**Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities**
ISSN (Online): 2583-1712
Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 108-118 https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.16

# A Study on Level of Awareness of Inclusive Education in Elementary Education: A Comparative Study with Special Reference to Jagun, Tinsukia District of Assam

**Barasha Dutta[1] and Sandip Sinha[2]**
[1]Faculty of Special Education, Arunachal University of Studies, Namsai, INDIA.
[2]Faculty of Physical Education and Sports Science, Arunachal University of Studies, Namsai, INDIA.

[2]Corresponding Author: singhasandip86@gmail.com

**www.ijrah.com || Vol. 4 No. 1 (2024): January Issue**

| **Date of Submission:** 15-01-2024 | **Date of Acceptance:** 20-01-2024 | **Date of Publication:** 27-01-2024 |
|---|---|---|

**ABSTRACT**

**The present study allows the researcher to understand whether government and private elementary schools are differed on the status, basic infrastructural facilities, teaching strategies, organizing co-curricular activities, availability of resources on the basis of the inclusive education. The prime objective of the study is to compare the level of awareness of inclusive education among teachers in private and government elementary schools in Jagun, Tinsukia District of Assam. A descriptive survey method aided by a self-developed questionnaire was used to collect data. The population of the study comprises teachers from both private and government funded elementary schools from Jagun. To fulfill the target a total of eight schools were randomly selected from where eighty teachers from both private and government schools provided with their opinions. Findings of the study suggested that children especially CWSN needs extra care and facilities according to their needs provided and facilitated with some acts and policies for CWSN which must be implemented in the both public and private funded institutes. Furthermore the NEP-2020 laid stress on inclusive-education to promote education towards holistic growth and development.**

***Keywords***- CWSN, Inclusive Education, Elementary School, NEP-2020.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive schools are constructed and planned with a vision and principle that believe in culture of rights, social justice and equity. It believes that all children are not same and accepts diversity as strength rather than a problem. Children learn in different styles and relate success more with the learning of life skills and social skills than scoring high marks in exams. Inclusive education refers to an educational setting where in all children are receiving the same educational experiences and are part of the common teaching learning process. It provides learning environment where has an equal opportunity to succeed. It based on ethical, social, educational principles and on equality and inherent dignity and respect for all. It is a means to realize the right quality education without discrimination.

Government of India's Policy Document Draft Action Plan for Inclusive Education of children and youth with disabilities, MHRD (2005) defines inclusive education as an approach that seeks to address the learning needs of all children, youth and adults with a specific focus on those who are vulnerable to marginalization and exclusion. Indian government took many initiatives for enrolling and providing education to children with disabilities in segregated schools but in 1974, a scheme name Integrated Education for Disabled Children (IEDC) was launched for integrating children with disabilities into the general schools. In the year 2000 Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan was launched to provide education to all whereas in the year 2009-10 scheme of inclusive education at secondary stage (IEDSS) was

**Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities**
ISSN (Online): 2583-1712
Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 108-118 https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.16

initiated which was merged with Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) in 2013.

Under the Integrated Education for Disabled Children Department of Education, children with disabilities are sought to be integrated in normal school system. Full assistance is being provided to states and UTs for education of the children suffering from certain mild disabilities in common schools with the help of necessary aids, incentives and specially trained teachers. The types of disabled children are covered under this scheme are mildly and moderately hearing impaired, mild to moderate Intellectual disabilities, partially sighted children, children with multiple handicaps and children with learning disability respectively.

"Inclusive education means all children in the same classrooms, in the same schools. It means real learning opportunities for groups who have traditionally been excluded-not only children with disabilities, but speakers of minority languages too" (UNICEF, 2013). The principle of inclusive education was adopted at the "World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality" (Salamanca Statement, Spain, 1994-95) and was restated at the "World Education Forum" under the commitments of the forum its fifth commitment named "Inclusive Education" has specified that "members of indigenous groups, those with disabilities, those who are homeless, those who are workers, those living with HIV/AIDS and others" and "Protection against discrimination based on culture, language, social group, gender or individual differences is an inalienable human right that must be respected and fostered by education systems" (Dakar & Senegal, 2000).

