ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Peer Reviewed Journal

AARHAT MULTIDISCIPLINARY INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH JOURNAL

Volume–X, Issues– V *Sep – Oct 2021*

ATTITUDES OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Dr. Satish Chandra

Principal, Amar Jyoti School and Rehabilitation Centre,

Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, India

Abstract

Children with disabilities are facing many challenges in inclusive settings. Many barriers like attitudinal and infrastructural barriers are creating hindrances in avail quality inclusive education by children with disabilities. This study primarily focuses (i) to compare general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their- (a) Gender (b) Locality and (ii) to compare general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their - (a) Teachers' category (b) School category (c) Teaching experience (d) Age (e) Academic qualifications (f) Professional qualifications. A total sample of 238 (145 general teachers) was chosen using a simple random sampling technique and (93 special teachers) were selected using the purposive sampling technique. A tool "Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education" developed and standardised by Dr. Vishal Sood and Dr. Arti Anand (2011) was used to collect the data. Results of the study indicate that (i) Teachers were found significantly different on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to their gender (male and female), their category (general and special teachers), teaching experience, age, academic qualifications, and professional qualifications. (ii) Teachers were not found significantly different on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to their locality and school category (class I-V and Class VI-VIII) (iii) Male teachers expressed positive attitudes than that of their female counterparts; urban teachers also showed slightly positive attitudes as compared to their rural counterparts and similarly, primary school teachers showed a little higher level of attitudes towards inclusive education to their upper primary counterparts. Regular inclusive pedagogical training for general teachers and provision of adequate support services, infrastructural facilities, recruitment of required rehabilitation

professionals, and availability of equipments in schools are recommended by the teachers.

Key Words: *Inclusive Education, Attitudes, Elementary School, Teachers*

Introduction

UNSCO (2019) stated in a report that there are 78,64,636 children with disabilities in India constituting 1.7% of the total child population and three-fourths of the children with disabilities at the age of five years and one-fourth between 5-19 years do not go to any educational institution. Besides this, the number of children enrolled in school drops significantly with each successive level of schooling and the number of girls with disabilities is less than boys with disabilities. According to U-DISE 2016-17 data shows that at the primary level there is a decline in the enrolment of differently-able children (1.1% to 0.25%). This is a bitter truth that children with disabilities are not getting quality access to education and other support services.

Teachers are key agents in implanting inclusive education. Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and children with disabilities become very important to make the school or classroom environment inclusive. Acceptance, love care and understanding the needs of children with disabilities by teachers, peers, and educational administrators can reduce many barriers in inclusive settings. Teachers can motivate the children without disabilities and make them aware bout the rights and needs of children with disabilities and they can increase the acceptance of children with disabilities among their peers.

Research studies point out that there are lots of barriers in inclusive settings and the attitudinal barrier is the biggest challenge to handle than other barriers in schools. Negative attitudes of teachers, peers and inadequate support services in inclusive schools may lead to dropout by children with disabilities. Many studies supported that attitudinal and infrastructural barriers should be minimized for better implementation of inclusive education.

Review of Related Literature

Bhatnagar and Das (2014) reveled in a research work 'Attitudes of Secondary Regular School Teachers towards Inclusive Education in New Delhi, India- A Qualitative Study' that (i) teachers held positive attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities and (ii) teachers also suggested a number of facilitators of inclusion in their schools such as improved infrastructure, policy changes, and provisions for institutional resources. In contrary to this Awal Mohammed Alhassan (2014) concluded in their study

'Implementation of Inclusive Education in Ghanaian Primary Schools: A Look at Teachers` Attitudes' that (i) differences in teachers` attitudes depending on the type of students` disabilities and disability severity and (ii) negative attitudes of teachers were associated with large class sizes and the presence of a student with a disability in the classroom.

Further, Bansal, Sneh (2016) conducted a study on 'Attitude of Teachers towards Inclusive Education in Relation to their Professional Commitment' and she concluded that (i) a significant positive correlation was found between the attitude of teachers towards inclusive education and professional commitment of teachers and (ii) the correlation value of total attitude towards inclusive education with dimension-wise analysis of professional commitment for teachers also indicates more or less similar trends, though the correlation value of commitment to basic human values with total attitude towards inclusive education is not significant.

