Chapter 5

Main Findings, Conclusions, Educational Implications and Recommendations for Further Study
The present study was planned to identify the barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in Haryana. In the process, the study assessed implementation status of inclusive education as well as the perceptions of stakeholders namely head teachers, teachers, CwSNs and parents of CwSNs regarding the barriers to implementation of inclusion. The data was analyzed by using appropriate techniques to arrive at valid conclusions and main findings of the study. The main findings emerged from the study are documented in this Chapter. Part-A presents findings on position of the implementation of inclusive education in Haryana. These findings are supported by Table 4.1 to 4.27. The findings reported in part-B are related to identification of nature of barriers to the implementation of inclusive education. These findings are supported by Table 4.28 to 4.50. The findings listed in part-C demonstrate the perceptions of stakeholders regarding barriers to the implementation of inclusive education. These findings are supported by Table 4.51 to 4.54. The findings summarized in part-D reveals the relationship between perceptions of stakeholders towards barriers to inclusive education. These findings are supported by Table 4.55 to 4.57. Part-E has listed suggestions received from stakeholders for overcoming barriers and strengthening the facilitators for successful implementation of inclusive education. The conclusions derived from the findings are mentioned in this Chapter. The wide range of educational implications emerging out of the study is also documented in this Chapter. The potential areas for further research in the fields related to this study have been indicated at the end.

5.1 MAIN FINDINGS

The important findings of the study are:
Part-A

1. The overall position of implementation of inclusive education in the State of Haryana is not encouraging since 27 (45%) standards, out of total 60 (100%), were met by the sample schools.

2. The four districts across the State varied on overall implementation of inclusive education. The schools of Sonipat district with a mean score of 4.42 were ahead to schools of other three districts in overall implementation of inclusive education.

3. The comparison of mean scores of rural and urban schools on implementation of 8 dimensions of inclusive education indicates that urban schools implemented inclusive education in a better way than rural schools.

4. Identification of CwSNs was done by all the 28 (100%) sample schools. However, 27 (96.43%) schools did not adhere to the identification norms prescribed in SSA. The procedures adopted for identification were not devoid of discrepancies.

5. Despite provisions in SSA, the identification process was not monitored by senior officials in 27 (96.43%) schools.

6. The provisions and standards set in SSA for conducting formal and medical assessment were met by all the 28 (100%) sample schools.

7. The aids and appliances were received, time to time, by all the 28 (100%) sample schools.

8. The aids and appliances were distributed in all the 28 (100%) schools through convergence with other departments of the government.

9. The aids and appliances were delayed in being received by 24 (85.71%) schools. The qualities of the aids were good in 25 (89.28%) schools.

10. Although, the participation of teachers in 20 days in-service programme was very low (3.57%), teachers in all the 28 (100%) schools had received 3-5 days special orientation.
11. The resource teachers were posted at the block level to cover a group of inclusive schools. No teacher was posted at the school level. The frequency of teachers visiting the school was found inadequate in all the 28 (100%) sample schools. The visits were made either occasionally or once in a month in the two third i.e 24 (85.71%) sample schools.

12. The special teachers were found skilled and competent in all the 28 (100%) schools but Individual Education Plan (IEP) was available in 4 (14.29%) schools only. These 4 schools were designated Model Inclusive Schools. In none of the surveyed schools, the special teachers were found collaborating with general teachers for developing IEP.

13. The provisions namely use of paraprofessionals, teaching aids, ability of special teachers to deal with unexpected incidents, as cited in SSA framework, were not implemented in any of the sample schools.

14. In compliance with provisions of SSA, the special teachers were discouraging discrimination between CwSNs and other students in all the 28 sample schools, which was an example of good inclusive practices.

15. The provision of Home-Based Education (HBE) was complied by only 4 (14.29%) out of 28 (100%) sample schools. These four schools were those where resource teachers were posted and the schools were designated as Model Inclusive Schools.

