ( $p = .000$ ), occupations ( $p = .000$ ) and family income ( $p = .043$ ). (iii) Male parents of CWSN were found more favourable in perception about

inclusive education than female parents. Further analysis showed that urban parents of CWSN expressed more favourable perceptions about inclusive education than rural parents. (iv) Parents of CWSN from Graduation and above EQ and Service occupation category showed conducive perception about inclusive education in comparison to parents from lower EQ and other occupation categories and (v) similarly, parents from high family income group also reflected positive perception about inclusive education in comparison to parents of low family income groups.

### **Objectives of the Study**

1. *To study the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their - (a) Gender (b) Locality.*
2. *To examine the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their - (a) Dependents (b) Educational qualification (EQ) (c) Occupation (d) Family Income (FI).*

### **Hypotheses of the Study**

1. *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators in terms of their - (a) Gender (b) Locality.*
2. *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators in terms of their - (a) Dependents (b) Educational qualification (EQ) (c) Occupation (d) Family income (FI).*

### **Methodology**

The nature of this research study is descriptive and therefore researcher employed a survey method of descriptive research for data collection from the respondents.

### **Sample and Sampling Technique**

Government schools run under SSA of Gwalior district of Madhya Pradesh, both from rural and urban areas were taken under consideration for this study. The schools were chosen by lottery method of simple random sampling technique, 10 primary schools (I-V) and 10 elementary level schools from each block and further a sample of 60 parents selected randomly whose children without disabilities were studying in SSA run regular inclusive schools of Gwalior district, Madhya Pradesh.

### **Tool Used**

The researcher used a self-made and standardised tool to measure the 'Perception of Parents of Normal Students about Inclusive Education (PPNSAIE). This tool contains 42 items on (i) awareness about inclusive education (ii) facilities and school environment (iii) instruction (iv) peer's relationship and (v) examination and evaluation. The reliability of the tool was calculated using the test-retest method and the coefficient of correlation of two sets of scores was found to be 0.80 that shows the tool is reliable to collect the data. All the measures were also used to make the tool valid for data collection.

### **Delimitations of the Study**

This study has been delimited to primary (Class I-V) and upper primary (class VI-VIII) inclusive schools located in rural and urban areas of district Gwalior (M.P.) only.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

**H<sub>01(a)</sub>** *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their gender.*

**Table 1: Difference in perceptions of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education by their gender**

| Gender | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | df | t-value (2-tailed) | p-value |
|--------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|---------|
| Male   | 38 | 63.79 | 19.69          | 3.193           | 58 | .378               | .707    |
| Female | 22 | 61.82 | 19.09          | 4.069           |    |                    | NS      |

*Significance level = 95% confidence interval, NS=Not-significant*

Table-1 shows that the mean scores of male parents (father) of *students without disabilities* (M=63.79, SD=19.69) showed slightly favourable perceptions about inclusive education in comparison to female parents (mothers) of *students without disabilities* (M=61.82, SD=19.09). These two means of male (father) and female (mother) parents of *students without disabilities* were analysed using a t-test (2-tailed) and the t-test was not significant on the gender of parents of *students without disabilities*,  $t(58) = .378$  as the  $p\text{-value} = .707$ ,  $p > .05$ . Therefore the null hypothesis (1a) that there is no significant difference among parents of *students without disabilities* on *their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators* according to their gender is accepted. Fathers (male parents) exhibit slightly favourable perceptions in comparison to mothers.

**H<sub>01(b)</sub>** *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their locality.*

**Table-2: Difference in perceptions of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education according to locality**

| Locality | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | df | t-value (2-tailed) | p-value |
|----------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|---------|
| Rural    | 28 | 59.93 | 15.12          | 2.858           | 58 | -1.180             | .243    |
| Urban    | 32 | 65.81 | 22.25          | 3.934           |    |                    | NS      |

*Significance level = 95% confidence interval, NS=Not-significant*

The table-2 reveals that the mean scores of urban parents of *students without disabilities* (M=65.81, SD=22.25) showed positive perceptions about inclusive education than rural parents of *students without disabilities* (M=59.93, SD=15.12). Two means of urban and rural parents of *students without disabilities* were analysed using a t-test (2-tailed) and the t-test was not found significant on the locality of parents of *students without disabilities*,  $t(58) = -1.180$  as  $p\text{-value}$  is  $.243$ ,  $p > .05$ . Therefore the null hypothesis (1b) that there is no significant difference among parents of *students without disabilities* on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their locality is accepted. Urban parents showed more positive/favourable perceptions as compared to rural parents.