Similarly, Sharma, Amit; Chari, Deepa and Chunawala, Sugra (2017) revealed in their study 'Exploring Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education in Indian Context Using 'Type of Disability' Lens' that higher positive attitudes towards inclusion of students with 'orthopedic challenges' while concerns about the inclusion of students with disabilities (SWD) related to vision, speech and hearing were stated. Some negative attitudes arose from teachers' concerns about pedagogic challenges in inclusive classrooms. Teachers with prior experience with SWD were more positive towards inclusion and highlighted the importance of technology in inclusive classrooms.

Further, Chandra, Satish and Bhadoria, V. S. (2017) also revealed in their study 'Perception of Educational Administrators and PRIs Members about Inclusive Education' that (i) Female educational administrators showed higher/positive attitudes towards inclusive education than their male counterparts. (ii) Contrary to it male PRIs members reflected higher/positive perceptions about inclusive education to their female counterparts. (iii) There was a significant difference among educational administrators and PRIs members on their perception about inclusive education according to their gender ($p=0.001$, $p<.05$). (iv)There was a significant difference among urban educational administrators-PRIs members and rural educational administrators-PRIs members on their perception about inclusive education according to their locality ($p=0.001$, $p<.05$) and (v) There was a significant difference between educational administrators and PRIs members about inclusive education according to their category ($p=0.001$, $p<.05$).

Recently, Shrivastava, Simi and Sharma, Ankita (2021) conducted a study on 'Attitudes of Teachers towards Inclusive Education' and they concluded that there is no specific difference observed in the attitudes of the special teachers and regular teachers in respect to inclusive education and (ii) there was no specific difference found in the attitudes of the special teachers and regular teachers according to their gender.

Objectives

1. To compare general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their- (a) Gender (b) Locality
2. To compare general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their - (a) Teachers' category (b) School category (c) Teaching experience (d) Age (e) Academic qualifications (f) Professional qualifications

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their– (a) Gender (b) Locality
2. There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their– (a) Teachers' category (b) School category (c) Teaching experience (d) Age (e) Academic qualifications (f) Professional qualifications

Research Plan and Procedure

Method

Nature of this study is descriptive in nature and the researcher employed the Survey method for the data collection from teachers on their attitude towards inclusive education.

Sample and Sampling Technique

In order to examine the attitude of teachers a total sample of 238 teachers (145 General teachers were selected using simple random sampling technique and 93 Special Teachers were chosen using purposive sampling technique; who were teaching in primary (class I-V) and upper primary level (Class VI-VIII) SSA run inclusive schools of Gwalior district of state Madhya Pradesh, India.

Tool Used

The researcher used standardised tool to measure the attitude of teachers i.e. "Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education" developed and standardised by Dr. Vishal

Sood and Dr. Arti Anand (2011). The reliability of the tool was found at 0.82.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

$H_{01(a)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their gender.

Table-1: Mean, SD and t-values of general and special teachers according to their gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t (2-tailed)	p-value
Male	140	76.51	19.19	1.621	236	3.095*	0.002 S
Female	98	68.40	20.90	2.111			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S= significant

Table-1 indicates that two means of male and female teachers were compared and the means of both the categories were compared using a t-test (2-tailed) and the results predicted that the difference between attitudes of male teachers (M=76.51, SD=19.19) and female (M=68.40, SD=20.90) about inclusive education was significant because t (236) = 3.095 value is significant as the p-value is .002, which is less than .05. Therefore the null hypothesis (1a) that there is no significant difference in teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their gender may be rejected. Further, it can be concluded from the mean scores of both the categories of teachers, that male teachers expressed more positive attitudes towards inclusive education than that of their female counterparts.

$H_{01(b)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their locality.

Table-2: Mean, SD and t-values of attitudes of general and special teachers according to their locality

Locality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t (2-tailed)	p-value
Rural	136	71.66	20.87	1.789	236	–1.330	0.185 NS
Urban	102	75.19	19.35	1.916			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, NS= not significant

Table-2 reveals that the difference between two means of rural (M=71.66, SD=20.87) and urban teachers (M=75.19, SD=19.35) on their attitudes towards inclusive education was not found significant, because t (236) = – 1.330 is not significant as p-value is .185 (p>.05). Therefore the null hypothesis (1b) that there is no significant difference among teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to their locality may be accepted. The means scores of urban teachers showed that they have slightly positive attitudes towards inclusive education as compared to their rural counterparts.