16. Since none of the schools was maintaining attendance record for HBE, the results showed complete non-compliance to Govt. of Haryana, School Education Department Order No. 1/3-2015 IED Dated 10.06.2015 and SSA norms, according to which preparation of attendance record under HBE was mandatory.

17. The awareness camps to remove the myths and misconceptions of parents about disabilities and inclusive education were organized in only 4 (14.29 %) sample schools.

18. The sports activities for CwSNs were organized by 6 (21.43%) schools; the participation of CwSNs in cultural activities was reported in 22 (78.75%) schools, none of the sample schools organized tours and excursions for CwSNs.
It was noted that certain schools had sent the CwSNs on tours and excursions organized by State government at Manali, Himachal Pradesh. The findings indicate a compliance with govt. letters ref. no. 1/37-2013 IEDSS dated 6.2.2014 and letter ref. no. SSA/IED/4078-4098 dated 20.5.2016 circulated across the State to ensure effective implementation of inclusive education provisions on sports and cultural activities.

**Part-B**

19. The overall picture of meeting the requirement of physical access was disappointing since only 11 standards out of 39 were fully met by the sample schools. This would imply that the needs of the CwSNs were not being adequately met in majority of schools with regard to being able to find a drinking water facility, mid-day meal serving area, and using toilet facility safely and without assistance.

20. In all the 28 (100%) schools, the school entrance gates were sufficiently wide i.e 4’ to 5’ feet to meet the government guidelines.

21. Nineteen (67.85%) out of 28 (100%) schools had obstruction free route to school entrance gate.

22. Twenty two (78.57%) schools had clear and leveled paths from the entrance gate to different school buildings within the campus.

23. In all the 28 (100%) schools, there were no sharp turns on the walkways.

24. The ramps constituted a major barrier to school access. In most of the cases, slope of the ramps was too steep. The ramps in 20 (71.42%) schools were not meeting the requirement of 1:12 gradient. In 21 (75 %) schools, the handrails on ramps were either non-existent or not complying with the prescribed standards. The surface of the ramps was found slippery in 16 (57.14%) schools. The width of the ramps was not according to the standards in 16 (57.14%) sample schools.

25. The drinking water facilities appeared to be another major barrier to the education of CwSNs since these were found inaccessible to CwSNs in 25 (89.28%) out of 28 (100%) schools.
26. All the sample schools had toilets available on their campus in accordance with SSA norms but the same were not appropriate for use by the CwSNs. The space inside the toilet was inadequate in 20 (71.42%) schools. In 15 (53.57%) schools, the toilet seats were not according to the suggested standards. The same number of schools was without the commode toilet facility. It is pertinent to mention that commode were available only in schools where toilets were marked specifically for the CwSNs. Toilets in all the 28 (100%) sample schools did not have grab-rails. In 25 (89.28%) schools, the light switches and door handles were not mounted at usable heights. None of the schools had separate toilets for girls thus compromising with the security and privacy of female students.

27. In all the 28 (100%) schools, the light switches were at a usable height and classrooms were properly ventilated and equipped with natural light. The design of the classroom was appropriate for each and every student. The seating with effective viewing area was appropriate in 27 (96.42%) schools. Sufficient space was available between the desks. The wheelchair mobility to each and every corner was feasible, except in a few classrooms of two schools. The classroom floors were leveled in all the 28 (100%) schools. The ceiling of classrooms was also safe. All the schools, except two, had sufficient classroom furniture (that also includes tat-patti) and classroom blackboards were found unglazed and centrally installed. Thus, the classrooms were not acting as barriers to impede the education of CwSNs.

28. The open surface and floors did not appear a significant barrier in the education of CwSNs since 24 (85.71%) out of 28 (100%) schools were conforming to the standards.

29. The library was not upto the prescribed standards in all the 28 (100%) schools.

30. The width of doors in all the 28 (100%) schools was rated in ‘no’ category of discrepancy scale thus the doors were not posing barrier to inclusion. The doors, in all the schools, were found accessible and usable. The CwSNs were using them independently and safely and door thresholds were not limiting the in-and-out movements of the CwSNs.
31. The school administrators were a barrier to the implementation of inclusive education since only 6 standards out of 25 were fully met by head teachers (administrators) of the sample schools. This would imply that the provisions of inclusive education mentioned in SSA framework were not being adequately complied by majority of school heads.