**H<sub>02(a)</sub>** *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators on the basis of number of the dependents in family*

**Table- 3: Mean and standard deviation of parents of students without disabilities according to dependents in family**

| Number of Dependents | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             | Minimum | Maximum |
|----------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
|                      |    |       |                |            | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound |         |         |
| < 5                  | 20 | 67.65 | 21.94          | 4.91       | 57.38                            | 77.92       | 12.00   | 93.00   |
| 5-10                 | 34 | 60.21 | 17.35          | 2.97       | 54.15                            | 66.26       | 27.00   | 96.00   |
| 10 & <               | 6  | 64.00 | 21.27          | 8.68       | 41.68                            | 86.32       | 36.00   | 87.00   |
| Total                | 60 | 63.07 | 19.33          | 2.50       | 58.07                            | 68.06       | 12.00   | 96.00   |

Table-3 shows the mean scores of parents of students without disabilities according to the number of dependents in their family, these means of parents (dependents < 5) (M=67.65, SD=21.94) is greater than parents (dependents 5 to 10) (M=60.21, SD=17.35) and parents (dependents 10 or <) (M=64.00, SD=21.27). The mean scores of parents’ dependents (< 5) showed higher/positive perceptions about inclusive education as compared to parents with a higher number of dependents in their family. On the basis of mean comparison it can be concluded that the parents are having dependents in their family less than 5, showed more positive / favourable perceptions about inclusive education.

**Table-4: Summary of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education according to the number of dependents**

| Groups         | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | p-value    |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|------------|
| Between Groups | 703.625        | 2  | 351.812     | .940 | .397<br>NS |
| Within Groups  | 21342.109      | 57 | 374.423     |      |            |
| Total          | 22045.733      | 59 |             |      |            |

*Significance level = 95% confidence interval, NS=Not-significant*

Table-4 reveals the summary of one way between subjects ANOVA test was used to analyse the perceptions of parents according to the dependents in family and the results of ANOVA showed no significant difference among parents of normal children according to the number of dependents in their family, F (2,57) = .940 is not significant as p-value is .397 ( $p > .05$ ). Therefore the null hypothesis (2a) that there is no significant difference in perceptions of parents of students without disabilities according to the number of dependents in their family is accepted.

**H<sub>02(b)</sub>** *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their educational qualifications (EQ).*

**Table-5: Mean and SD of parents of normal students according to Educational Qualification (EQ)**

| Education Qualification    | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             | Minimum | Maximum |
|----------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
|                            |    |       |                |            | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound |         |         |
| Up to Middle               | 28 | 45.82 | 12.40          | 2.343      | 41.0129                          | 50.6300     | 12.00   | 63.00   |
| Middle to Higher Secondary | 21 | 73.52 | 5.76           | 1.256      | 70.9025                          | 76.1451     | 60.00   | 84.00   |
| Graduation and above       | 11 | 87.00 | 5.53           | 1.667      | 83.2837                          | 90.7163     | 78.00   | 96.00   |
| Total                      | 60 | 63.07 | 19.33          | 2.495      | 58.0731                          | 68.0602     | 12.00   | 96.00   |

Table-5 indicates that the mean scores of parents of students without disabilities according to their educational qualification, the mean of parents with Graduation and above educational qualification (M=87.00, SD=5.53) is greater than Middle to Higher Secondary parents (M=73.52, SD=5.76) and parents with up to middle (M=45.82, SD=12.40). The mean scores of Graduate parents reflected positive perceptions about inclusive education than as parents with middle to higher secondary and up to middle qualification. Standard deviation of parents with Graduation and above (SD=5.53) and Middle to Higher Secondary (SD=5.76) showed they are more homogeneous in population and parents up to Middle educational qualification (12.40088) seem much heterogeneous in the population. Comparison of mean scores of parents showed that parents with higher educational qualifications are more positive/favourable about inclusive education.

**Table-6 Summary of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education according to EQ**

| Groups         | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | p-value   |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-----------|
| Between Groups | 16924.388      | 2  | 8462.194    | 94.183* | .001<br>S |
| Within Groups  | 5121.345       | 57 | 89.848      |         |           |
| Total          | 22045.733      | 59 |             |         |           |

