

Vol IX 2019

ISSN : 2250-2653

RESEARCH FRONTS

A Peer Reviewed Journal of Multiple Sciences, Arts & Commerce



Vol IX 2019

RESEARCH FRONTS

ISSN : 2250-2653

A Peer Reviewed Journal of Multiple Sciences, Arts & Commerce

Registered and copyright with :

Government Digvijay P.G. Autonomous College. Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh, India

Website : www.gdcr.ac.in

Email : principal@digvijaycollege.com

No part of the content(s) of the volume is allowed to be reproduced without the prior permission of the Institute.

Patron :

Dr. B.N. Meshram, Principal, Govt. Digvijay P.G. Autonomous College, Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

Chief Editor :

Dr. Krishna Nandan Prasad

E-mail : *krishnanandan112@gmail.com*

Editor

Dr. Shailendra Singh

Associate Editor

Dr. Sanjay Kumar Thiske

Assistant Editors

Dr. Pramod Kumar Mahish

Prof. Raju Khuntley

Editorial Board :

Dr. Gyan Prakash, Professor, School of Economics, D.A.V., Indore (M.P.)

Dr. R.N. Singh, Principal, Govt. V.Y.T. P.G. Autonomous College, Durg (C.G.)

Dr. Manisha Dubey, Prof of Economics, Gurughasidas Central University, Bilaspur (C.G.)

Dr. Tirtheshwar Singh, Prof of Hindi & Philology, Janjatiya Central University, Amarkantak (M.P.)

Shri Mumtaz Khan, Formerly Associate Prof. of Geography, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi

Dr. Shushil Tiwari, Principal, Govt. Girls College, Durg (C.G.)

Dr. Rajeev Guhey, Prof of Geology, Govt. Science College, Raipur (C.G.)

Board of Advisors :

Dr. S.K. Singh, Vice Chancellor, Bastar University, Bastar (C.G.)

Dr. Mandavi Singh, Vice Chancellor, Indira Kala Sangeet University, Khairagarh (C.G.)

Dr. S.C. Singh, UGC Member in the governing body of the college.

Dr. Prahlad Kumar, Prof. of Economics, Allahabad University, Allahabad (U.P.)

Dr. Hanuman Singh Yadav, Formerly Professor, RPEG, BU, Bhopal (M.P.)

Dr. Ramendra Mishra, Formerly Prof. of History, UTD, R.S.U., Raipur (C.G.)

Dr. Ravindra Brahme, Prof. of Economics. Pt. R.S.U. Raipur (C.G.)

Dr. Suresh Zade, Prof. & Head Dept. of Zoology, RTM University, Nagpur (Maharashtra)

Published & Printed by:

Government Digvijay P.G. Autonomous College, Rajnandgaon. Chhattisgarh 491 441 (India)

Contents

| S. No. | Title | Author(s) | Pages |
|--------|--|--|-------|
| 1 | Inclusive Education Growth and Challenges | Riddhi Pasari and Gyan Prakash | 1-13 |
| 2 | Sustainable Health in the Times of SDGs- Voices from the Margins | Sanghmitra S. Acharya | 14-35 |
| 3 | Food and Social Security of Agricultural Labourers Some Observations from Chhattisgarh | Krishna Nandan Prasad | 36-56 |
| 4 | Development of Tourism and Eco-Tourism in West Sikkim | Nima Lhaky Sherpa | 57-64 |
| 5 | Study of Portrayal of Women in Indian TV Advertisements – Stereotype or Progressive: A Content Analysis Approach | Meenu Kumar and Akansha Raman Khare | 65-75 |
| 6 | Fish Fauna Diversity: A case study of Rajnandgaon District, C.G. | Sanjay Thiske | 76-94 |

From the Desk of Chief Editor...

*This volume has the following features. **First**, it covers the regional diversity as it represents northern region (Delhi), central region (Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh) and eastern region of India. **Second**, it caters the academic diversity by addressing the issues of Education, Health, Food & social Security, Tourism and Portrayal of Women in Indian TV Advertisements from the social science stream. **Third**, it also enhances the academic coverage by including paper on Fish Fauna Diversity from the natural science stream.*

Generous and timely contributions from the authors are greatly appreciated for regular publication of this journal which is fully financed by the autonomous cell of the college with the sole aim of enhancing research environment in the country.