32. Regarding transfer of funds, there were no administrative barriers in any of the schools. All the 28 (100%) schools received the funds well in time since the transfer was mostly through electronic mode.

33. There were no enrolment barriers and it was noted that SSA policy on admission of CwSNs was fully complied by heads of all the 28 (100%) schools.

34. The barriers were found on organisation of counseling camps for parents and procurement and distribution of aids and appliances in 24 (85.71%) schools.

35. In all the 28 (100%) schools, the teachers were relieved in-time by head teachers for attending in-service training but lack of in-service training in all, except one, head teachers constituted a potential barrier for the implementation of inclusive education. The in-service training on inclusion was received by 1 (3.57%) head teacher only.

36. The head teachers in 24 (85.71%) sample schools were found ‘major’ discrepant in the area of collaborative teaching, resource room support, ensuring availability and accessibility to teaching learning material in the class.

37. All the 28 (100%) head teachers were reported ‘major’ discrepant in use of appropriate technology, arranging suitable writer for children with writing difficulties and in promotion of adaptive assessment procedures. The only area where head teacher acted as facilitator to inclusive education was the procurement of activity/text books since it was procured by head teachers in 25 (89.28%) out of 28 (100%) sample schools.

38. The study revealed that not a single feeling was positively expressed by all the respondents to facilitate the implementation of inclusive education. The negative feelings towards the CwSNs and inclusive education were expressed by majority of
respondents. The negative feelings were related to the process of inclusive education than its philosophy.

39. The negative attitudes were found in the area of disability and inclusive education since 73.21% respondents believed that the disability is not a curable condition. 53.57% believed that the CwSNs were not as capable as the other students. 71.42% opined that the examination system should not be modified for the CwSNs. 70.23% viewed that the CwSNs should be taught in special schools only.

Part-C

40. The highest physical barrier that parents perceived was ‘inaccessible drinking water’ for the CwSNs. In addition, the physical hindrances in implementation of inclusion namely ‘unfriendly toilets’, ‘unreachable mid-day meal area’, ‘defective classroom design’, and ‘inappropriate ramps’ were perceived as barriers to inclusion by parents. According to parents, the implementation of inclusive education was least affected by the school ‘playgrounds’ and ‘pathways’ since they were suitable to meet the requirements of the CwSNs. In the category of ‘administrative barriers’, the parents perceived ‘lack of efforts by head teacher to encourage the teachers to use appropriate technology, technological aids and software in the class’ as the top most barrier to implement inclusive education. The parents perceived that ‘current appointment norms of special teachers’ were faulty and thus it was awarded second highest rank in the continuum of barriers. Regarding ‘attitudinal barriers’, the parents were against the view of labeling CwSNs as ‘stupid’, ‘lame’ or hopeless’. All parents favoured the continuation of special grants to CwSNs.

41. The teachers perceived ramps as the highest barrier to implement inclusive education. The second highest rank was given to inappropriate classroom layouts. The other barriers namely inaccessible drinking water, unfriendly/unsuitable toilets and odd playgrounds perceived by teachers were placed by them at the 3rd, 4th and 5th position in the list. The doors and pathways were found least affecting barriers. In the category of ‘administrative barriers’, the teachers found ‘lack of efforts by head teacher to encourage teachers to use
appropriate technology in the class’ as the top most barrier. Since CwSNs were not denied for admission, it was given lowest rank meaning thereby that it was least affecting barrier due to zero rejection admission policy of the government. Regarding the category of ‘attitudinal barriers’, the teacher’s perceptions on the item namely ‘the teaching of CwSNs is the responsibility of special teacher only’ received highest barrier score. It was considered top most attitudinal barrier by the teachers.