There are few major policies under which government of India has chalked out the goal of inclusive education. First of such policy was NEP, 1986. It provides inclusive education to all the sections of the society as Scheduled Castes (SC)/Scheduled Tribes (ST), women, other educationally backward classes and areas, minorities, handicaps, etc. to ensure universal access to elementary education (NPE, 1986, pp. 7-11). Before NEP, 1986, Kothari Commission Report also suggested for opening of common schools in the neighborhood. Next in this direction was, District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) which was launched in 1993-94 and merged with Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) in 2017. The National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2005, formulated by NCERT, has recommended inclusive schools for learners with special educational needs by making appropriate modifications in the content, presentation and transaction strategies, preparing teachers and developing learning friendly evaluation procedures. It implies that all learners, young people with or without disabilities being able to learn together, through access to common school provisions, schools and community educational settings with an appropriate network of support services. This is possible only in a flexible educational system that assimilates the needs of a diverse range of learners and adapts itself to meet these needs.

Article 23 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) states that the disabled children have the right to enjoy a full and decent life condition, which ensures dignity, promote self-reliance, and facilitate child's active participation in the community. They are entitled to special care, education, health care, training, rehabilitation, employment preparation, and recreation opportunities to achieve the fullest possible social integration and individual development, including his or her cultural and spiritual development. The UNESCO Salamanca Statement (1994) came subsequently to stress that children with special educational needs 'must have access to regular schools'. These objectives in India cannot be achieved without the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the general system of education.

This study is also important as to study about the status, basic infrastructural facilities, teaching skills, curriculum, co-curricular activities of private and government middle schools. It will help to analysis that how many CWSN is part of an education system. There are different types of children with special needs and different factors are responsible to make a person disabled. The disabilities of CWSN can be classified as follows:

**Table No. 1.1: Showing the types of disability and categorization of CWSN**

| **Children With Special Needs (CWSN)** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Physical** | **Cognitive** | **Behaviour** |
| Partially hearing<br>Hearing impaired<br>Speech disorder<br>Partially sighted<br>Visually impaired<br>Locomotor Disorder<br>Special Health Disorder<br>Multiple Handicap | Mental Retardation<br>Learning Disabled<br>Gifted Children | Personality Disorder<br>Conduct Disorder<br>Childhood Psychoses |

The NEP-2020 envisages an inclusive and structural change in the educational system. It focuses on 'Equitable and Inclusive Education' which reverberates the idea that no child should be left behind in terms of

educational opportunity because of their background and socio-cultural identities. It also focuses on the ICT based learning for the CWSN students and it will also develop the students' interest towards the education. NEP-2020 is basically focused on the inclusive education system to provide students' equal educational opportunities for the differently able children with the general students.
The main idea behind this study is that a lot of awareness needs to be created and raised, as all of these children and adults need to be treated equally. Creating and raising disability awareness in schools is one of the main actions that need to be done all across the world. Teacher attitude is one of the most important variables in the education of the children with and without disabilities.

## II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

**Parbin (2022):** Investigated the role of SSA in inclusive education and to identify constraints in the implement of the scheme. Findings indicated there has been significant progress in attainment of accessibility targets as the number.

**Leila, H. et al. (2022):** Revealed that over the last 50 years, advances in medical science and the work of the education inclusion movement have expanded human understanding of the needs and potential of persons with disabilities (PWD). As a result, a number of governments around the world have implemented life-changing K-12 education reforms for children with disabilities. Since 2006, the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which calls to "ensure an inclusive education system at all levels," has added momentum to the education inclusion movement. As of October 2022, there are 164 CRPD signatories.

**Khetrapal (2021):** Investigated the present status of the provision for inclusive education of the elementary level in India and found that the enrollment of children with special needs in India from 25,07,880 in 2013-15; 23,17,863 in 2014-15 and further 22,85,531 in 2015-16. This is a decrease of 7.58% points from 2013-14 to 2014-15 and a decrease of 1.39% points from 2014-15 to 2015-16.

**Richard, R. et al. (2021):** Found that the lack of opportunities for training and professional development is perceived to be a major obstacle to the progress of inclusive education as required by national legislation in Hyderabad city. Recommendations are made for further research that is closely allied to changes in practice, for the development of professional development of teachers and other professionals, and for the development of centralized provision in rural areas to address the needs of families.

**Jayanthi, N. & Patnaik, N. (2020):** Reveled that there are various models and practices for special and inclusive education in rural and remote areas, but reaching children with special educational needs in such areas is still a challenge. Though there are schools in these areas, not all are sufficiently equipped to address the education of children with special needs. Yet, interestingly, in some rural/tribal communities, the teachers are naturally at ease with children with diverse needs. The schools in such areas tend to have heterogeneous classes with one teacher providing instruction to combined groups at different grade levels. Evidence shows that rural teachers are less resistant to including children with special needs compared to urban teachers.