Inclusive Education Growth and Challenges

Riddhi Pasari * and Gyan Prakash**

Abstract

Inclusive Education also termed as inclusion is an approach towards educating all the children of similar age group under one roof irrespective of their developmental characteristics, social as well as their economic background. Inclusion is based on right of all the children to have quality education and aims to maximise the inner potential of all the children. It is one of the most effective ways to inculcate the seeds of equality, cooperation and collaboration amongst children. The Government of India has initiated various policies and strategies to incorporate inclusive education in schools such as Integrated Education for Disabled Children, 1974, Rehabilitation of India Act, 1992 etc. These policies were implemented with an objective to make all schools disabled friendly by 2020. This study traces the major growth in inclusion and challenges faced by school teachers while practising inclusion. The study is conducted in Indore city and near about 100 teachers of government and private schools is selected by convenient sampling method. The study found that only 6%-7% of teachers teaching special children have attended training programmes. Along with this there is hardly any infrastructure available in schools premises to give special education. The study says that teachers should be given training and institutions should be well equipped in order to successfully implement inclusion. Along with this the government policies should be made on realistic basis. Keeping in view all these points this article discusses in detail the concept of inclusive education, its importance, challenges and measures to successfully implement inclusion.

Keywords: Inclusive Education, Disabled children, School teachers, Training.

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is a powerful instrument of social change and often initiates an upward movement in the social structure and thereby helping to bridge the gap between different sections of society.

On the other hand, inclusive education is an educational approach towards educating all the children of similar age group under one roof irrespective of their developmental characteristics, social as well as economic background.

1. MA Scholar, School of Economics, DAVV, Indore

** Professor, School of Economics, DAVV, Indore

CONCEPT OF INCLUSION IN INDIA

In India, inclusive education is lacking behind either in its efficacy, infrastructure, and/or implementation. To date there have been numerous acts of legislation that have ordered special education students out of isolated educational environment and into regular classrooms.

In 1974, centrally sponsored scheme named Integrated Education for Disabled Children (IEDC) which was introduced to provide education to children with special needs. Various facilities such as books, stationeries, uniform, transport allowances etc. were provided to children.

The government initiatives in the area of inclusive education can be traced back to National Educational Policy, 1986, which recommended education for women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, adult working class and people in far flung remote areas.

Project Integration Education for Disabled (PIED), 1987 was a collaboration of Ministry of Human Resource Department (MHRD) and United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) which was implemented in cities of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Nagaland, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Haryana, Mizoram, Delhi Municipal Corporation, Varodara Municipal Corporation.

Rehabilitation Council of India Act, 1992 was enacted which gave rights to Children with disabilities to be taught by qualified teachers. Under this act teacher teaching children with disabilities should have license and professional special teachers should be registered under the act.

In 1995, Persons with Disability Act was passed with an objective to make all schools disabled friendly by 2020 by providing preventive and promotional aspects and providing free of cost education in appropriate environment up to 18 years of age. This act was later replaced by Right of Person with Disabilities Act, 2016.

Later in the year 2000, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan (SSA) was started with an objective of universalization of elementary/ primary education. The Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan later was joined with Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyaan to become Samagra Shiksha Abhiyaan in 2018.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

All around nation inclusive education is mandated by the law. Inclusion, however, is much more than a simple physical placement of a special education student in a regular education classroom. It is the meaningful participation of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum. In order to make participation meaningful, it is crucial to examine the attitudes towards inclusion of the individuals who play a central role in the process, that is, the attitudes of the regular education teacher. Teacher attitudes regarding inclusive education vary widely. The study indicates that overall teachers whether in government schools or private schools believe in the concept of inclusion. The study also suggests that teachers like to teach in inclusion classrooms and they are generally interested in serving special students. However, study also indicates that teachers do not believe they are receiving enough support and training in how to teach in an inclusion

classroom. It is this lack of support and training which prevents them from being the most effective teachers in the inclusion situation.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

- Kala Parasuram (2006). Studied on Variables that Affect Teachers Attitudes towards Disability and Inclusive Education in Mumbai, India, revealed that while some of the variables of interest did affect teacher's attitude towards disabilities, the only variable that affected teachers attitudes towards inclusion was prior acquaintance with a person with a disability.
- Bowman (1986), in her 14-nation UNESCO study of approximately 1,000 teachers with experience of teaching children with SEN, reported a wide difference in teacher opinions regarding integration. The countries surveyed were Egypt, Jordan, Colombia, Mexico, Venezuela, Botswana, Senegal, Zambia, Australia, Thailand, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Norway and Portugal. The teachers were found to favour different types of children for integration into ordinary classes. Interestingly, Bowman noted that in countries which had a law requiring integration, teachers expressed more favourable views (ranging from 47 to 93 per cent). Teachers from countries which offered the most sophisticated segregated educational provision were less supportive to integration (ranging from 0 to 28 per cent).

OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

Given that regular teachers are the key service providers in teaching students with special needs in the inclusive classroom, their attitude towards inclusion is a contributing factor to its success or failure. For the purposes of this study, attitude of teachers towards inclusion is examined by studying affective factors (feeling about the individual with disability), behavioural factors (intention to interact with the individual who has the disability), cognitive (knowledge about the disability and inclusive education).

Teachers who are ill-prepared or uncomfortable with the concept of inclusion may pass that discontent onto the students, which in turn can undermine the confidence and success of those students. Conversely, teachers who support and believe in the concept of inclusion can provide special education students with confidence and a comfortable learning environment.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study investigated teachers' attitude regarding inclusion of children with special needs in regular school in Indore city. This section is organized into four parts. These parts describe the research design utilized; the participants; the research approach; and econometrics tool utilized.

RESEARCH DESIGN

A descriptive research design was utilized for this study in order to investigate regular teacher attitudes regarding inclusive education practices in schools. Data from the participants was gathered on convenient basis. Quantitative data was gathered via a survey assessing teacher attitude, which is the dependent variable for the purposes of this study. The research questions for this study are: Is there any difference in the attitude of government teachers and private teachers towards inclusion, challenges the teachers usually face while implementing inclusion, important skills which are necessary to implement inclusive education and how do teachers personally cater the needs of special children.

PARTICIPANTS

For the purpose of study, total 14 schools were selected randomly and from the selected school, 100 teachers were chosen as the population of the study of which 40 teachers are government school teachers and 60 are private school teachers. Out of 100 teachers only 59% teachers hold a degree of Bachelors in Education or Diploma in Education or Montessori Training which is a compulsory degree required according to educational curriculum. The selected teachers were undergone for comprehensive study and have been selected through convenient sampling method.

RESEACRH APPORACH

The survey on Teacher Attitudes towards Inclusive Education consists of three sections. First section of the survey gathers teacher demographic information specifically, gender, age, educational level, teaching experience, teaching experience to disabled students and types of disabled students taught by teachers. Second section of the survey consists of 23 questions divided in 4 sub-parts- Attitude of Teachers towards Disability, Attitude and Knowledge of Teachers towards Inclusive Education and Special Children, Commitment of Teachers towards Special Children and Training and Development of Teachers. The teachers were instructed to put a tick on their response on the 5 point Likert scale. They were instructed to SA (Strongly Agree= 5), A (Agree= 4), N (Neutral= 3), SD (Strongly Disagree= 2), or D (Disagree= 1). Higher scores on each item suggested positive attitudes regarding inclusive education. Third section of the survey consists of open-ended questions related to types of disabilities teachers are ready to accept in their classroom, challenge faced by teachers, important skills required to implement inclusive education, training workshops and skills developed during the workshops.

ECONOMETRICS TOOLS

To have a comparative study of inclusive education in Private and Government schools regarding attitude of teachers towards inclusive education the following dummy variable regression model has been used.

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + U_i$$

Where,

Y_i = denotes for inclusive education score regarding attitude of teachers towards inclusive education of both Private schools and Government schools

D_i = dummy variable

$D_i = 1$, is defined for attitude of teachers towards inclusive education in government schools

$D_i = 0$, is defined for attitude of teachers towards inclusive education in private schools

Mean score of attitude of teachers towards inclusive education in private schools

$$Y_i \Sigma | Y_i / D_i = 0_i | = \beta_0$$

Mean score of attitude of teachers towards inclusive education in government schools

$$Y_i \Sigma | Y_i / D_i = 1_i | = \beta_0 + \beta_1$$

+ Means: The attitude of teachers towards inclusive education in government schools mean score is higher regarding inclusive education.

-Means – The attitude of teachers towards inclusive education in government schools mean score is higher regarding inclusive education.