42. The third stakeholders regarding barriers to the implementation of inclusive education were the head teachers who perceived inadequate drinking water as the topmost barrier to implement inclusive education. The second rank among other perceived physical barriers was given to lack of suitable and accessible toilets. The inaccessible school entrance gate was considered third highest physical barrier. The other factors perceived by head teachers for creating hindrances in the implementation of inclusive education were: ‘the mid-day meal area was unreachable’, ‘the design of the classroom was flawed’, ‘the ramps were inappropriate’, and ‘playgrounds were not usable for CwSNs’. Interestingly, the pathways were ‘not at all’ found a perceived physical barrier in the proliferation of inclusive education. In the category of ‘administrative barriers’, the highest barrier perceived by head teachers was ‘faulty appointment norms of special teachers’. The inefficiency of head teachers to organize activities for inclusive education and procurement of books for CwSNs were the least affecting barriers. On the front of ‘attitudinal barriers’, the head teachers viewed ‘giving extra help and attention to CwSNs’ a major threat to the implementation of inclusive education.

43. The main stakeholders of inclusive education were CwSNs. According to them, the poor toilet facility in schools was the most prominent physical barrier. The other barriers reported by the CwSNs includes: inaccessible drinking water (2nd highest barrier), slippery floors (3rd highest barrier), and unreachable mid-day meal area (4th highest barrier). Interestingly, the doors and playground were found least affecting barriers to inclusion. The ramps, school entrance gates, pathways and design of the classroom were cited as moderate category barriers
by CwSNs. On administrative fronts, the highest barrier score was given to the item namely ‘current appointments norms of recruitment of special teachers are faulty’. It was tied with the score on the item ‘lack of efforts by head teacher to use technology in classroom to teach CwSNs’. It was reported by CwSNs that the school heads were not providing accurate information on inclusive education schemes (2nd highest barrier). The CwSNs were against the myths that inclusive education was contributing nothing to meet their educational needs.

**Part-D**

44. The relationship between perception of head teachers and teachers on administrative barriers to inclusive education was positive and very weak. The null hypothesis $H_{01}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of administrators and teachers in relation to administrative barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

45. The relationship between perception of teachers and parents on administrative barriers to inclusive education was positive but very weak. The null hypothesis $H_{02}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of teachers and parents in relation to administrative barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

46. The relationship between perception of parents and head teachers regarding administrative barriers to inclusive education was positive and very weak. The null hypothesis $H_{03}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of parents and administrators in relation to administrative barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

47. The relationship between perception of head teachers (administrators) and teachers regarding physical barriers to inclusive education was negative and weak. The null hypothesis $H_{04}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation
among the perceptions of administrators and teachers in relation to physical barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

48. The relationship between perception of teachers and parents regarding physical barriers to the implementation of inclusive education was positive and weak. The null hypotheses $H_{05}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of teachers and parents in relation to physical barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ is accepted at .05 level of significance.

49. The relationship between perception of parents and head teachers/administrators on physical barriers to inclusive education was positive but weak / low. The null hypothesis $H_{06}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of administrators and parents in relation to physical barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

50. The relationship between perception of head teachers and teachers on attitudinal barriers to inclusive education was negative and extremely weak. The null hypothesis $H_{07}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of administrators and teachers in relation to attitudinal barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

51. The relationship between perception of teachers and parents regarding attitudinal barriers to inclusive education was positive and weak. The null hypothesis $H_{08}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of teachers and parents in relation to attitudinal barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

52. The relationship between perception of head teachers and parents regarding attitudinal barriers to inclusive education was negative and weak. The null hypothesis $H_{09}$ stating that ‘there is no significant correlation among the perceptions of parents and administrators in relation to attitudinal barriers to the
implementation of inclusive education in the primary schools in Haryana State’ was accepted at 0.05 level of significance.

PART-E

The suggestions given by stakeholders for overcoming barriers and strengthening the facilitators for successful implementation of inclusive education are as follows:

1. The inclusive schools may be strengthened by ensuring physical access and removing administrative and attitudinal barriers especially the inadequate funding, flawed appointments of special teachers, negative comments, teasing, staring and isolation of CwSNs.