**Yadav, J., Sachdeva, M., & Rai, R. (2020):** Conducted a comparative study of inclusive education system in government & private universities of Lucknow especially studied those concepts related to private & government education and inclusive education in front of challenges in private and government sector. Higher education department face the problems of various challenges of higher education. Found that teachers & students face lots of problems at university level.

**Sharma, R. (2020):** Found that teacher's attitudes significantly influence the learning environment they create for the students and the application of proper practices in the classroom. Teacher plays a vital role in the implementation of inclusive education. The study helped in measuring the attitude of teachers towards inclusive classroom of Jammu City (J&K). Attempt has been made to clear the misconceptions of teachers about inclusive classroom and indicating the need to develop positive attitude so as to make education universal for all irrespectively caste, creed, color and disability.

**Sharma, T. (2018):** This study discusses the status of disabled education, infrastructure and different policies regarding disables' education in India. The research attempts to seek answers to the questions such as; who is included, into what they are included and where they are after inclusion, why the goal of full inclusion not achieved yet? Result showed that only 61.2% disabled population between ages 5-19 are getting education and out of total enrolment of students from first to fifth grade aggregated 1.18% and sixth to eight grade 1.13% students in schools are the children with special need. Majority of the disabled live in rural areas allowing very less access to school and further noted that the infrastructure, societal attitude, inflexible education system are obstructs in the way of inclusion.

## III. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The prime objective of the study is to compare the level of awareness of inclusive education among teachers in private and government middle schools in Jagun, Tinsukia District of Assam.

## IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used the descriptive survey research design. The research is designed to understand the status

**Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities**
ISSN (Online): 2583-1712
Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 108-118 https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.16

and awareness of inclusive education in government and private middle schools and the study area is delimited to Jagun, Tinsukia District of Assam.

As to complete the study within the stipulated time the investigator has collected data from four (04) government and four (04) private middle schools having at least 10 members from each school making 80 total number of units as the sample size.

**Table 3.1: Showing the profile of study sample**

| Sl. No. | Name of the Schools | Authority/Funded |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Rampur Gaon M.E School | Government |
| 2 | Rashtriya Bhasha M.E School | Government |
| 3 | Rampur M.E School | Government |
| 4 | Tinkupani M.E School | Government |
| 5 | Jagun Jatiya Vidyalaya | Private |
| 6 | Rose Bird English Medium School | Private |
| 7 | St.Vincent English School | Private |
| 8 | Mount Carmel English School | Private |

A self-designed questionnaire was used for the collection of data for the present study with proper permission taken from school administration. The investigator made the respondents aware about the purpose of the research and also informed the coordinators of accredited institution about the purpose of research. The statistical tools used in the study include; Skewness, Kurtosis, Mean, Standard Deviation, ANOVA with Friedman's test and Graphics alpha reliability test.

## V. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

***Demographic Profile***

**Table 5.1: Showing the demographic profile.**

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance | Skewness | | Kurtosis | |
| | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Std. Error | Statistic | Std. Error |
| SEX | 80 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.5500 | .50063 | .251 | -.205 | .269 | -2.009 | .532 |
| Age Group | 80 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.6875 | .78907 | .623 | .622 | .269 | -1.114 | .532 |
| School | 80 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.5000 | .50315 | .253 | .000 | .269 | -2.052 | .532 |
| Valid N (list-wise) | 80 | | | | | | | | | |

Table 5.1 shows the descriptive statistics of three variables: sex, age group and school. These variables are categorical and have two or more levels and the mean of sex is 1.5500, which means that there are more females (coded as 2) than males (coded as 1) in the sample. The standard deviation of sex is 0.50063, which means that there is a moderate variation in the distribution. The Skewness of sex is -0.205, which means that the distribution of sex is slightly skewed to the left, meaning that there are more values above the mean than below it. The Kurtosis of sex is -2.009, which means that the distribution of sex is platykurtic, meaning that it has thinner tails and a flatter peak than a normal distribution.

The mean of age group is 2.6875, which means that the average age group of the sample is between 21-30 years (coded as 3). The SD of age group is 0.78907, which means that there is a high variation in the distribution. The Skewness of age group is 0.622, which means that the distribution of age group is moderately skewed to the right, meaning that there are more values below the mean than above it. The kurtosis of age group is -1.114, which means that the distribution of age group is platykurtic, meaning that it has thinner tails and a flatter peak than a normal distribution.

The mean of school is 1.5000, which means that there are equal numbers of private (coded as 1) and government (coded as 2) schools in the sample. The SD

**Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities**
ISSN (Online): 2583-1712
Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 108-118 https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.16

of School is 0.50315, which means that there is a moderate variation in the distribution. The Skewness and kurtosis of school are both zero, which means that the distribution of school is symmetrical and mesokurtic, meaning that it has similar tails and peak as a normal distribution.

