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REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Research is a careful scientific investigation, especially through search for new facts in any branch of knowledge. It may be defined as the application of scientific methods to study of problems. It is a systematic attempt to obtain answer to meaningful questions about the phenomenon and events. Redman and Mory (2009) defined research ‘a systematic effort to gaining new knowledge’.

Research takes advantage of the accumulated knowledge, a result of constant human endeavour from time immemorial. It can never be undertaken in isolation of the work that has already been done on the problem which is directly or indirectly related to a proposed study. So, a review of related literature is important as it provides background and technical knowledge, useful in conducting the proposed research. Any research without such a review of related literature is like a building without a sound foundation. The review of related literature provides a clear picture of the study to be taken as a pre-requisite to the identification of the problem and, then, to conduct the research to solve it. The review of the past investigations in a particular field serves as a guide to the investigator as it helps in avoiding mere duplication of the work already done in that area. The knowledge of what has already been done in the area of research regarding the methods, tools for data gathering and the results of analysis, keeps the investigator systematic in his/her own endeavour. According to Best (1977), ‘practically all human knowledge can be found in books and libraries. Unlike other animals who start a new beginning with each generation, man builds upon the accumulated and recorded knowledge of the past. His constant adding to the vast store of knowledge makes possible progress in all areas of human endeavour.’

According to Borg and Gall (1983), ‘the literature in any field forms the foundation upon which all future work will be built. If we fail to build the foundation of knowledge provided by the review of literature, our work is likely to be shallow and naive and will often duplicate work that has already being done better by someone else.’
In the present research, the review of related literature has been done as it provides background and technical knowledge, useful in conducting the proposed research. A careful review of the research journals, books, dissertations, theses and other sources of information on the problem to be investigated has been one of the important steps in the planning of any research study. The availability of literature in the area of present study is scant, especially in Indian context. It is due to the reason that the philosophy and practice of inclusive education are new to the field of education and research studies are going on various facets of this emerging field. A few related research studies were perused by the investigator during different stages of this study and the same are quoted below. The reviews have been done in connection with barriers and implementation of inclusive education at primary school level and are presented in the chronological order.

2.1 STUDIES CONDUCTED ABROAD

Ritter (1989) found regular education teachers unprepared for the inclusion of students with special needs. The behaviour of regular teacher for children with special needs was more problematic than special education teacher. The regular teachers experienced a narrower range of deviance among CwSNs than special education teachers and therefore their recommendations for developing normal behaviour were more restrictive.

Phillips (1990 as cited in Wehbi, 2007) explored the narratives of 33 persons with disabilities over an eighteen month period. It was found that prevailing societal misconceptions limited the educational opportunities of persons with disabilities and disabled students were discouraged by school counsellors to pursue higher education. It was revealed by the sample that they were seen ‘incapable’ by society despite the fact that they were excelling in academics. The narratives revealed perceptions of participants as how the American notions about disability affected their self-image and restricted them from attaining higher education.

In Canada, Law (1993 as cited in Pivik, McComas and Laflamme, 2002) studied the cultural, economic, institutional, physical, and social factors associated with home, neighbourhood, school, and community environments in inclusive settings. The
sample comprised 22 parents of children with disabilities. The data was gathered through focus group interviews. The physical barriers found in inclusive schools were steep ramps, uncut curbs, heavy doors, and door thresholds. It was concluded that lack of knowledge, bureaucratic inflexibility, and beliefs toward resource availability acted barriers to inclusive education. The physical, institutional and attitudinal barriers hindered the full participation of children with disabilities in school activities.

Cohen (1994) in a study titled ‘Overcoming Barriers to Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in the Local Schools—A Blueprint for Change’ reviewed the moral, educational, and legal bases for inclusion in public school general education. The sample consist 80 parents and educators of children with disabilities in six schools—three schools that were relatively more inclusive and three schools that were relatively less inclusive. The differences on planning and decision making for children with disabilities were studied. The study compared inclusive education practices of Illinois schools with Vermont and Colorado, the two States identified more significantly ahead than Illinois in implementing inclusive practices. The investigator conducted focus group interviews with 80 parents and educators in Illinois, and examined the process of decision making over 4 years. The study found barriers to inclusion in the areas of information, attitudes, instructional technology, leadership, accessibility, organization, implementation, finance, regulatory mechanism, and legality. Ten recommendations to remove the barriers to inclusion were made by the investigator.

A report titled ‘Inclusive Education: A Series of Issue Papers’ was published in 1994 by Coalition on School Inclusion, Springfield. The report documented that students with disabilities were denied admission in schools due to existence of architectural barriers. The issue of architectural barriers was quoted ‘complex’ since there was acute shortage of funds and the issue was not tackled by administration and policy makers properly. The documents concluded that the issue must be addressed, and solution must be found to enable all students with disabilities to access their schools.

A study by Apallachia Educational Lab (1996) reported concerns about adequate staffing of professionals, needed in the implementation of inclusion.
According to Boundy (1996), the educational separation of children with and without disabilities was prevailing in some States. The effective implementation of inclusion was hindered by factors namely: students with disabilities were labelled as crippled, mentally retarded, deaf and dumb etc., educational outcomes of students were restricted due to traditional classroom and curriculum transactions, children with severe disabilities were admitted in segregated schools, inclusion in classroom was not linked with inclusion in the community, and the availability of limited role models for students with disabilities was aggravating the situations.

The City University of New York (1996 as cited in Walker and Ovington, 1999) identified several types of criticism on inclusion. These include: the university was following ‘one-size, fits all’ approach, the funds needed for implementing inclusive education were treated as imposed burden, the teacher were not prepared to meet the diverse needs of children with disabilities in inclusive classrooms, the specialized service for special children were not available within the regular classrooms, full inclusion was perceived to have destructive effect on general education, only ideological professionals and few parents favoured inclusive education.

McLaughlin et al. (1996), in a comprehensive review of literature, indicate that the staff and teachers of inclusive schools were more concerned and frustrated over the amount of time spent in collaborative planning, curriculum modifications and planning social interactions. The school staffs were also anxious about their level of knowledge about inclusion. The investigators discovered cost as a potential barrier in the implementation of inclusion policies. Increased costs were reported in areas such as personnel, professional development and renovating school buildings.