2. Inclusion may be facilitated by creating acceptance of CwSNs through age-appropriate disability awareness and rehabilitation training programmes for non-disabled peers.

3. It was suggested to take help/advice of CwSNs and their parents while identifying and removing the barriers to inclusive education.

4. The funds/donations may be mobilized from society to create a disabled friendly infrastructure in the school.

5. Policy makers who are well acquainted with the ground realities only be assigned the duty of formulating policies on inclusion.

6. Training for all teachers should be planned on how technology in general and computer technology in particular can be used in classroom for CwSNs.

7. Special teachers should be appointed in every school so as to spend more time in planning and organizing the activities for CwSNs.

8. The school curriculum must contain topics on disability and examples of best practices on inclusive education to generate awareness and understanding on these issues among non-disabled.

9. The resource room should be created in each school to facilitate the CwSNs to access educational facilities at basic level.

10. It appeared extremely difficult for every CwSNs to achieve high standards in scholastic (academic) education so the focus of inclusive schools should be on
developing vocational efficiency in CwSNs together with making them self-dependent in meeting their daily living needs.

11. It was suggested to appoint volunteers instead of special teachers for getting maximum benefits and coverage of Home-Based Education for severely disabled children.

12. The role of paraprofessionals namely physiotherapist, speech therapist, audiologist, psychologist etc. is extremely important in facilitating inclusive education. It was suggested to appoint/arrange these professionals at block/cluster level to assist special and regular teachers to attend the medical and behavioral problems of the CwSNs in a meaningful way.

13. One of the challenges before the inclusive education is how to teach the disabled and non-disabled students in a common classroom with pedagogy that suits both types of learners. In this context, it was suggested that teachers should be trained during pre-service and in-service programmes on how to use multisensory pedagogical skills in inclusive classrooms so that all students could benefit and their ‘togetherness’ also promotes learning to a maximum level.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

The inclusive education under SSA was launched by the Government of India in 2003 with an objective to increase the enrollment of CwSNs at elementary stage by providing them accessible and quality education. This was in-line with policy of government to achieve the target of Universal Elementary Education. However, the findings of this study show that the objective set by the government 14 years ago has not been met so far. The position of the implementation inclusive education was not found upto mark. It was noted that 55% of overall survey standards were not being fully implemented by the sample schools. The identification process, as carried out by the sample schools for CwSNs, was flawed. This result was consistent with the findings of Singal (2010) who found great discrepancies in identification process for CwSNs. The findings are also supported by Balasundaram (2005) who cited lack of reliable statistics on disability as hindrance to the implementation of inclusive education. The positive side of implementation status was that the aspect of functional
and formal assessment was fully implemented by all the schools. The quality of aids and appliances provided to CwSNs was found good in contradictions to Mander (2002), who observed that aids supplied in Andhra Pradesh were poor in quality. The present study refute the claims of Bindal & Sharma (2010), Sharma & Desai (2002), and Swaroop (2001) that provisions for teacher training on inclusive education were inadequate since the present study found that teachers of 100% sample schools had attended the training. The present study also found that the schools lacked resource teachers and teaching-learning materials to implement inclusive education programmes. Moreover, the resource teachers were appointed at block level for a group of schools, rather than in every school. These results were congruent with Berwal (2016) and to a report published in ‘The Tribune’ on June 21, 2017 that resource teachers were working on contract basis at block level. The non-availability of resource teachers at each school level was observed one of the reasons for slow progress of inclusion since these teachers play active role in ensuring barrier free access to CwSNs, preparing Individual Education Plan in collaboration with general teachers and providing counseling and guidance to parents of CwSNs. Home-based education was another area of concern where majority of the schools failed to comply the policy provisions. These findings disagrees with Berwal (2016) who found that HBE was provided in 100% schools but congruent to Ali (2016) who stated that implementation of HBE was not sufficient. The study noted that distinctive experiences were provided to CwSNs in adventure sports, culture, art and craft activities. This kind of support helps CwSNs to progress and grow in life by gaining confidence. Such activities will not only increase their acceptance and friendship among the non-disabled classmates but also instill in them self-discipline and competitive spirit. These results are consistent with Koul (2008) who suggested that field trips were useful for CwSNs.