$H_{02(a)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to teachers' category.

Table-3: Mean, SD and t-values of attitudes of general and special teachers according to their category

Category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t (2-tailed)	p-value
General Teachers	145	61.72	15.95	1.324	236	–15.368*	0.001 S
Special Teachers	93	91.03	11.44	1.186			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S= significant

Mean scores of general and special teachers categories are shown in table-3 were compared using a two-tailed t-test and the results revealed that the difference between the attitudes of special teachers (M=91.03, SD=11.44) and general teachers (M=61.72, SD=15.95) about inclusive education was perceived significantly different because t (236) = –15.368 value is significant as the p-value is .000, (p<.05). Therefore the null hypothesis (2a) that there is no significant difference between general and special teachers' categories on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators may be rejected.

$H_{02(b)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their school category.

Table-4: Mean, SD and t-values of attitudes of general and special teachers according to their school category

School category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t (2-tailed)	p-value
Primary	151	74.56	19.14	1.557	236	1.391	0.166 NS
Upper Primary School	87	70.77	21.99	2.359			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, NS= not significant

From the table-4 it is seen that two means of Primary School teachers (M=74.56, SD=19.14) and Upper Primary Schools (M=70.77, SD=21.99) on their attitudes, t-value was not found significant, because t (236) = 1.391 is not significant as the p-value is .166 (p>.05). Thus the null hypothesis (2b) that there is no significant difference among teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to their school category may be accepted. Mean scores of primary school teachers (M=74.56, SD=19.14) are slightly higher than upper primary school teachers (M=70.77, SD=21.99), it can be concluded that primary school teachers showed a little higher level of attitudes towards inclusive education to their upper primary counterparts.

$H_{02(c)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their teaching experience.

Table-5: Mean and SD of general and special teachers according to their teaching experience

Teaching Experience	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
< 5 years	56	82.34	14.05	1.877	78.576	86.102	48.00	103.00
5-10 years	96	81.04	16.03	1.636	77.792	84.290	41.00	108.00
10 years <	86	58.42	19.61	2.114	54.213	62.623	32.00	109.00
Total	238	73.17	20.27	1.313	70.584	75.760	32.00	109.00

Mean scores of teachers according to teaching experience are shown in the above table-5, and the above table reveals that the mean of teachers of below 5 years teaching experience (M=82.34, SD=14.05) is greater than that of teachers of 5-10 years experience (M=81.04, SD=16.03) and 10 years and more teaching experience (M=58.42, SD=19.61). Below five years and 5-10 years teaching experience teachers showed more favourable attitudes towards inclusive education in comparison to teachers with 10 years and above teaching experience. 10 years more teaching experience (SD=19.61) were heterogeneous in the population.

Table-6: Summary of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of general and special teachers according to teaching experience

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	29370.620	2	14685.310	50.766*	.001 S
Within Groups	67979.317	235	289.274		
Total	97349.937	237			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S= significant

Table-7: Summary of Post Hoc Test - Multiple Comparisons of general and special teachers according to their teaching experience

	(I) Experience-Total Teachers	(J) Experience-Total Teachers	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Scheffe	< 5 years	5 to 10 years	1.29762	2.859	.902	-5.7475	8.3427
		10 years <	23.92068*	2.920	.001	16.7263	31.1151
	5 to 10 years	< 5 years	-1.29762	2.859	.902	-8.3427	5.7475
		10 years <	22.62306*	2.525	.001	16.4023	28.8439
	10 years <	< 5 years	-23.92068*	2.920	.001	-31.1151	-16.7263
		5 to 10 years	-22.62306*	2.525	.001	-28.8439	-16.4023

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

Table-6 shows the mean squares between groups (29370.620) and within-group (67979.317), the F-test is statistically significant because F(2,235)=50.7666 is significant as the p-value is .001, which is less than .05. Thus the null hypothesis (2c) that there is no significant difference among teachers according to teaching experience on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators may be rejected.

A Scheffe Post Hoc test (table-7) reflects that the difference in attitudes between teachers having teaching experience less than 5 years and 10 years or above teaching experience is significant as the p-value for this mean difference is .001, which is less than .05 at .05 significance level. Similarly, it can be seen that the difference in attitudes between teachers having teaching experience 5 to 10 years and teachers having 10 years or more teaching experience is significant at $\alpha = .05$ as the p-value for this mean difference is .001 which is less than .05. However, there is no significant difference between less than 5 years of teaching experience teachers and teachers having 5-10 years teaching experience as for as attitudes towards inclusive education are concerned because the p-value is .902, which is greater than .05.