Significance level = 95% interval, S= Significant

**Table-7: Summary of Post Hoc Test Multiple Comparisons on the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities about inclusive education according to EQ**

|  | (I) EQ Parents of Students without Disabilities | (J) EQ Parents of Students without Disabilities | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |             |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
|  |   |   |                       |            |      | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound |
| Scheffe  | Up to Middle                                    | Middle to Higher Secondary                      | -27.70*               | 2.73       | .001 | -33.18                  | -22.22      |
|  |   | Graduation and above                            | -41.17*               | 3.37       | .001 | -47.93                  | -34.42      |
|  | Middle to Higher Secondary                      | Up to Middle                                    | 27.70*                | 2.73       | .001 | 22.22                   | 33.18       |
|  |   | Graduation and above                            | -13.47*               | 3.52       | .001 | -20.54                  | -6.41       |
|  | Graduation and above                            | Up to Middle                                    | 41.17*                | 3.37       | .001 | 34.42                   | 47.93       |
|  |   | Middle to Higher Secondary                      | 13.47*                | 3.52       | .001 | 6.41                    | 20.54       |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. |   |   |                       |            |      |                         |             |

Table-6 provides the summary of one way between subjects ANOVA (alpha .05) test was used to analyse the perceptions of parents according to their educational qualification and the results of ANOVA showed significant difference among parents  $F(2,57) = 94.183, p < .05$ , according to their educational qualification categories. In this case, the null hypothesis (2b) that there is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education according to their educational qualification is rejected. An alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education according to their educational qualification is accepted. This finding reveals that parents in their education groups are significantly different on their perceptions about inclusive education.

A Scheffe post hoc test (table-7) shows that the difference in perceptions between parents of students without disabilities from up to Middle qualification group as compared to parents from middle to higher secondary qualification and parents from graduation and above qualification group is significant as the p-values for these mean differences = .001 and .001 ( $p < .05$ ) respectively. Similarly, it can be seen that difference between the perceptions of parents from middle to higher secondary qualification category as compared to parents from up to Middle and parents from graduation qualification category is found significant at  $\alpha = .05$ , as the p-values for these mean differences = .001 and .001 ( $p < .05$ ). Further again the difference in perceptions between parents from graduation and above qualification category as compared to parents from middle and parents from middle to higher secondary qualification category is significant, as the p-values for these mean differences = .001 and .001 ( $p < .05$ ) at  $\alpha = .05$  respectively.

**H<sub>02(c)</sub>** *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their occupation.*

**Table-8: Mean and Standard deviation of parents of students without disabilities according to their occupation**

| Occupation of Parents of Normal Students | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|--|----|-------|----------------|
| Service                                  | 11 | 80.91 | 08.80          |
| Business                                 | 08 | 73.50 | 07.86          |
| Agricultural work                        | 23 | 52.65 | 18.57          |
| Domestic work                            | 18 | 60.83 | 19.25          |
| Total                                    | 60 | 63.07 | 19.33          |

Table-8 shows the mean scores of parents of *students without disabilities* according to their occupation, the mean of parents from the service category (M=80.91, SD=8.80) is greater than parents from the business category (M=73.50, SD=7.86), parents from the agricultural work category (M=52.65, SD=18.57) and parents from domestic work category (M=60.83, SD=19.25). The mean score of parents from the service category reflected more favourable perceptions about inclusive education than that of parents of other occupation categories. Parents from the business category also showed more favourable perceptions compared to agricultural and domestic work parents. Further from this table, it is also observed that a large standard deviation of domestic work parents (SD=19.25) reflected the heterogeneity in the population. Parents from service category showed more positive/favourable perceptions about inclusive education in their occupation categories.

**Table-9: Summary of Uni-variate ANOVA on the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities according to their occupation**

| Tests of Between-Subjects Effects        |                         |    |             |        |           |                    |                             |
|--|-------------------------|----|-------------|--------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Source                                   | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.      | Noncent. Parameter | Observed Power <sup>b</sup> |
| Occupation of Parents of Normal Students | 6957.107                | 3  | 2319.036    | 8.607* | .001<br>S | 25.821             | .991                        |
| Error                                    | 15088.626               | 56 | 269.440     |        |           |                    |                             |
| Total                                    | 260690.000              | 60 |             |        |           |                    |                             |
| Corrected Total                          | 22045.733               | 59 |             |        |           |                    |                             |

a. R Squared = .316 (Adjusted R Squared = .279); b. Computed using alpha = .05

| Univariate Tests |                |    |             |        |           |                    |                             |
|------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
|                  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.      | Noncent. Parameter | Observed Power <sup>a</sup> |
| Contrast         | 6957.107       | 3  | 2319.036    | 8.607* | .001<br>S | 25.821             | .991                        |
| Error            | 15088.626      | 56 | 269.440     |        |           |                    |                             |