**Table 5.2: Showing the Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test**

| Reliability Statistics | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Cronbach's Alpha** | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | No. of Items (N) |
| **.854** | .853 | 15 |

Table 5.2 shows the reliability statistics and the ANOVA with Friedman's test results of a scale with 15 items. The scale is used to measure some ordinal variable across 80 people. The Cronbach's alpha of the scale is 0.854, which means that the scale has a high internal consistency and reliability. The Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items is 0.853, which means that the reliability of the scale is not affected by the variation in the item scores.

**Table 5.3: Showing ANOVA with Friedman's Test**

| ANOVA with Friedman's Test | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **Friedman's Chi-Square** | **Sig** |
| **Between People** | | 330.120 | 79 | 4.179 | | |
| **Within People** | Between Items | 86.362[a] | 14 | 6.169 | 126.891 | .000 |
| | Residual | 675.905 | 1106 | .611 | | |
| | Total | 762.267 | 1120 | .681 | | |
| **Total** | | 1092.387 | 1199 | .911 | | |
| **Grand Mean = 2.9633** | | | | | | |
| **a. Kendall's coefficient of concordance W = .079.** | | | | | | |

The ANOVA with Friedman's test is used to compare the mean ranks of the 15 items across the 80 people. The Friedman's chi-square value is 126.891, which is significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.000$). This means that there is a significant difference in the mean ranks of the items. The Kendall's coefficient of concordance W is 0.079, which means that there is a low agreement among the people on the ranking of the items.

**Table 5.4: Showing descriptive statistics of eight items that measure the attitudes and perceptions of teachers towards inclusive education**

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Min | Max |
| | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| **I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with an IEP for learning problems.** | Government | 40 | 3.4250 | .71208 | .11259 | 3.1973 | 3.6527 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Private | 40 | 3.3500 | .80224 | .12685 | 3.0934 | 3.6066 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 3.3875 | .75463 | .08437 | 3.2196 | 3.5554 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| **I am encouraging my administrators to attend conference and workshops on teaching students with special needs.** | Government | 40 | 3.2250 | .89120 | .14091 | 2.9400 | 3.5100 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Private | 40 | 3.3750 | .86787 | .13722 | 3.0974 | 3.6526 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 3.3000 | .87728 | .09808 | 3.1048 | 3.4952 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| **I am provided with sufficient in** | Govern | 40 | 2.80 | .93918 | .1485 | 2.4996 | 3.1004 | 1.00 | 4.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **service training through my school district which allows me the ability to teach students with an IEP.** | ment | | 00 | | 0 | | | | |
| | Private | 40 | 2.9250 | 1.07148 | .16942 | 2.5823 | 3.2677 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 2.8625 | 1.00308 | .11215 | 2.6393 | 3.0857 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| **I know the techniques of teaching units and lessons with the diversity of students in mind.** | Government | 40 | 3.4250 | .74722 | .11815 | 3.1860 | 3.6640 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| | Private | 40 | 3.2500 | .98058 | .15504 | 2.9364 | 3.5636 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 3.3375 | .87067 | .09734 | 3.1437 | 3.5313 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| **I know how to adapt and handle teaching materials to respond to the needs of each of my students.** | Government | 40 | 3.2250 | .89120 | .14091 | 2.9400 | 3.5100 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Private | 40 | 3.3500 | .86380 | .13658 | 3.0737 | 3.6263 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 3.2875 | .87430 | .09775 | 3.0929 | 3.4821 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| **I can adapt my communication techniques to ensure that all students can be successfully included in the mainstream classroom.** | Government | 40 | 3.1250 | .85297 | .13487 | 2.8522 | 3.3978 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| | Private | 40 | 3.1750 | 1.03497 | .16364 | 2.8440 | 3.5060 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 3.1500 | .94266 | .10539 | 2.9402 | 3.3598 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| **Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education.** | Government | 40 | 2.6250 | .74032 | .11706 | 2.3882 | 2.8618 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Private | 40 | 2.8250 | .98417 | .15561 | 2.5102 | 3.1398 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 2.7250 | .87113 | .09739 | 2.5311 | 2.9189 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| **I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities.** | Government | 40 | 3.0500 | .84580 | .13373 | 2.7795 | 3.3205 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Private | 40 | 2.7500 | 1.03155 | .16310 | 2.4201 | 3.0799 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 80 | 2.9000 | .94935 | .10614 | 2.6887 | 3.1113 | 1.00 | 4.00 |

Table 5.4 shows the descriptive statistics of eight items that measure the attitudes and perceptions of teachers towards inclusive education. The items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The table compares the responses of teachers from government and private schools, as well as the total sample of 80 teachers. The mean scores of the items range from 2.6250 to 3.4250, which indicate that the teachers generally have positive or neutral attitudes towards inclusive education. The highest mean score is for the item "I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with an IEP for learning problems", which suggests that the teachers recognize the need for professional development in this area. The lowest mean score is for the item "Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education", which implies that the teachers are less confident about the academic benefits of inclusive education.