$H_{02(d)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their age.

Table-8: Mean and SD of general and special teachers overall according to their age

Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
< 35 years	82	80.26	14.74	1.628	77.016	83.495	48.00	103.00
35 to 45 years	79	75.80	18.65	2.098	71.620	79.974	36.00	108.00
45 years <	77	62.94	22.91	2.610	57.735	68.134	32.00	109.00
Total	238	73.17	20.27	1.313	70.584	75.760	32.00	109.00

Table-8 reflects that the mean score of teachers in below < 35 years age group (M=80.26, SD=14.74) is greater than 35-45 years age group teachers of (M=75.80, SD=18.65) and 45 years or more age group teachers (M=62.94 SD=22.91). The mean scores of teachers in their age categories reflected that teachers below 35 years five years and 35-45 years age group teachers showed most favourable attitudes towards inclusive education than that of 45 years and above age group teachers.

Table-9: Summary of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of general and special teachers overall according to their age

Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	12728.880	2	6364.440	17.675*	.001 S
Within Groups	84621.057	235	360.090		
Total	97349.937	237			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S= significant

Table-10: Summary of Post Hoc Test-Multiple Comparisons of general and special teachers according to their age

	(I) Age-Total Teachers	(J) Age-Total Teachers	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Scheffe	< 35 years	35-45 years	4.45863	2.991	.331	-2.9109	11.8281
		45 years & <	17.32103*	3.011	.001	9.9029	24.7391
	35 – 45 years	< 35 years	-4.45863	2.991	.331	-11.8281	2.9109
		45 years & <	12.86240*	3.038	.001	5.3764	20.3484
	45 years & <	< 35 years	-17.32103*	3.011	.001	-24.7391	-9.9029
		35-45 years	-12.86240*	3.038	.001	-20.3484	-5.3764
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.							

One way between-subjects ANOVA was used to test the attitudes of teachers according

to teaching experience and the results of ANOVA (table-9) shows mean squares between groups (12728.880) and within-group (84621.057) that F-test is found significant because F(2,235)=17.675 is significant as the p-value is .001, which is less than .05. Thus the null hypothesis (2d) that there is no significant difference among teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their age may be rejected.

A Scheffe Post Hoc test (table-10) provides a summary of the significance in teachers' age categories. The difference in attitudes between teachers less than 35 years and teachers of 45 years and above age group is significant as the p-value for this mean difference is .001, which is less than .05. Similarly, it can be seen that the difference in attitudes between teachers of 35-45 years and 45 years age is significant at $\alpha = .05$ as the p-value for this mean difference is .001 which is less than .05. However, there is no significant difference between teachers of less than 35 years and 35-45 years age groups as for as attitudes about inclusive education are concerned because the p-value is .331, which is greater than .05.

$H_{02(e)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their academic qualifications.

Table-11: Mean and SD of general and special teachers according to their academic qualifications

EQ Academic	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Std. Error**	**95% Confidence Interval for Mean**		**Minimum**	**Maximum**
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Higher Secondary	56	57.07	18.15	2.425	52.210	61.932	32.00	98.00
Graduation	89	68.33	16.82	1.783	64.781	71.869	34.00	97.00
PG and above	93	87.51	14.22	1.474	84.576	90.434	51.00	109.00
Total	238	73.17	20.27	1.313	70.584	75.760	32.00	109.00

Table-11 shows the descriptive statistics of the sample teachers according to their academic qualifications and the mean of teachers with qualifications PG and above (M=87.51, SD=14.22) is greater than teachers with Graduate teachers (M=68.33, SD=16.82) and teachers with Higher Secondary qualifications (M=57.07, SD=18.15). The discussion of mean scores of teachers revealed that teachers with PG and above showed more favourable attitudes towards inclusive education than that of their counterparts with higher secondary and graduate teachers.