On overall implementation of inclusive education across the four districts of the State, slight variations were observed. The schools of Sonipat district were at the top. A reasonably good performance of the Sonipat district reflects the hard work put by its administrators, special and general teachers in implementing inclusion. Another reason for its success might be proximity with national capital and comparably high
level of education among parents. The comparison of rural and urban schools on their mean scores of overall implementation shows that rural schools were not adequately contributing to the success of inclusive education. One of the reasons of poor performance of rural schools might be appointment of special resource teachers who were mainly posted in urban schools. The inclusive education was facilitated by them in urban schools in a better way than in case of rural schools.

In the area of barriers to inclusive education, this study indicates a gloomy picture. With regard to physical access, the sample schools met 11 standards only out of total 39. This implies that needs of the CwSNs were not adequately fulfilled by majority of the schools. The physical barriers were identified in the area of drinking water, toilets, ramps and floors. All districts had one or more major discrepancies in these areas. This study identified that children with physical disabilities, especially those in wheelchairs had difficulty in accessing the ramps safely and independently. On the positive side, all walkways were useable by CwSNs. The buildings were interconnected by pathways in all the schools. This suggested that the CwSNs were able to use all the buildings on these campuses. The results indicate that classrooms in all the four districts were usable by CwSNs. There was no hindrance at the entry. All the classrooms had proper visibility as these were either illuminated with electricity or natural light and blackboards were installed centrally and at appropriate height to make them clearly visible from all angles. The classroom seating was found appropriate and accessible. The findings on classroom infrastructure for CwSNs contradict the findings of a study by Baux (2012) but support Pandey (2016). The overall analysis suggests that although schools moved ahead to remove the architectural barriers for easy access but the developments did not met the standards mandated in SSA documents. The results further suggest renovating the existing buildings and complying with bylaws on barrier free access while constructing new school buildings. This research is confirmatory to the views of Jha (2002) and Alur (2002) that children with disabilities were facing barriers as the building were not constructed with their mobility needs in mind.

The study found school administrators a barrier to the implementation of the inclusive education. Only 6 standards out of 25 were fully met by head teachers
administrators) of the sample schools. This would imply that the provisions of inclusive education mentioned in SSA framework were not being adequately complied by majority of school heads. The head of the schools miserably failed to encourage the teachers to use technology in classroom, prepare and use the Individual Educational Plan (IEP) etc. Some of the reasons for administrative barriers are that the heads lacked autonomy, motivation and relevant training to practise the philosophy of inclusion. This study suggests a need to work on these three issues since autonomy is closely associated with motivation and planning. The persons who are given autonomy in planning and execution of ideas generally feel motivated to implement the ideas. The poor salaries and faulty appointment of teachers were reported as top administrative barriers. These factors pose most significant barriers to collaboration with general teachers on IEP at every school level. The positive side of the results was that the head teacher facilitated the inclusive education through timely procurement of activity/text books for CwSNs. The finding on inadequate in-service training, by and large, confirm the observations of Hegarty and Alur (2002) that although most of the administrators have heard of inclusion, but they were not aware about the specific provisions for inclusive education. The result of present study are consistent with Kalyanpur (2008) who reported that merely 37% of school principals had heard of inclusive schooling and administrators were not trained for inclusive settings. However, the results did not confirm the findings of Wehbi (2011) who found finance a prominent obstacle in facilitating education to persons with disabilities. The results provided by this study clearly emphasize the need to provide training to school administrators on the provisions of inclusion education, school plans, and strategies to assist, schedule and motivate teachers to use technology in classroom etc. Addressing the areas of barriers identified in this study would go a long way in helping the school heads to implement inclusive education successfully.