But the magnitude of the distribution

$$\begin{aligned} & \wedge \beta_1 \\ & \wedge H_0: \beta_1 = 0 \\ & \wedge t = \beta_1 / SE \end{aligned}$$

If 't' calculated value is greater than the relevant table values than

$\wedge \beta_1$ is statically significant and accordingly the difference in attitude of teachers towards inclusive education in government and private schools may be considered as significant.

4. EMPIRICS

Table 1 Attitude of Teachers Towards Disability

| S No. | Statements | Y= a+bX |
|-------|--|--|
| 1 | I do not dread the thought that I could eventually end up with disability. | 3.817 - 0.292 D_i * (t=0.292/0.2893) |
| 2 | I tend to make contacts with people with disabilities and do not finish them as quickly as possible. | 4.217 – 0.217 D_i * (t = -0.217/0.19) |
| 3 | I am not afraid to look directly at a person with disability. | 4.167 – 0.042 D_i * (t=-0.042/0.190) |
| 4 | I do not find it difficult to overcome my initial shock when meeting people with severe physical disabilities. | 3.55 – 0.325 D_i * (t=-0.325/0.248) |

*Non- Significant; **Significant at 5% level; ***Significant at 1% level

Observations

1. Under the first statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking alike. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.817) is higher than government school teachers (3.525). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value (**Table 1**) it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I do not dread to thought that I could eventually end up with disability is same.
2. Under the second statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking same. Although mean value of private school teachers

- (4.217) is higher than government school teachers (4.00). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I tend to make contacts with people with disabilities and do not finish them as quickly as possible is alike.
3. Under the third statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking identical. Although mean value of private school teachers (4.167) is higher than government school teachers (4.125). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I am not afraid to look directly at a person with disability is same.
 4. Under the fourth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking similar. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.55) is higher than government school teachers (3.225). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I do not find it difficult to overcome my initial shock when meeting people with severe physical disabilities is alike.

Table 2 Attitude and Knowledge of Teachers Towards Inclusive Education and Special Children

| S No. | Statements | Y= a+bX |
|-------|---|--|
| 1 | Every child has the right to be educated corresponding to his own development characteristics. | 4.68- 0.008 D _i * (t= -0.008/0.0961) |
| 2 | Children with physical disabilities should not learn in special schools. | 3.083- 0.142D _i * (t=-0.142/0.283) |
| 3 | The best result is achieved if each child with special educational needs is placed in a special education classroom that best suits him/her. | 4.383- 0.158D _i * (t =-0.158/0.166) |
| 4 | Children who require specialized academic support gain in confidence, social and emotional security in regular schools. | 3.8- 0.158 D _i * (t =-0.158/0.217) |
| 5 | Inclusive education programs provide different students with opportunities for mutual communication, thus promote students to understand and accept individual diversity. | 3.83- 0.142D _i * (t = -0.142/0.216) |
| 6 | Concept of inclusion sounds good in theory and also work well in practice. | 2.15- 0.225D _i * (t =-0.225/0.209) |
| 7 | I feel that inclusion is not expensive. | 2.867-0.108D _i * (t = -0.108/0.231) |

*Non- Significant; **Significant at 5% level; ***Significant at 1% level

Observations

1. Under the first statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking alike. Although mean value of private school teachers (4.683) is higher than government school teachers (4.675). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value (**Table 2**) it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. Every child has the right to be educated corresponding to his own development characteristics is same.
2. Under the second statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking identical. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.083) is higher than government school teachers (2.941). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. Children with physical disabilities should not learn in special schools is alike.
3. Under the third statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking similar. Although mean value of private school teachers (4.383) is higher than government school teachers (4.225). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. The best result is achieved if each child with special educational needs is placed in a special education classroom that best suits him/her is same.
4. Under the fourth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking same. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.8) is higher than government school teachers (3.65). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. Children who require specialized academic support gain in confidence, social and emotional security in regular schools is similar.
5. Under the fifth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking alike. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.83) is higher than government school teachers (3.688). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. inclusive education programs provide different students with opportunities for mutual communication, thus promote students to understand and accept individual diversity is identical.
6. Under the sixth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking similar. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.15) is higher than government school teachers (1.925). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. Concept of inclusion sounds good in theory and also work well in practice is alike.
7. Under the seventh statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking identical. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.867) is higher than government school teachers (2.759). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I feel that inclusion is not expensive is alike.