The Roeher Institute (1996) revealed that attitude emerged as one of the barriers of inclusion at post-secondary school level. The study reported that the post-secondary schools were concerned about ‘watering down’ their academic credentials if they accept students with intellectual disabilities.

Top (1996) examined the level of implementation of inclusive practice by State special education agencies and found alarming results. The findings in Top's (1996) study showed that State directors were reluctant to accepting that their respective
States were not practising full inclusion. Regarding implementation of inclusion, it was noted that, the State directors had difference of opinions. Although most of them reported that there was an increase of inclusion in their state by 85 percent, they failed to hide the fact that most of the them viewed inclusion and integration as synonymous. The findings of the study suggested the need for educating the State directors on the implementation of inclusion.

In the study conducted by Trump and Hange (1996), focus group interviews were the mode of collecting the data. The aim of the study was to find out the concerns of teachers about inclusion. The study found various concerns of teacher about inclusion. These were: discrepancy might emerge between the academic and social development of disabled and non-disabled students when they got promoted to the next grade levels; there are chances that special education students become dependent on teachers and peers and instructional aides might be inappropriately used. The investigator noted that another concern was about inclusion of students with behavioural issues. The study noted several obstacles that prevented a successful implementation of inclusion. The barriers that they identified included: resistance to change on the part of administrators, teachers and parents, role confusion, lack of administrative support, lack of planning, lack of adequate personnel, lack of training, and lack of funding. It was also found that general and special educators having long teaching experience felt threatened on the implementation of inclusion because it was affecting their status quo. The study reported a tension between the relationship of general and special education teachers because the former consider the latter as their assistant in handling students with disabilities.

Evans, Ilfeld and Hanssen (1998) found attitudes a potential barrier in implementation of inclusive education. The belief of educators that there are ‘some’ children that could not learn was a barrier to inclusion. Another barrier identified by them was inadequate resource support. It was suggested that the government should allocate funds to schools from general grant rather than allocating funds for each child with disabilities. Furthermore, they also emphasized that there was a need to improve the early childhood identification and screening system for the benefits of children with disabilities.
Smith and Rapport (1999) conducted an in-depth literature review on barriers to inclusive education. The review found lack of knowledge and training of educators and administrators as main barrier to inclusion. Other barriers identified by the researchers included: turf guarding, inadequate preparation of human resources, lack of communication/collaboration between various actors, and the beliefs that some children would lose out, if inclusion was to be allowed. It was found that school personnel were much concerned about the extra time requirements of children with disabilities, which affected the balance of time that would be given to the non-disabled students.

In Hong Kong, a study by Wong et al. (1999) on the educational experiences of children with disabilities in 224 schools found lack of resources and inadequate training for educators. The schools were following traditional curriculum and pedagogy. The teachers were more focused on how to bring success in examination rather than attending to the peculiar needs of children with disabilities. The investigator noted that as per the national 'integration policy', the schools were duty bound to make available suitable resources for the disabled; however, little was done in this regard. The study data were collected by interviewing parents as well as teachers. The study further revealed different kinds of difficulties, faced by the stakeholders in promoting integration of the children with special needs vis-à-vis their typically developing peers. The teachers and other staff of the school did not show any commitment to modify the school system to fulfill needs of disabled learners.

Lieberman and Houstan (1999) carried out a survey over 170 physical education teachers within New York State and identified some barriers to inclusion associated with teachers, students with visual impairments and school administrators. These barriers impede the inclusion of visually impaired in physical education and physical activity programmes. It was concluded that the lack of professional preparation of teachers hindered the inclusion. In addition, unmodified curriculum and activities provided in general education classes create problem to inclusion. It was observed that activities like basketball, football, hockey etc. in traditional format were not conducive to independent participation of visually impaired students. Modifications in the form of auditory balls and changing the rules of the games may prevent obstacles to inclusion. Another barrier found was pace of the lesson present in the classroom. It
was reiterated that teachers may unknowingly move at a pace that is conducive to learning for sighted students but not for students with visual impairments. The category of student related barriers included parental overprotection, limited exposure, lack of opportunities and lack of confidence. Administration related factors that impede inclusion included: shortage of time for planning for visually impaired, lack of equipments, lack of physical education on the individualized education plan and irrelevant excuses by doctors.

A document titled ‘International Best Practices in Universal Design: A Global Review’ was published by Canadian Human Rights Commission in 2006. The document described the ways and means to remove architectural barriers through universal designs to facilitate free movements of persons with disabilities. The document appears very useful to those who are unfamiliar with concepts of universal designs which is a requirement for new buildings after United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD). The document urged that universal designs are necessary for the inclusion of disabled in mainstream society.

Pivik, McComas and Laflamme (2002) examined students with disabilities and their parents to identify the barriers to inclusive education. They identified the physical environmental (e.g., narrow doorways, ramps), intentional barriers (e.g., isolation, bullying), unintentional attitudinal barriers (e.g., lack of knowledge, understanding or awareness), and physical limitations (e.g., difficulties with manual dexterity) as the barriers. The study reported that hurtful attitudes namely pin pointing, mouths dropping open being ridiculed, being labeled as ‘stupid’, snobbish attitudes by teaching staff, and the disabled generally being treated differently from other students was prevailing. For example, one youth reported that her peers ‘just stare at her and point and then whisper to each other’. The researchers made recommendations for promoting accessibility and full participation.

According to Quinn and Reba (2002), the barriers to inclusive education could also be labelled as (i) natural, (ii) physical, (iii) intellectual, (iv) emotional, (v) moral and (vi) social.
A study by Pivik (2003), titled ‘Architectural Barrier Identification and Modification Prioritization in the Upper Canada District School Board’, reported the physical barriers in schools as identified by the principals, special education resource teachers and students. The barriers were identified in areas like: entrance gate, ramps, door, passage ways, toilets, drinking water facilities, elevators, classrooms, handrails, library and recreational facilities. Focus was to remove barriers from classrooms, toilets, libraries and ramps. The report provided a glimpse into how different persons holding different positions in school world saw their schools differently but supported collaborative efforts.