The attitudinal barriers were identified in all the areas. On philosophical level, the sample agreed to inclusive education but the practice on ground was found influenced with prejudice against CwSNs. The negative feelings were seen on the issues of teaching CwSNs in special schools and whether examination system should be modified for CwSNs. The results indicated that respondents were holding attitudes
that relate CwSNs with disability and not to abilities. The findings pointed that CwSNs in inclusive schools were only admitted and they were yet to be accepted as inseparable part of education system. The study also revealed that a large percentage of respondents held positive attitude for creating accessible toilets for CwSNs and facilitating the classroom seating arrangement without discrimination. The results of the present research contradict the findings of Das (2012) that in-service teachers had positive attitude towards inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream schools. These results are consistent with National Trust for the Welfare of Persons with Autism, Cerebral Palsy, Mental Retardation and Multiple Disabilities Act, 1999 that CwSNs face attitudinal barriers in education system. It was experienced by the researcher during her field visits that CwSNs were called by non-disabled peers, teachers and supporting staff as ‘Chautala’ ‘Surdas’, ‘Andha’ and ‘Kana’ etc. Hence, to conclude, it can be said that despite the concerted efforts by various agencies and the state government, the discrimination with CwSNs still continues in inclusive schools and in such a situation it will be unlikely for CwSNs to receive a satisfactory education.

The study sub-areas of physical, attitudinal and administrative barriers to inclusive education were also rated. It was found that among top ten barriers, as perceived by parents, five were raised by the administrators, three by physical structures and two by negative attitudes. In case of teachers, out of ten top barriers, eight were related to administrators whereas two to the negative attitudes. The teachers did not find any physical factor among the top ten barriers. According to head teachers, six barriers out of top ten were personally related to them in the capacity of administrators, three were due to negative attitudes whereas one barrier was associated with inaccessible physical infrastructure. Out of top ten barriers perceived by CwSNs, five were associated with physical infrastructure, three to administrators whereas two barriers were associated with attitudes. In the light of findings, it can be concluded that administrators appeared a most common and significant barrier to the implementation of inclusive education. The findings suggest three areas for action. First, the administrators should be provided adequate training on inclusive education. Secondly, teachers should be made to understand the limitations of the administrators
in implementing inclusion because teachers linked eight barriers out of top ten with administrators. It implies that teachers considered administrators as solely responsible for poor implementation of inclusive education in Haryana. These results indicated that inclusion has caused a tension between the teachers and school heads.

The magnitude of relationship between perception of teachers and head teachers about administrative barriers to inclusion was low but a positive correlation exists between the variables. It means that the variables were not strongly associated but both teachers and head teachers had some common views regarding the nature of barriers. The relationship between perception of teachers and parents on administrative barriers to inclusive education was positive and very weak. It also implies that both categories of stakeholders agreed to the fact that administrative barriers were present to slow the success of inclusion but the weak relationship shows their disagreement on nature of barriers. The same situation was observed while ascertaining the relationship between perception of parents and head teachers on administrative barriers. The magnitude of correlation between perception of teachers and parents, and parents and head teachers/administrators on physical barriers to inclusive education was found positive and weak. However, the relationship between perception of head teachers (administrators) and teachers regarding physical barriers to inclusive education was negative and weak. It means that these two categories of stakeholders lack strong consensus on nature of barriers to inclusion. In case of attitudinal barriers, the relationship between perception of head teachers and teachers as well as head teachers and parents was noted weak and negative, which shows lack of agreement between these categories of stakeholders. The relationship between perception of teachers and parents regarding attitudinal barriers to inclusive education was positive and weak. The results indicate that the parents views on attitudinal barriers are influenced by their affection and care for their disabled wards but it was not true in case of teachers since they had a professional relationships with the CwSNs hence a weak correlation was resulted.