Table 3 Commitment of Teachers Towards Special Children

| S No. | Statements | Y= a+bX |
|-------|---|---|
| 1 | I am comfortable to handle disruptive behaviour in the classroom. | 3- 0.325 D _i * (t = -0.325/0.232) |
| 2 | I can accurately measure student comprehension of what I have taught. | 3.667- 0.067 D _i * (t = -0.067/0.188) |
| 3 | I can collaborate with other professionals in helping students with disabilities. | 4.183- 0.158 D _i * (t = -0.158/0.177) |
| 4 | I can assist children and their families in helping their children do well in school. | 4.05- 0.2 D _i * (t = -0.2/0.158) |
| 5 | I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities. | 2.187- 0.233 D _i * (t = -0.233/0.229) |

*Non- Significant; **Significant at 5% level; ***Significant at 1% level

Observations

1. Under the first statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking identical. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.00) is higher than government school teachers (2.675). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value (**Table 3**) it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I am comfortable to handle disruptive behaviour in the classroom is alike.
2. Under the second statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking alike. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.667) is higher than government school teachers (3.6). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I can accurately measure student comprehension of what I have taught is same.
3. Under the third statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking similar. Although mean value of private school teachers (4.183) is higher than government school teachers (4.025). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I can collaborate with other professionals in helping students with disabilities is identical.
4. Under the fourth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking alike. Although mean value of private school teachers (4.05) is higher than government school teachers (3.85). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I can assist children and their families in helping their children do well in school is same.
5. Under the fifth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking same. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.817) is higher than government school teachers (2.584). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be

concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities is alike.

Table 4 Training and Development of Teachers

| S No. | Statements | Y= a+bX |
|-------|--|--|
| 1 | I am aware about various government initiatives towards inclusive education. | 3.05- 0.025 D _i * (t = -0.025/0.220) |
| 2 | I had training and development in order to prepare to feel competent in dealing with students with disabilities. | 2.483- 0.208 D _i * (t = -0.208/0.188) |
| 3 | I have instructional skills and educational background to effectively teach students with disabilities in general classroom. | 2.733- 0.158 D _i * (t = -0.158/0.210) |
| 4 | I attend training workshops to develop various skills required to educate special children. | 2.783- 0.283 D _i * (t = -0.283/0.208) |
| 5 | I know how to collaborate in order for inclusion to be successful. | 2.867- 0.092 D _i * (t = -0.092/0.210) |
| 6 | I am specialized in teaching students with disabilities. | 2.517- 0.216 D _i * (t = -0.216/0.1667) |
| 7 | There are sufficient supportive resources and professional pedagogues to support inclusive education this school. | 2.45- 0.3D _i * (t = -0.3/0.180) |

*Non- Significant; **Significant at 5% level; ***Significant at 1% level

Observations

1. Under the first statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking alike. Although mean value of private school teachers (3.05) is higher than government school teachers (3.025). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value (**Table 4**) it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I am aware about various government initiatives towards inclusive education is same.
2. Under the second statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking identical. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.483) is higher than government school teachers (2.275). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I had training and development in order to prepare to feel competent in dealing with students with disabilities is alike.
3. Under the third statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking similar. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.733) is higher than government school teachers (2.575). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I have instructional skills and educational background to effectively teach students with disabilities in general classroom is identical.

4. Under the fourth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking same. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.783) is higher than government school teachers (2.5). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I attend training workshops to develop various skills required to educate special children is alike.
5. Under the fifth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking same. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.867) is higher than government school teachers (2.775). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I know how to collaborate in order for inclusion to be successful is alike.
6. Under the sixth statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking similar. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.517) is higher than government school teachers (2.301). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. I am specialized in teaching students with disabilities is identical.
7. Under the seventh statement the government school teachers and private school teachers are thinking same. Although mean value of private school teachers (2.45) is higher than government school teachers (2.15). Being insignificant difference between private and government teachers' mean value it may be concluded that their opinion regarding the statement i.e. there are sufficient supportive resources and professional pedagogues to support inclusive education this school is similar.