Weiner (2003) found that the greatest challenge before the inclusion is changing the education system. It is the teachers’ perceptions, attitudes, and opportunities for collaboration that directly affect the success of inclusion.

Frieden (2004), Chairperson, National Council on Disability, Washington, DC, found lack of administrative support and time as major barriers to education of the learners with disabilities. Other barriers included: insufficient teaching materials, a mismatch between methods of teaching and learning styles, misfit evaluation procedures, and teachers’ lack of understanding of the inclusive practices.

According to Swain et al. (2004), the notion of inclusion is based on understanding the exclusion and the need to address barriers to inclusion. These barriers are understood in a range of ways. The barriers may be structural, attitudinal or physical. The inflexible policies and inadequate allocation of resources were structural barriers, the inability of students with disabilities to access different places in the school were physical barriers whereas indifferent attitude of teachers and behavioural labeling of the disabled by peer group were categorized as attitudinal barriers. The researchers viewed that inclusion should work for creating enabling rather than disabling environments, with a focus on overcoming a wide range of barriers.

The review of literature in Bangladesh and Vietnam by Centre for Services and Information on Disability (CSID), Bangladesh (2005 as cited in Ahuja and Ibrahim, 2006) reveals that inclusive schools were being operated in Bangladesh by the NGOs in a non-formal system and only marginalised children, and children with mild
degrees of disabilities, were enrolled in the inclusive schools. The authors, after reviewing the literature on inclusive education in Bangladesh, concluded that the teachers were not adequately qualified and trained for inclusion, classrooms were inaccessible and seating arrangements were uncomfortable for children with disabilities. The review suggested that the classroom environment was not suitable for accommodating different types of disabled children and the supply of teaching/learning materials/equipment was insufficient. In Vietnam, all the government special schools had been transformed into inclusive schools. Regarding Vietnam, the shortfalls indicted by this study were: insufficient resource allocation, inadequately trained teachers, inadequate supply of Braille books, lack of equipments and other teaching/learning materials, rigid curriculum, and improper planning.

According to Edmonds (2005), cited by the Asia Pacific Centre on Disability, there are at least four types of barriers faced by people with disability—structures, information systems, governance, and attitudes.

With regard to using teaching strategies in inclusive settings, a summary report of the European Agency for Development of Special Needs Education (2005) concluded that teaching approaches namely co-operative teaching, cooperative learning, collaborative problem solving, heterogeneous grouping, effective teaching, home-based education system etc., were suitable for the learners with disabilities at primary as well as secondary school level. In the same report, the case study of Luxembourg (2005) reported that teachers observed and documented the behavioural and learning difficulties of students with disabilities. These reports were shared with those who were teaching a specific class of the learners with disabilities. The case study of Iceland’s schools (2005) showed that although the students with disabilities spent most of their school time in the inclusive classroom, a big part of their teaching and learning was individualized. Here, the study material was adapted and modified to the needs of the students.

Lambert et al. (2005) viewed, ‘Unless general education teachers are competent in modifying and adapting their curricula and instructional practices, one essential stakeholder of standards-based education, students with special needs, will continue to
be at a distinct educational disadvantage’. In support to this statement, the researcher conducted a study to determine the attitude of general education teachers toward inclusion and found that there were least positive responses on items ‘feasibility of teaching a wide range of students in one classroom’ and the ‘skill of the general educator to teach a variety of students’. However, most of the other items they investigated, showed positive results. They concluded that general education practitioners were becoming less and less doubtful towards inclusion but recommended that there was still a need to equip them with skills on different instructions as well as adequate pre-service preparation.

Ring et al. (2005) conducted a study titled, ‘Barriers to Inclusion: A Case Study of a Pupil with Severe Learning Difficulties in Ireland’. The aim of the study was to examine the inclusion of a pupil with severe learning difficulty. The research employed a qualitative approach of data collection. Data was analyzed qualitatively, and quantitative reporting and display procedures were also employed. The barriers to inclusion included non-disabled pupil’s lack of knowledge and understanding of learning disability and mainstream teachers’ perception about inclusion.

Sharma (2005) vide a study titled ‘Integrated Education in India: Challenges and Prospects’ presented a list of challenges that Indian education system face in its move towards implementing integrated education. The study concluded that prevailing negative attitudes, poverty attached to disability, ignorance about funding provisions for disabled and inadequate resources pose a great threat to integrated education in India.

Skarbrevik (2005) examined the social inclusion of pupils with special needs in the mainstream classrooms. A questionnaire comprising ten items on different aspects of social inclusion was administered. The sample was assessed for their participation in play and activities, being alone during break times, being teased by other pupils, invitations to parties and taking the lead in social activities. The study revealed that a large number of pupils with special needs were satisfied with their participation in the classroom. However, their friend circle was limited in comparison to pupils without special needs. This was in line with Hunt, Alwell, Farron-Davis and Goetz (1996), who investigated the
effectiveness of an intervention, designed to facilitate the social inclusion of pupils with severe multiple special needs by promoting social relationships, friendships and interactive partnerships between pupils.

Steinfeld (2005) demonstrated that the cost of making a building accessible is generally less than 1% of total construction cost, however, the cost of making adaptations after a building is completed is far greater. But in contrast, Steinfeld cited a research by Schroeder and Steinfeld (1979) who redesigned nine non-accessible buildings to meet accessibility standards. The redesigning of the said buildings did not need any additional space but just rearrangement in the existing building plan was done without having any big cost.

An assessment of inclusive education in Bangladesh was done by Ahuja and Ibrahim (2006). During the course of investigation, discussions were held with representatives of organizations working for and with children with disabilities. The study revealed the government rules and regulations as major barriers towards the inclusion of the children with physical disabilities. It was found that inclusive education in Bangladesh was the responsibility of the Social Welfare Ministry, rather than the Education Ministry. This ministry plans special education programmes in separate institutions, with a focus only on welfare, instead of the rights-based approach.

According to Wood (2006), the barriers to inclusive education could also be categorized on the basis of (i) obvious and (ii) hidden barriers.