In the nut shell, it can be concluded that implementation status of inclusive education in Haryana was not satisfactory. There were barriers to providing education to CwSNs in an inclusive school. The school heads were perceived significant barriers to
inclusion by all stakeholders. The barriers may be overcome by creating awareness and providing training on inclusive education, recruiting special teachers at school level to meet the specific demands of CwSNs within the classroom and by getting the support from parents. Involvement of parents and CwSNs is essential while planning construction and classroom activities, and providing transport facilities in consultation with teachers and administrators. The stakeholders have a vital role as partners to the implementation of inclusive education and identification and removal of barriers to its success.

5.3 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The usefulness of the present study lies in:

1. Filling the gap between the theory and practice of inclusive education. The findings of present study exposed the real position of implementation of inclusive education in Haryana. The finding can be helpful in formulating future plans by the government.

2. Reducing/eliminating the physical, administrative and attitudinal barriers to inclusive education which were identified during the study.

3. Using the survey tools to survey other institutions and settings which were not covered by this research.

4. Benefiting students, teachers, administrators, parents, counselors, trainers, special educators and policy makers by providing comprehensive picture of inclusive education.

5. Creating awareness among the policy makers about the magnitude of the problem and inspiring them to allocate larger funds for the development and execution of inclusive education.

6. Designing workshops, in-service training and conferences related to problem under study and inviting the stakeholders to actively participate in them. The training of stakeholders is critical since action by an untrained person in implementation of inclusive education may prove a bane rather than a boon.
Awareness generation on the philosophy and concept of inclusive education and eradicating the myths and misconceptions related to disability is of paramount importance for the success of inclusive education.

7. Restructuring the pedagogy and assessment techniques that meet the requirements of children with special needs.

8. The findings pave a way for opening a good inclusive school to be emulated by others as a role model.

9. Inspiring the media to give maximum coverage to inclusive education activities namely sports for CwSNs, cultural activities and tours and excursion for CwSNs.

10. Appointing the resource teachers at school level to make them more beneficial and accessible to CwSNs.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Keeping in view the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made for further research:

1. Only four districts of Haryana were geographically covered in the present study, therefore a study may be planned in a wider geographical region.

2. A follow-up study in the same four districts may be undertaken. This follow-up study would not only provide conclusive results on the barriers to implementation of inclusive education but also help in determining the reliability of the present study.

3. The sample of present study was primary schools; a similar study may be planned for upper primary schools, secondary schools, degree colleges, nursing colleges, engineering colleges, polytechnics, universities etc. to get an extensive and intensive understanding of implementation of inclusive education at different educational institutions.

4. In the present study, the sample was selected from a plain area, a comparative study of subjects and schools from tribal, desert and backward areas may be
conducted. Similar findings in another setting would broaden the implications of this study.

5. A study to review contents and methodology of in-service training programmes on inclusive education may be conducted. This would enable the policy makers to determine the suitability of contents and methodology which is currently being used to train the teachers and head teachers for practicing inclusion.

6. In the present study, the perceptions of four stakeholders namely teachers, head teachers, CwSNs and their parents regarding barrier to inclusion of CwSNs were determined, a study may be conceived by including District Education Officers, State Project Officers, rehabilitation professionals, and NGOs’ in the sample to get a broader picture of status of implementation of inclusive education.

7. This study sought to identify the administrative, physical and attitudinal barriers to inclusive education, a study may be planned to assess other barriers to inclusive education like social, academic and organizational barriers.

8. In view of the overall scenario of education of the disabled in the country, a study to find out the position of barriers to education of CwSNs in special schools may also prove its usefulness.

9. An intervention programme may be designed using NGO’s as key factor/agency in eradicating barriers to inclusive education and the execution of the intervention programmes may be studied through a longitudinal study. Involvement of NGOs is required since implementation of inclusive education is not the task of civil servants and schools alone rather it needs collaborative efforts from all quarters of the society.

10. A research study may be planned to document the barriers to early intervention for CwSNs in inclusive settings versus early intervention in segregated settings.

11. A further research is warranted to determine self-efficacy, current skill level and training needs of stakeholders for removing the barriers and placing the facilitators for successful inclusive practices.