Table-12: Summary of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of general and special teachers overall according to their academic qualifications

Groups	**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**p-value**
Between Groups	35713.425	2	17856.712	68.082*	.001 S
Within Groups	61636.512	235	262.283		
Total	97349.937	237			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S= significant

Table-13: Summary of Post Hoc Test-Multiple Comparisons of general and special teachers according to academic qualifications

Dependent Variable: Attitude							
	(I) EQ-Academic Total Teachers	**(J) EQ-Academic Total Teachers**	**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**	**95% Confidence Interval**	
						Lower Bound	**Upper Bound**
Scheffe	Higher Secondary	Graduation	-11.25441*	2.762	.001	-18.0593	-4.4495
		PG and above	-30.43395*	2.739	.001	-37.1821	-23.6858
	Graduation	Higher Secondary	11.25441*	2.762	.001	4.4495	18.0593
		PG and above	-19.17953*	2.401	.001	-25.0955	-13.2636
	PG and above	Higher Secondary	30.43395*	2.739	.001	23.6858	37.1821
		Graduation	19.17953*	2.401	.001	13.2636	25.0955
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.							

Table-12 provides the summary of one-way between-subjects ANOVA used to analyse the difference between the attitudes of teachers according to educational qualifications and the results of ANOVA reveal the mean squares between groups (35713.425) and within-group (61636.512) and F-test is found significant because F (2,235) = 68.082 is significant as the p-value is .001, which is less than .05. Thus the null hypothesis (2e) that there is no significant difference among teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to academic qualifications may be rejected.

A Scheffe Post Hoc test (table-13) gives the comparative summary of differences among the teachers' academic qualifications categories. The difference in attitudes between higher secondary teachers compared to Graduate and Post Graduate or above teachers is significant as the p-value for this mean difference is .001, which is less than .05. Similarly, it can be seen that the difference in attitudes between Graduate teachers compared to Post Graduate and Higher Secondary teachers are significant at $\alpha = .05$ as the p-value for this mean difference is .001 which is less than .05. Further again it is reflected that the difference between teachers with PG and above academic qualifications and teachers with Higher Secondary and teachers with Graduation is significant as for as attitudes towards inclusive education are concerned, the p-value for this mean difference is .001, which is less than .05. It can be concluded that teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to academic qualifications are differ significantly over each category of academic qualifications.

$H_{02(f)}$ There is no significant difference among general and special teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their professional qualifications.

Table-14: Mean and SD of general and special teachers according to their professional qualifications

Professional Qualifications	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
D.Ed./D.Ed.SE	84	56.25	15.34	1.673	52.921	59.578	32.00	97.00
B.Ed./B.Ed. SE	99	78.48	16.86	1.695	75.110	81.839	34.00	108.00
M.Ed./M.Ed. SE	55	89.47	12.54	1.690	86.083	92.861	59.00	109.00
Total	238	73.17	20.27	1.313	70.584	75.760	32.00	109.00

Table-14 reflects that the mean scores of teachers according to their academic qualifications and the mean score of teachers with M.Ed./M.Ed.SE (M=89.47, SD=12.54) is greater than teachers with B.Ed./B.Ed.SE (M=78.48, SD=16.86) and teachers with D.Ed./DEd.SE (M=56.25, SD=15.34). It can be concluded that mean scores of teachers with higher professional qualifications showed higher/positive attitudes about inclusive education than as compared to their counterparts with lower professional qualifications. B.Ed./B.Ed.SE (SD=16.86) reflected that they were more heterogeneous in population.

Table-15: Summary of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of general and special teachers according to their professional qualifications

Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	41451.791	2	20725.896	87.133*	.001 S
Within Groups	55898.146	235	237.864		
Total	97349.937	237			

Significance level = 95% confidence interval, S= significant

Table-16: Summary of Post Hoc Test-Multiple Comparisons of general and special teachers according to their professional qualifications

	(I) Professional Qualifications Total Teachers	(J) Professional Qualifications Total Teachers	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Scheffe	D.Ed. / D.Ed.SE	B.Ed./B.Ed.SE	-22.22475*	2.287	.001	-27.8608	-16.5887
		M.Ed./M.Ed.SE	-33.22273*	2.675	.001	-39.8128	-26.6326
	B.Ed./B.Ed. SE	D.Ed./D.Ed.SE	22.22475*	2.287	.001	16.5887	27.8608
		M.Ed./M.Ed.SE	-0.99798*	2.593	.001	-17.3875	-4.6085
	M.Ed. / M.Ed. SE	D.Ed./D.Ed.SE	33.22273*	2.675	.001	26.6326	39.8128
		B.Ed./B.Ed. SE	10.99798*	2.593	.001	4.6085	17.3875
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.							