A research on ‘Inclusion of Disabled in Primary School Play-grounds’ was conducted by Woolley et al. in 2006. The objectives of the study were to identify the organizational, social and physical barriers to inclusion. The sample consisted of two classes of children in six schools. The data was gathered by listing the opinions of children through small group discussions and mapping exercises. Observation of play/games was undertaken in play grounds. Relevant staff in the school was interviewed. The list of organizational barriers identified in the study included: lack of afternoon play time in schools, reduced play opportunities at break and lunch time, lack of training of staff on health and safety of children with disabilities. In addition, it was concluded that social barriers emerged from less interaction in the playgrounds.
Limited access to playground, inappropriate design of playground, fixed equipment on playground were included in the list of physical barriers.

Runswick-Cole (2008) stated that, ‘it is the school’s role to overcome the barriers so that students with disabilities can receive an appropriate education with their nondisabled peers’. It was noted that parents who were opposing were more likely to have medical view of disability, whereas parents supporting inclusion were more likely to think of their child’s disability as a barrier to learning.

Abrizah and Ahmad (2010) conducted a study titled ‘Systematic Barriers: The Challenges in the Provision of Inclusive School Libraries in Malaysia’. The study found six barriers in the provision of inclusive school libraries: physical, resources, curriculum, policy, unintentional and intentional attitudinal barriers. The study concluded with a recommendation to find the ways and means for improving the access of inclusive school libraries.

Alqaryouti (2010) investigated the inclusion of students with disabilities in Oman. Out of 28 subjects, 16 were male and 12 female. Eleven students were visually impaired and 17 students were orthopedically disabled. A questionnaire consisting 59 items was used to collect the data. The data on barriers to inclusion was statistically analysed. Results indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the barriers to inclusion due to the type of disability. However, gender had no effect on the barriers to inclusion.

Talay, Akpınar and Belkayali (2010) examined the suitability of playgrounds for children with disabilities in Ankara, Turkey. The sample comprised 667 parents of disabled children and on site survey of 355 playgrounds was carried out to judge the suitability. The questionnaire and checklist were used to collect the data. The findings revealed that not only physical but also social barriers have restricted the disabled children to use the playgrounds. The results show that playgrounds were not suitable for the children with disabilities. Lack of awareness and inadequate planning by municipalities were cited as barriers for suitable playgrounds. The study recommends to remove barriers through awareness generation and by seeking cooperation of the disabled groups during planning stage.
Glazzard (2011) studied the perceptions of the barriers to effective inclusion in one primary school. It was found that teachers were holding negative attitude towards pupils with disabilities. The negative attitudes appeared a barrier to school’s commitment for providing effective inclusion. A strong opposition from parents to practice inclusion was observed. The parents strongly felt that inclusion was problematic.

Grimes et al. (2011) wrote in Development Bulletin under the title ‘Inclusive Education in South East Asia: Critical challenges in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Indonesia’ that getting education in age appropriate settings is a right of people with disabilities. However, societal barriers prevent them from availing this opportunity. The barriers to inclusive education experienced in context of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Indonesia were lack of information to parents and inability of teachers and policy makers to respond to the unique needs of disabled learners. The absence or lack of information can lower peoples’ confidence to appropriately handle the needs of peoples with disabilities.

Jenkin (2011) quoted Clements et al. (2008) in an article ‘Disability Inclusion Practice: Research Findings from Australia and thoughts for future research and practice in the Pacific and Asia’, published in Pamela edited Development Bulletin. The authors wrote: ‘while the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) affirms and enforces notions of inclusion, research around the world suggests that the practice of inclusion lacks clarity and is ambiguous in translation. The recent research conducted in Australia suggests that the practice of inclusion is further complicated by a lack of systematic planning and resourcing of its multiple events’. It was concluded that there is a dearth of research and knowledge pertaining to inclusive practices.

Khan (2011) in a thesis for the degree of Master of Education, titled ‘Investigation of Secondary School Teachers’ Attitudes Towards and Knowledge about Inclusive Education in Bangladesh’, submitted to the University of Canterbury, New Zealand found that secondary school teachers had predominantly positive attitude towards inclusive education for children with special needs, except for children who had
physical disabilities, such as: visual or hearing impairments. Furthermore, the secondary school teachers had diverse conceptualization of inclusive education and barriers to the success if inclusive education included insufficient knowledge, lack of training and lack of teaching materials.

Mthethwa (2011) conducted a study titled ‘Principals’ Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding Inclusive Education: Implications for Curriculum and Assessment’ in South Africa. According to researcher, the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and the National Committee for Education Support Services (NCESS) identified certain barriers to inclusive education. These were: poor socio-economic status, attitudes, inflexible curriculum, language and communication, inaccessible physical infrastructure, poor support services, lack of parental involvement, lack of enabling and supporting legislation.

A study on the educational situation of people with disabilities in Lebanon was conducted by Wehbi (2011). The sample comprised 200 participants with disabilities from Bekaa region. Selection of the sample was purposive and aimed at ensuring diversity. The sample included 74 participants between the ages of 18 and 26, 89 participants between 27 and 40, and 37 participants above 40 years of age. The kind of disabilities ranged from the physical to the sensory. The research was focused to identify the barriers that people with disabilities faced in pursuing their education. The main findings illustrated that existing system of education was a major barrier to the education of people with disabilities. Apart from it, participants identified lack of funds, poor health, inadequate transportation facilities, inflexible policies and family pressures as difficulties in pursuing their education. The female participants were not allowed to continue education in nearby villages since proper transportation was not available. A student with muscular dystrophy was not permitted to switch over from one academic programme to another. The health issues were potential barriers to attaining education.

The World Report on Disability (2011) published by the World Bank and World Health Organization stated that the inclusion of children with disabilities in mainstream schools is cost-effective and contributes to the elimination of discrimination. The report suggested that including children with disabilities in
education require changes to system and school. The success of inclusive system of education depends largely on a country’s commitment to adopt appropriate legislation, provide clear policy direction, develop national plan of action, establish infrastructure and capacity for implementation. It also requires increase in financing. The report exhorts that many of the physical barriers that children with disabilities face in education can easily be overcome with simple measures such as changing the layout of classrooms. Barriers to inclusion are to be removed by appropriate training to mainstream teachers which will increase their confidence and skills in educating children with disabilities.