5. INFERENCES AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The survey on attitude of teachers towards inclusive education was done on primary basis by analysing the attitude of government and private teachers. There was no such significant conclusion drawn on comparative study of government and private teachers. However during the research through personal interaction with teachers points were recorded which the major area of consideration is.

According to school curriculum the students are promoted to higher classes irrespective of their development at current stage. Secondly, at times parents are not ready to accept the speciality of their children which is a major issue. On the other hand, many schools give admission to special children without having adequate resources or professionals to teach special children.

Teachers are ready to have training in order to educate special children and implement inclusion but due to lack of training programs inclusion is possible up to certain level.

6. CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that no statistically significant difference exist between government and private teachers in relation to their attitudes regarding inclusive education. According to the results, both government and private

teachers generally hold a neutral attitude regarding inclusion. The results are consistent with the existing research that teachers, overall, are not adverse to the concept of inclusion.

Part C of the survey which discussed about the challenges faced by teachers, skills required to implement inclusive education had following conclusions: 87 out of 100 teachers faced a problem of giving special attention to disabled children which may create problems for normal students. Secondly, 88 out of 100 teachers find it difficult to discipline and handle special children. 92 teachers feel that experimental activities and practical approach is an important skill required while teaching. On the other hand 89 out of 100 teachers demands for special training. These are the major outcomes of the study which are to be noticed to implement concept of inclusion successfully.

REFERENCES

1. Kala Parasuram (2006). Variables that Affect Teachers' Attitudes Towards Disability and Inclusive Education in Mumbai, India, Disability and Society vol 21, ISS.3, 2006.
2. BOWMAN, I. (1986). 'Teacher-training and the integration of handicapped pupils: some findings from a fourteen nation UNESCO study', European Journal of Special Needs Education, 1, 29–38

APPENDICES

1. TABLES

Following are tables drawn out from the information provided by 100 teachers of government schools and private schools.

TABLE A: TYPE OF DISABLED STUDENTS TAUGHT BY TEACHERS

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Low Vision | 34 |
| Partial Hearing Impairment | 15 |
| Learning Disability | 20 |
| Speech and Language Disability | 20 |
| Leprosy Cursed Child | 01 |
| Loco motor Disability | 05 |
| Dwarfism | 08 |
| Intellectual Disability | 19 |
| Mental Illness | 11 |
| Acid Victim Attack | 02 |
| Autism Spectrum Disorder | 15 |
| Multiple Disabilities | 08 |

TABLE B: TYPES OF DISABILITY TEACHERS ARE READY TO ACCEPT

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Low Vision | 55 |
| Partial Hearing Impairment | 52 |
| Learning Disability | 40 |
| Speech and Language Disability | 46 |
| Leprosy Cursed Child | 22 |
| Loco motor Disability | 24 |
| Dwarfism | 67 |
| Intellectual Disability | 40 |
| Mental Illness | 10 |
| Acid Victim Attack | 51 |
| Autism Spectrum Disorder | 45 |
| Multiple Disabilities | 42 |

TABLE C: CHALLENGES FACED BY TEACHERS WHILE IMPLEMENTING INCLUSION

| Challenges Faced | No. of Teachers |
|---|-----------------|
| Lack of support from parents. | 05 |
| Have to give them special attention. | 87 |
| Lack of infrastructure and resources in school premises. | 12 |
| Feeling of isolation and segregation amongst special children. | 07 |
| It is difficult to balance between normal and special children. | 33 |
| They create problems for normal students. | 73 |
| It is difficult to handle and discipline them. | 88 |

| | |
|--|----|
| To understand their understanding level and treat them accordingly. | 17 |
| Problems like mood swings, grasping power, mentally absent in class. | 26 |
| Unable to complete course time. | 9 |
| It feels like burdened with responsibilities. | 21 |
| Unable to understand their basic problem. | 42 |

TABLE D: SKILLS REQUIRED BY TEACHERS TO IMPLEMENT INCLUSION

| Skills required by Teachers | No. of Teachers |
|--|------------------------|
| Teaching through experimental activities and practical approach. | 92 |
| Friend like behaviour, love, care and support. | 85 |
| Calm and patience. | 37 |
| Creating healthy atmosphere. | 77 |
| Special training required on regular basis. | 89 |
| Skills to analyze them, their behaviour and requirements. | 48 |
| An observant and good listener. | 12 |
| Emotional and mental intelligence required. | 06 |