Table-15 shows the summary of one-way between-subjects ANOVA used to analyse the difference between the attitudes of teachers according to professional qualifications and the results of ANOVA showed the mean squares between groups (41451.791) and within-group (55898.146) and F-test is found significant because F (2,235) = 87.133 is significant as the p-value is .000, which is less than .05. Thus the null hypothesis (2f) that there is no significant difference among teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education with reference to its barriers and facilitators according to their professional qualifications may be rejected.

A Scheffe Post Hoc test (table-16) indicates the differences in attitudes among the teachers' professional qualifications categories. The difference between teachers with D.Ed./D.Ed.SE professional qualifications as compared to teachers with B.Ed./B.Ed.SE and teachers with M.Ed./M.Ed.SE and above as professional qualifications is significant as the p-value for this mean difference is .001, which is less than .05. Similarly, it can be seen that the difference in attitudes between teachers with B.Ed./B.Ed.SE professional qualifications and compared to teachers with M.Ed./M.Ed.SE and teachers with

D.Ed./D.Ed.SE professional qualifications is significant at α = .05 as the p-value for this mean difference is .001 which is less than .05. Further again it is reflected in the above table that the difference between teachers with M.Ed./M.Ed.SE and above as compared to teachers with D.Ed./D.Ed.SE and teachers with B.Ed./B.Ed.SE professional qualifications is significant because p-value for this mean difference is .001, which is less than .05. It can be concluded that teachers on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to professional qualifications are differing significantly over each category of professional qualifications.

Results

(i) Teachers were found significantly different on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to their gender (male and female), their category (general and special teachers), teaching experience, age, academic qualifications, and professional qualifications.

(ii) Teachers were not found significantly different on their attitudes towards inclusive education according to their locality and school category (class I-V and Class VI-VIII).

(iii) Male teachers expressed positive attitudes than that of their female counterparts; urban teachers also showed slightly positive attitudes as compared to their rural counterparts and similarly primary school teachers showed a little higher level of attitudes towards inclusive education as compared to their upper primary counterparts.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Teachers who are working in inclusive schools are found significantly different over their categories. The results of the study indicate that general teacher should be given training in terms of inclusive pedagogy and awareness about the rights of children with disabilities. They should be motivated to create an inclusive school or classroom environment for better implementation of inclusive education.

Regular inclusive pedagogical training for general teachers and provision of adequate support services, infrastructural facilities, recruitment of required rehabilitation professionals and availability of adequate equipments in schools are recommended by the teachers.

References

Alhassan, Awal Mohammed (2014) Implementation of Inclusive Education in Ghanaian Primary Schools: A Look at Teachers` Attitudes. *American Journal of Educational Research*. 2014, 2(3), 142-148.

Bansal, Sneh (2016) Attitude of Teachers towards Inclusive Education in Relation to their Professional Commitment. *Indian Journal of Educational Studies : An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 3(1), 96-108. Dr. Sneh Bansal.pdf (ccemohali.org)

Bhatnagar, N. and Das, A. (2014) Attitude of Secondary Regular School Teachers towards Inclusive Education in New Delhi, India-A Qualitative Study. *Exceptionality Education International*, 24(2), 17-30.

Chandra, Satish and Bhadoria, V. S. (2017). Perception of Educational Administrators and PRIs Members about Inclusive Education. *Pedagogy of Learning*, 3(4), 46-55.

Sharma, Amit; Chari, Deepa and Chunawala, Sugra (2017). Exploring Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education in Indian Context Using 'Type of Disability' Lens. *International Journal of Technology and Inclusive Education (IJTIE)*, 6(2), 1134-1142. Exploring-Teachers-Attitudes-Towards-Inclusive-Education-in-Indian-Context-.pdf (infonomics-society.org)

Shrivastava, Simi and Sharma, Ankita (2021). Attitudes of Teachers towards Inclusive Education, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 26(2), 15-18. DOI: 10.9790/0837-2602081518

Sood, Vishal and Anand, Arti (2011). Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.

UNESCO (2019). State of the Education Report for India: Children with Disabilities. Retrieved from N for nose: state of the education report for India 2019; children with disabilities - UNESCO Digital Library