Baux (2012) in a report titled, ‘Breaking down Barriers to Inclusion’ stated that in Mali many schools were not accessible to children with disabilities, mainly for practical reasons: classrooms were unsuited to wheelchair access and classroom lighting was not adapted to students with visual impairments. The teachers’ lack of understanding about disability and insufficient training in inclusive education techniques meant that schools were not inclusive. A key challenge was to provide emergency relief whilst continuing to establish sustainable practices.

Smith et al. (2012) provided a comprehensive list of barriers to the successful implementation of inclusion. The barriers were classified under three broad dimensions viz. organizational barriers, attitudinal barriers, and knowledge barriers. Organizational barriers were related to assigning classes to teachers as per time tables. Attitudinal barriers focus on the belief of teachers, administrators, and other school staff about students with disabilities and inclusion. The knowledge barriers were simply the limited knowledge about students with disabilities and inclusive teaching strategies. These barriers were making it difficult to run a successful inclusive programme, however, it was suggested to overcome each of these barriers with various strategies.

Das (2012) examined the perception of in-service teachers towards inclusion of students with disabilities. The study was carried out in southern Bangladesh by taking 62 in-service teachers from 18 mainstream schools. Self-developed questionnaire was used for data collection. In addition, focus group discussions were organized in each
school. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentages. It was found that in-service teachers had positive attitude towards inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream schools. It was further observed that if inclusion is to be successful, knowledge of disabilities, positive attitude, special training and skills, administrative supports, collaboration with other professionals and resource allocation is important.

Malak (2013) conducted a study titled ‘Inclusive Education in Bangladesh: Are pre service teachers ready to accept students with special educational needs in regular classes?’ The aim of the study was to examine pre service special education teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education for students with special education needs in Bangladesh. One hundred pre-service special education teachers from leading teachers' education institutes were purposively sampled. A 20 item based survey questionnaire was used to measure participants’ attitude. The result revealed that while the pupil teachers hold favourable attitudes towards students with disabilities, they are concerned about some basic issues on inclusion. Practicum and close contacts with children with special needs were found to be important variables which shaped the attitude of pupil teachers.

A document titled ‘Guidelines: Promoting Physical Activity among People with Disabilities’ was published by Health Education Authority (n.d). The document contends that 1 out of 5 children and adults in Massachusetts were having one or more disabilities and these persons face greater social and environmental barriers than the general population while doing physical activities. Therefore, it was suggested that the barriers which limit physical activities of the disabled should be considered, reduced or overcome while planning physical activities for the disabled.

Saunders and DeBeer (n.d) documented that inclusion is a healthy state of mind and exclusion cause unhealthy and sometime violent reaction in the schools. The principles of exclusion are based upon physical or a developmental ability of a person as well as it also applies to issues like race, ethnicity, culture, religion, gender, social class etc. It was found that school principals were facing obstacles in practicing inclusion due to lack of understanding and misinformation. The investigators
concluded that gender equity is desired to arrive at the stage of true inclusion. The findings of the study are very useful for the principals to implement inclusion.

Mphongoshe et al. (2015) studied the perceptions and experiences of stakeholders’ about the implementation of inclusive education in South Africa. Eleven stakeholders of inclusive education namely six teachers, two members of management committee, one student with disabilities and two students without disabilities, drawn through purposive sampling technique, constituted the sample. The data was collected by employing audiotapes during unstructured interviews. The findings indicate poor management of resources, untrained teachers, inflexible curriculum and lack of proper mechanism to monitor inclusive education were effecting the implementation adversely.

Stanley (2015) studied perception of general education teachers, special education teachers and administrators of elementary schools on inclusion. The sample was interviewed at a location of their choice. The participants did not found inclusion suitable for all children with disabilities. The sample perceived team teaching, co-teaching and co-planning by general education teacher and special education teacher as essential conditions for the success of inclusive education.

Kawser, Ahmed and Ahmed (2016) identified barriers to inclusive education in the context of Bangladesh. The sample comprised professionals working in the area of inclusive education. The researchers conducted interviews with the professionals to identify the barriers. The negative attitude of the members of the society, limited resources, faulty policy making, lack of team work etc were identified potential barriers to inclusive education.

Sharma, Loreman and Simi (2017) reported perceived barriers and facilitators to inclusion among habitants of Solomon Island. The data was gathered from parents of children with disabilities and government representatives. The results revealed a unique perspective on disability-inclusive education and provided insights for future directions towards inclusive education. The barriers identified were physical and attitudinal whereas the facilitators were new policies of the government to promote inclusion.
2.2 STUDIES CONDUCTED IN INDIA


The National Trust for the Welfare of Persons with Autism, Cerebral Palsy, Mental Retardation & Multiple Disabilities (1999) classified the barriers in the society into two: the environmental and attitudinal barriers. The major environmental barriers were of two types: architectural and communication. People generally held an attitude that related a disabled person with his or her disability and not to his/her abilities.

A policy document titled ‘Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan: A Programme for Universal Elementary Education’ was released by Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India in 2002. The document was amended from time to time. The document clearly states that architectural barriers in school shall be removed for easy access. Efforts shall be taken to provide disabled friendly facilities in school and educational institutions. Development of innovative designs for schools to provide an enabling environment for children with special needs should also be part of the programme.

Alur (2002) in a survey identified three kinds of barriers: attitudinal, physical and social. These barriers were common irrespective of the type of school, social strata of the stakeholders and the age of the child.

Hegarty and Alur (2002) in their book titled ‘Education and Children with Special Educational Needs (CwSNs): From Segregation to Inclusion’ reported a study presented in a seminar titled ‘Integrated Education for CwSNs: A Matter of Social Justice and Human Rights’ organized in Delhi in 1997. The study examined the reasons for dropping out of students with special needs from mainstream schools before enrolling in a special school. Out of many reasons identified, one reason was that students repeatedly failed in their class and were asked to leave by teachers or administrators, and many of these students with disabilities were teased for their ‘failure’. It was reported that teachers in mainstream schools erased the lessons on the board before the time students with disability copy them. It was also found that many students never moved up beyond
nursery level classes and found it embarrassing to be in lower classes with children younger than them. The students with special needs had very limited friend circles. Sometime they felt isolated. This made them hyperactive and developed behavioral problems in them and ultimately they were forced to leave the school. A knowledge gap was found within the government. It was observed that most ‘higher up’ policy makers, planners and administrators have heard of inclusion, but they were not aware of the provisions made by the government for inclusive education.