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S= Significant



**Table-10: Summary of Post Hoc Tests Multiple Comparisons (Pair-wise) on the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities according to their occupation**

|  | (I)<br>Occupation<br>Parents of<br><i>students<br/>without<br/>disabilities</i> | (J)<br>Occupation<br>Parents of<br><i>students<br/>without<br/>disabilities</i> | Mean<br>Difference<br>(I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |             |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
|  |   |   |                             |            |      | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound |
| Scheffe  | Service   | Business  | 7.4091                      | 7.627      | .336 | -7.87                   | 22.68       |
|  |   | Agricultural Work   | 28.2569*                    | 6.017      | .001 | 16.20                   | 40.31       |
|  |   | Domestic work   | 20.0758*                    | 6.281      | .002 | 7.49                    | 32.66       |
|  | Business  | Service   | -7.4091                     | 7.627      | .336 | -22.68                  | 7.87        |
|  |   | Agricultural Work   | 20.8478*                    | 6.737      | .003 | 7.35                    | 34.34       |
|  |   | Domestic work   | 12.6667                     | 6.974      | .075 | -1.30                   | 26.63       |
|  | Agricultural Work   | Service   | -28.2569*                   | 6.017      | .001 | -40.31                  | -16.20      |
|  |   | Business  | -20.8478*                   | 6.737      | .003 | -34.34                  | -7.35       |
|  |   | Domestic work   | -8.1812                     | 5.165      | .119 | -18.52                  | 2.16        |
|  | Domestic work   | Service   | -20.0758*                   | 6.281      | .002 | -32.66                  | -7.49       |
|  |   | Business  | -12.6667                    | 6.974      | .075 | -26.63                  | 1.30        |
|  |   | Agricultural Work   | 8.1812                      | 5.165      | .119 | -2.16                   | 18.52       |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level |   |   |                             |            |      |                         |             |

The summary of uni-variate one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to analyse between-subjects effects on the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities is given in table-9. These results revealed that the difference among parents' occupation categories is significant, because F-test is found significant  $F(3, 56) = 8.607$ , as the p-value = .001 ( $p < .05$ ). Again the null hypothesis (2c) that there is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education according to their occupation is rejected. Therefore the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education according to their occupation is accepted.

Further, table-10 showed the pair-wise comparisons of parents on their perceptions about inclusive education according to their occupation categories, using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The difference in perceptions between parents of students without disabilities from the service occupation category as compared to parents from agricultural work and domestic work categories is significant, as the p-values for these mean differences are = .001, .002 respectively ( $p < .05$ ). Similarly, the difference in perceptions about inclusive education between parents from the business category as compared to parents from the agricultural work category is significant, as the p-value for this mean difference is .003, which is less than .05. However, there is no significant difference between parents from the service category and parents from the business

category, as the p-value for this mean difference is .336 ( $p > .05$ ). Similarly, the difference between parents from the business category is not found significant to parents from the service and domestic work occupation category, as p-values for these mean differences are .336 and .075 ( $p > .05$ ) respectively. Further, the difference in perceptions between parents from the domestic work category is not significant to parents from the business and agricultural work categories, as the p-values for these mean differences are .075 and .119 ( $p > .05$ ). A Scheffe post hoc test also showed (table-10) a similar significant difference pattern among the occupation categories of parents of normal students as discussed in pair-wise comparisons.

**H<sub>02(a)</sub>** *There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their family income (FI).*

**Table-11: Mean and standard deviation of parents of students without disabilities according to their family income**

| Family Income | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             | Minimum | Maximum |
|---------------|----|-------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
|               |    |       |                |            | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound |         |         |
| Below Average | 24 | 44.33 | 12.84          | 2.620      | 38.91                            | 49.75       | 12.00   | 72.00   |
| Average       | 25 | 73.28 | 11.79          | 2.357      | 68.41                            | 78.15       | 45.00   | 96.00   |
| Above Average | 11 | 80.73 | 06.77          | 2.040      | 76.18                            | 85.27       | 63.00   | 87.00   |
| Total         | 60 | 63.07 | 19.33          | 2.495      | 58.07                            | 68.06       | 12.00   | 96.00   |

Table-11 reveals the mean scores of parents of students without disabilities according to their family income and the mean score of parents from the higher-income group (above average;  $M=80.73$ ,  $SD=6.77$ ) is greater than parents of income group (average;  $M=73.28$ ,  $SD=11.79$ ) and parents belong to income group (below average;  $M=44.33$ ,  $SD=12.84$ ). These mean scores of parents with above-average SES showed higher/positive perceptions about inclusive education over the parents who belong to comparatively lower SES groups. The standard deviation of parents with higher income (above average,  $SD=6.77$ ) showed more homogeneity as compared to parents with lower income categories of the population on their perceptions about inclusive education.