Jha (2002) wrote that most schools in India were confronting two types of barriers, internal and external. In his words, ‘there are walls between the schools and children before they get enrolled, they face walls with curriculum inside the classrooms and finally they face more walls when they have to take examinations which determine how successful they will be in life.’ Explaining the situation further, he was of the view that the nature of such barriers could be physical and social or economic. Sometimes, non-availability of schools and the location-area that could not be accessed became the major barrier for children to get education.

Shreenath in REACH India (2003) under the title ‘Breaking Barriers: Towards Inclusion’ concluded that there was a lack of involvement of people with disabilities in poverty eradication projects. The people with disabilities constitute poorest communities whose involvement in community development projects is must to know their needs and difficulties. It was generally a lack of awareness and experience that people with disabilities were excluded from poverty eradication projects considering them incapable or worthless.

UNICEF (2003) conducted a study to present ‘Examples of Inclusive Education in India’. The objectives of this study were to assess the state of special needs and inclusive education in the country in terms of policies, resources and practices; to identify and document the experiences of ‘good practice models’ of special needs and inclusive education for children with disabilities and to provide recommendations to strengthen the capacity of the government and other partners in the country to bring about policy reforms and promote programmes that support inclusive education. The study documented examples of successful inclusion. It was observed that although
special schools and integrated education have been developed over the years, the inclusive education has gained momentum during the last decade of 20th century.

In ‘The Educator’ (January-June, 2003 issue as cited in Thakur and Thakur, 2012), Mani wrote that ‘inclusive education is an ideology and not a programme. It is a concept of effective schools where every child has a place to study and teachers become facilitators of learning rather than providers of information.’ Mani’s views provide a clear understanding of inclusive education. He called it an ‘ideology’ which indicated its interdisciplinary relevance as ideology was for practice by a person in accordance with his philosophical orientations. Mani also pointed out the changing role of teacher from being a provider of knowledge to a facilitator of information.

Timmons and Alur (2004) pointed out that the education of children with disabilities in India is primarily delivered through Non-Governmental Organizations. These Non-Governmental Organizations have set up, developed and maintained segregated schools for children with disabilities. The system of segregated school is a major provider of education for Children with Special Needs (CwSNs). However, ninety eight percent of children with disabilities receive no service at all despite the involvement of NGOs.

Soni (2004) studied the perceptions about education of disabled children. The purpose was to investigate perceptions of students, parents and teachers/administrators and all other actors in the school world about education of the disabled children at elementary schools levels. The sample was drawn from rural areas of Devas (District Primary Education Programme) and Ujjain (non-District Primary Education Programme) districts of Madhya Pradesh. Questionnaires, interviews, and observation schedules were used as tools of the study. Null hypotheses were formulated and tested using ‘t’ statistics. The results revealed no significant differences between groups and subgroups and between District Primary Education Programme and non-District Primary Education Programme districts. The result suggested the need of intensive efforts to create awareness about Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, so that the disabled children might get benefited and the goal of Universalisation of Elementary Education (UEE) might get achieved.
Balasundaram (2005) asserted that poor student-teacher ratio, lack of academic motivation and teachers’ lust for money and the disparity between elite educational institutions and their poor counterparts were some factors that acted as barriers to implementation of inclusive education in India. It was further observed that another obstacle in the education of children with disabilities was the lack of reliable statistics on the prevalence of disability as surveys conducted by the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) in 2002 and the Census in 2001 showed varying figures with the NSSO quoting 1.8% (1.85 crore of the country’s population) and the census quoting 2.13% (2.19 crore) of the population.

Giffard–Lindsay (2007) in Research Monograph No.15, in ‘Create’, titled: ‘Inclusive Education in India: Interpretation, Implementation and Issues’ wrote about attitudinal change that matters the issues and constraints surrounding interpretation and implementation of inclusive education encountered in the Indian context. The author stated that implementation issues are not unique to India. However, the all-pervasive caste system was a barrier to attitudinal change. The context-specificity of this socio-religious construct was a factor that could not be ignored when looking at the implementation for the future of any aspect of life in India.

Roy (2007) conducted a situation analysis of inclusive education programme in the state of Madhya Pradesh for Sightsavers International, Madhya Pradesh. The study reported that awareness among parents, community and implementing officials in the state was not at the desired level, there was a need for developing awareness among the stakeholders. It was found that the main reason for gap in identifying, assessing and certifying the persons with disabilities (PWDs) had been insufficient number of personnel for undertaking the same. As regards the provision of aids and appliances, it was reported that the delivery to disabled learners was delayed due to involvement of number of agencies in the process. At the attitude level, 41% of the respondents showed very positive attitude towards the field of disability. It was recommended that a systematic training of officials at various levels might help in effective implementation of the programmes in the state. More teams were needed to be developed for identification and assessment of the disabled persons.
A project of Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) and Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) in India, headed by Koul (2008), made many useful suggestions about teaching strategies in inclusive settings. These strategies were modifying material and activities, team teaching, peer tutoring, co-operative learning, language experience, and the task analysis. Among these, team teaching in inclusive settings was recommended by experts as there was a need to take help from other specialists (physiotherapist, speech therapist, social workers etc.) in inclusive settings, apart from a regular teacher. Outside the classroom, field trips to museums, historical sites and community locations were considered useful.

Kalyanpur (2008), in a study titled ‘Equality, Quality and Quantity: Challenges in Inclusive Education Policies and Service Provision in India’ reported a study carried out on principals of private and government schools. The study showed that merely 37% of the school principals had heard of inclusive schooling. The study further found that teachers and administrators were not trained for inclusive settings and it was directly reflecting in the educational achievements of the marginalised students. The implementation of the inclusive education was found impaired due to ignorance of principal about the provisions of inclusive education.

The National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People (NCPEDP), New Delhi conducted a survey in 2009 to know the status of education of the disabled in the country. Three hundred and twenty two (322) universities and three hundred and nineteen (319) schools were contacted during the survey and out of these one hundred and nineteen (119) universities and eighty nine (89) schools responded. The result showed that only 0.1% of the disabled students were in universities and 0.5% in the mainstream schools. The figure indicated that a considerable neglect of the disabled persons still prevailed in the society.

O’Keefe et al. (2009) in a report, titled ‘People with Disabilities in India: From Commitments to Outcomes’ published by World Bank Human Development Unit, South Asia Region, it was stated that majority of the school buildings in India were not accessible to people with disabilities. It was found that only 18% of SSA schools were ‘barrier free’, and the numbers were lower in some states, with 2% in Jammu
and Kashmir, and 6% in Bihar. It was further observed that most of the school buildings were already built, and modifications in existing architecture are very expensive, however modifications are needed if the education system is to be made inclusive. The report further stated that the split of teacher education between Rehabilitation Council of India and National Council for Teacher Education as apex monitoring bodies is effecting the inclusion. It was recommended that there should be one agency which shall be responsible for training all teachers in inclusive education.

Pandey (2009) conducted a study of barriers in the implementation of inclusive education at the elementary level in Delhi. The objectives of the study were (i). to review the existing special education programme, (ii) to study the perception of various persons related to special needs education, (iii) to identify the barriers in the implementation of inclusive education policies, (iv) to develop relevant tools to study the barriers in the implementation of inclusive educational programme, and (v) to suggest measures to promote inclusion. Descriptive survey method was used to conduct the study. The sample comprised teachers and head of schools located in Delhi. Data was collected through interview and observation schedule. A comparison was made between public and government schools for analysis of results through percentage method. It was found that both type of schools namely government and public were not aware of the concept of inclusion. They failed to differentiate between the terms ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’. The results indicated that inclusion was better facilitated by the private schools as compared to the government schools. The awareness among the principals regarding facilities, concessions, and constitutional provisions for the disabled was found to be low. The result showed that almost all schools (91.9 percent) did not have teaching learning materials like Braille papers, Braille books, tactile maps, embossed diagrams, large print books etc. for use of visually impaired children. Eighty seven percent government schools and 72.2 percent public schools did not have educational aids and appliances like Braille duplicators and writers, writing devices etc. Most of the schools did not have basic equipments, aids and appliances for children with special educational needs. They did have only computers with text to speech software. Non availability of all these materials and equipments were big barrier to the implementation of inclusive education in Delhi.
Singal (2010) in a UNESCO paper titled ‘Education of Children with Disabilities in India’ concluded that in the micro-processes of the classroom, the mainstream teachers drew rigid boundaries between ‘regular’ children and the ‘included’ child. It was argued that although learning in an appropriate environment was important, but it was difficult to decide how this appropriate environment is constituted, and more significantly, who made decision where a child is appropriately placed. The researcher pointed out that the currently over medicated view of the CwSNs took the focus away from the learning needs of the child. The emphasis was largely on efforts directed at child related factors through the provision of aid and appliances.

Singh (2009) in an article titled ‘Challenges in Inclusive Education and Service Provisions: Policies and Practices in Indian Context’ concluded that about 98% of children with disabilities were not attending any type of educational institutions in India. The researcher found that deep rooted negative attitudes and social stigma attached with the disability has led to the exclusion of disabled from the mainstream. The availability of educational institutions for disabled learners was not in proportion to their number. Moreover, the issues like socio-economic constraints, attitudes, curriculum, governance and resources were important for consideration of inclusive education. The researcher further observed that physical access to school is not only the issue in inclusion but social, academic and economic access also needed attention of policy makers. It was felt that only physical access to school does not ensure meaningful participation. For participation to be meaningful, factors such as school climate that values diversity, a safe and supportive environment, and positive attitudes are essential. Though physical access is prerequisite, government should not be focused on only physical access of children with disabilities but addresses various barriers that make school practically inaccessible. For example, the language and format of instructions is to be made part and parcel of access. Sign language for the deaf, Braille reading or large print text book for the blind students are all examples of what is required to be there for real access and participation of children with disabilities.

Kaur (2010) conducted a study titled, ‘A Study of Implementation of Inclusion of Children with Special Needs in Delhi Primary Schools’. The objectives consisted of identification of schools with good practices of inclusion and to investigate the
perception, attitude of the elementary school principals and teachers towards inclusion of students with disability in the schools, the implementation strategies and practices of inclusion in schools and the role of principals in introducing change in schools. The sample comprised 20 Municipal Council of Delhi schools, 49 teachers, children with special needs and 20 principals. An attitude scale, survey, interview schedule and classroom observations were used for collection of data. Data obtained were subjected to appropriate quantitative and qualitative analysis. The findings of the study concluded that most of the principals showed favourable attitude towards inclusion. It was recommended that the in-service training programme must include subject matter on inclusion and principals and teachers were to be given more opportunities for observing and knowing the students with disabilities. Deficiency of appropriate infrastructure for disabled in schools was identified as potential barrier to their education. Principals were found key agent for bringing change in schools for the education of children with disabilities.

Barriga (2011), under the title ‘Future Stolen: Barriers to Education with Disabilities in Nepal’, wrote a comprehensive report and highlighted that children with disabilities in Nepal were either deprived the right to attend school or getting inferior segregated education. The children were often denied admission or had to leave school prematurely because of inaccessible schools, inadequately trained teachers, or lack of awareness among parents. The report called upon the Government of Nepal to make schools inclusive and accessible to provide quality education without discrimination.