**Table-12: Summary of one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of perceptions of parents of students without disabilities according to their family income**

| Groups         | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | p-value   |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-----------|
| Between Groups | 14461.178      | 2  | 7230.589    | 54.340* | .001<br>S |
| Within Groups  | 7584.555       | 57 | 133.062     |         |           |
| Total          | 22045.733      | 59 |             |         |           |

*Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S=Significant*

**Table-13: Summary of Post Hoc Tests Multiple Comparisons of perceptions of parents of normal students according to their family income**

|         | (I) Family Income of Parents of Students without Disabilities | (J) Family Income of Parents of Students without Disabilities | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |             |
|---------|---|---|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
|         |   |   |                       |            |      | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound |
| Scheffe | Below Average   | Average   | -28.94667*            | 3.296      | .001 | -35.54                  | -22.34      |
|         |   | Above Average   | -36.39394*            | 4.200      | .001 | -44.80                  | -27.98      |
|         | Average   | Below Average   | 28.94667*             | 3.296      | .001 | 22.34                   | 35.54       |
|         |   | Above Average   | -7.44727              | 4.173      | .080 | -15.80                  | .91         |
|         | Above Average   | Below Average   | 36.39394*             | 4.200      | .001 | 27.98                   | 44.80       |
|         |   | Average   | 7.44727               | 4.173      | .080 | -.91                    | 15.80       |

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table-12 provides the summary of one way between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA), used to test the perceptions of parents of students without disabilities according to their family income categories. The results from the above table show that F-test is significant on three income categories i.e. below average, average and above-average family income of parents of students without disabilities, because  $F(2,57)=54.340$  is significant, as the p-value = .001, which is less than .05. Thus the null hypothesis (2d) that there is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their family income may be rejected. A significant difference is found among parents without disabilities according to their family income.

A Scheffe post hoc test (table-13) showed the significant differences of perceptions among parents of students without disabilities according to their family income i.e., below Rs. 7000, Average and Rs. 12000 and above. The difference in perceptions between parents from below-average family income category as compared to parents from average and parents from above-average family income category is significant, as the p-values for these mean differences are .001 and .001 ( $p < .05$ ) respectively. However, the difference between parents from the above-average income group and parents from the Average income group is not significant.

### Results

1. There is no significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their gender (mother and father), locality (rural and urban) and the number of dependents in their family.
2. There is a significant difference among parents of students without disabilities on their perceptions about inclusive education according to their educational qualifications, occupations, and family income categories.
3. Fathers exhibited favourable perceptions in comparison to mothers.

4. Urban parents showed more positive/favourable perceptions as compared to rural parents.
5. Parents are having dependents in their family less than 5, showed more positive / favourable perceptions about inclusive education.
6. Parents with higher educational qualifications demonstrated more positive/favourable about inclusive education.
7. Parents from service category exhibited more positive/favourable perceptions about inclusive education in their occupation categories.
8. Parents from above average income group reflected positive/favourable perceptions about inclusive education in their income categories.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

Researcher found that the parents of students without disabilities are significantly different in their perception of their educational qualifications, occupations, and family income categories. Findings of this study are in the line of Chandra, Satish and Bhadoria, V.S. (2017) no significant difference among subjects grouped on the basis of gender, locality and there was significant difference among subjects grouped on the basis of educational qualification; meanwhile the findings of the study are contrary to Ravindranadan and Raju (2007) was no significant difference among the groups of subjects on the basis of education in all the variables a significant difference exists between rural and urban parents only in social adjustment and parental attitude. Therefore, it can be concluded that parents of students without disabilities may have varied perceptions about inclusive education and this difference in their perception may affect the implementation of inclusive education. Therefore it is recommended that awareness creating campaigns should be organized in society and adequate infrastructural facilities and conducive school environment should be developed.

### **References**

- Chandra, Satish and Bhadoria, V. S. (2017) conducted a study on 'Parents' Perception about Inclusive Education. *Journal of Educational Chronicle*, 7(2), 15-26.
- Kumar, Suman and Rao, Geeta (2008). Parental attitudes towards children with hearing impairment. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*. 19(2), 111-117.
- H.V. Lakshmi, C.V. Geetha and K.N. Krishnamurthy (2009). Parental perspectives towards the education of visually impaired children. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*, 20(2), 84-91.
- Ravindranadan, Vidhya and S. Raju (2007). Adjustment and attitude of parents of children with mental retardation. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 33(1), 137-141.

### **Cite This Article:**

*Dr. Satish Chandra, (2021). Perceptions of Parents of Students without Disabilities about Inclusive Education, Educreator Research Journal VIII (VI), 44-55.*