Chib (2011) in an autobiography titled ‘One Little Finger’ recounted experiences with society in her effort to stand against the Cerebral Palsy. The author was diagnosed with Cerebral Palsy at a very tender age. Her mother went through a period of depression when the doctor told that the child was mentally handicapped. Later on, after endless examinations, the doctors diagnosed the child as Spastic with mental retardation. The author received education in a special school in England. She educates herself, learn to type with her little finger and speak through the ‘light-writer’. The education makes her capable to manage day-to-day activities independently and skillfully and later on she became a successful event manager defeating all the odd situations and barriers to learning.
Ahmad (2012) in a study titled ‘Barriers of Inclusive Education for Children with Intellectual Disabilities’ concluded that the majority of children with disabilities in developing countries were out of school, while many of those enrolled were not learning. Thus, removing barriers to accessing education and to learning for persons with disabilities were pre-requisites for the realization of ‘Education for All’, paving the way to prosperity for all and sustainable development of humanity. The researcher further noted that negative societal attitudes, absence of ramp, large class size, congested and uncomfortable seating arrangements were common barriers to inclusion.

Berwal (2012) asserted that stakeholders of the school world (members of school management committee, parents, and administrators) lack basic understanding of the concept of inclusion and rights and opportunities as guaranteed to the disabled by the Indian Constitution.

Kohama (2012) in a thesis, titled ‘Inclusive Education in India: A Country in Transition’, submitted to the Department of International Studies at the University of Oregon stated that the government of India has created numerous policies around special education since the country’s independence in 1947. Although the government of India has attempted to create policies that are inclusive for people with disabilities, their implementation efforts have not resulted in an inclusive system of education, nor have they reached their goal of ‘education for all’ across the country. The Government of India needed to bridge the gaps in their education system to build a strong system of inclusive education in India.

Singh (2012) examined programmes and activities under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan with reference to education of children with special names at elementary school level. The study found attitudinal barriers for CwSNs. However, most of CwSNs reported non-discrimination on the part of teachers’. There were no barriers to doors, windows and floors. The facilities of ramps and toilets were available with handrails.

Yadava (2013) viewed that inclusive education in India is at a very initial stage of conceptualization and implementation. Despite the fact that the pace of implementation is slow, the concept has been discussed, debated and implemented at some places with a hope to get positive outcomes. The author noticed teacher
education a weak link between policy and practice of inclusion. It was observed that the teacher education diplomas and degrees offer ‘education of children with special needs’ as an optional subject which is inadequate to prepare teachers to teach children with special needs in inclusive settings.

Deshprabhu (2014) conducted an overview of inclusive education in India. It was felt that inclusive education is the need of the hour and demand of the day. A long list of barriers that hinder inclusive education was presented. The negative attitude towards the disabled was rated greatest barrier to inclusion. Another major obstacle reported by students was physically getting into the school. The inadequacy of funds, fragmented and uncoordinated training of teachers, socio-economic factors and inappropriate government policies were also found barriers to the implementation of inclusive education. It was concluded that inclusion without adequate preparation of general school will not yield satisfactory results. It is essential that issues related to infrastructural facilities, curriculum modification and educational materials should be addressed.

Menon (2014) narrated various approaches to inclusive and integrated education for children with disabilities. The author inter-alia stated that negative attitudes of teachers, parents and members of school management committees towards students with disabilities are major barriers to successful inclusive education. The misconceptions prevailed among planners and policy makers that inclusion is costly, theoretical, difficult to apply, requires special skills and a disability-specific issue are actually preventing its effective implementation. The author suggested several measures to overcome these misconceptions/barriers.

Sharma and Sharma (2014) discussed attitudinal, social and educational barriers in inclusive education. It was stated that inclusive education as an ideology is implemented through Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, yet there are many hurdles in achieving its goals. The authors described several hurdles/barriers namely negative attitude of masses, social stigma and inadequacy of educational facilities together with health problems of disabled children as well as inadequate infrastructural facilities that discourage learners with disabilities to take advantage of inclusive education.
Mishra and Bhaumik (2015) emphasized the need to focus on educating children with disabilities in mainstream settings. It was noted that inclusion is generally cost-effective than special or separate schools. The authors viewed that progressive policies, trained staff, accessible facilities, flexible curricula and teaching methods are not an additional intervention but they are essential to benefit all children in inclusive schools. It was argued that it is the responsibility of the teachers that every student, with his or her own interests and capabilities is included with and accepted by other children. In view of large number of the disabled children in the country and scant availability of special education professionals, the cross-disability approach was recommended for dealing with children with disabilities in inclusive schools.

Pandey (2016) studied structural barriers in implementing inclusive education for children with special needs. The sample consisted of government primary and upper primary schools of Varanasi city. A checklist consisting 15 items was used to identify the physical barriers. It was found that majority of schools had accessible doors, well maintained windows, stairs with adequate railings, ventilated and illuminated classrooms. However, the study revealed that only 50 percent of schools have adequate ramps, disabled friendly toilets and water outlets.

Vijayan and Geetha (2016) highlighted the need and relevance of integrated and inclusive education in Indian context. It was viewed that integrated and inclusive education for the disabled children in India is a necessity not an option. The authors argued that in view of huge population of disabled children and their rural based demographic pattern, education of children with disabilities should be in local schools with the resources available locally. In such a way, the disabled children continue to be a member of their family and society. Integration was considered as the cost effective approach and implementation of this scheme would address the need of special children. The authors considered integration and inclusion as synonymous. The use of resource model, itinerant model and dual model for educating children with disabilities was recommended as these serve best as per the specific needs of CwSNs and availability of resources.
2.3 CONCLUSION

The analysis of literature supports that there are barriers to inclusion of the disabled learners and these barriers may be described in numerous ways. The analysis of the articles, papers, reports, surveys and Theses further indicate that barriers to education of children with disabilities exist in the form of inaccessible buildings, negative attitudes, rigid, de-motivating and centrally designed curriculum, inadequately trained teachers, inappropriate policies, ignorant administrators, scant funding, shortage of time etc. The pace of the implementation of inclusive education was found slow. The review reveals that despite the fact that much has been written about the differences between the concepts of integration, mainstreaming and inclusion, a large section of population is still ignorant about the differences because these are basically theoretical in nature. The three concepts viz. mainstreaming, integration and inclusion are often used by the stakeholders interchangeably while implementing the inclusion. The three barriers to inclusive education namely administrative, physical, and attitudinal are repeatedly expressed or implied in the review and were, thus, selected for the investigation in the primary schools of Haryana.