The standard deviations of the items range from 0.71208 to 1.07148, which indicate that there is a moderate to high variation in the responses of the teachers. The highest standard deviation is for the item "I am provided with sufficient in service training through my school district which allows me the ability to teach students with an IEP", which implies that the teachers have different opinions about the adequacy of their in-service training. The lowest standard deviation is for the item "I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with an IEP for learning problems", which suggests that the teachers have more agreement on this item.

The 95% confidence intervals for the mean scores of the items show the range of values that are likely to contain the true population mean with 95% probability. The confidence intervals can be used to compare the mean scores of government and private schools and to test if there is a significant difference between them. For example, the confidence interval for the mean score of government schools on the item "I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with an IEP for learning problems" is [3.1973,

**Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities**
ISSN (Online): 2583-1712
Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 108-118 https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.16

3.6527], while the confidence interval for private schools is [3.0934, 3.6066]. Since these intervals overlap, we can infer that there is no significant difference between government and private schools on this item. However, if the intervals do not overlap, we can infer that there is a significant difference between them. For example, the confidence interval for government schools on the item "I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities" is [2.7795, 3.3205], while the confidence interval for private schools is [2.4201, 3.0799]. Since these intervals do not overlap, we can infer that there is a significant difference between government and private schools on this item, and that government schools have a higher mean score than private schools.

The minimum and maximum scores of the items show the lowest and highest values obtained by any teacher on each item. The minimum scores range from 1 to 2, while the maximum scores are all 4. This indicates that none of the teachers strongly agreed with all of the items, and that some of them strongly disagreed with some of them.

**Table 5.5: Showing the test of homogeneity of variances and the ANOVA results of the eight items that measure the attitudes and perceptions of teachers towards Inclusive Education**

| Test of Homogeneity of Variances | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Levene Statistic** | **df1** | **df2** | **Sig.** |
| **I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with an IEP for learning problems** | .249 | 1 | 78 | .619 |
| **I am encouraging my administrators to attend conference and workshops on teaching students with special needs.** | .005 | 1 | 78 | .943 |
| **I am provided with sufficient in service training through my school district which allows me the ability to teach students with an IEP.** | 3.014 | 1 | 78 | .086 |
| **I know the techniques of teaching units and lessons with the diversity of students in mind** | 2.873 | 1 | 78 | .094 |
| **I know how to adapt and handle teaching materials to respond to the needs of each of my students** | .086 | 1 | 78 | .770 |
| **I can adapt my communication techniques to ensure that all students can be successfully included in the mainstream classroom** | 2.774 | 1 | 78 | .100 |
| **Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education** | 7.929 | 1 | 78 | .006 |
| **I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities** | 5.192 | 1 | 78 | .025 |

**Table 5.6: Showing the ANOVA test used to compare the mean scores of the two groups (government and private schools) for each item**

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| **I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with an IEP for learning problems** | Between Groups | .112 | 1 | .112 | .196 | .660 |
| | Within Groups | 44.875 | 78 | .575 | | |
| | Total | 44.988 | 79 | | | |
| **I am encouraging my administrators to attend conference and workshops on teaching students with special needs.** | Between Groups | .450 | 1 | .450 | .582 | .448 |
| | Within Groups | 60.350 | 78 | .774 | | |
| | Total | 60.800 | 79 | | | |
| **I am provided with sufficient in service training through my school district which allows me the ability to teach students with an IEP.** | Between Groups | .312 | 1 | .312 | .308 | .581 |
| | Within Groups | 79.175 | 78 | 1.015 | | |
| | Total | 79.488 | 79 | | | |
| **I know the techniques of teaching units and lessons with the diversity of students in mind** | Between Groups | .612 | 1 | .612 | .806 | .372 |
| | Within | 59.275 | 78 | .760 | | |

**Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities**
ISSN (Online): 2583-1712
Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 108-118 https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.16

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 59.888 | 79 | | | |
| **I know how to adapt and handle teaching materials to respond to the needs of each of my students** | Between Groups | .312 | 1 | .312 | .406 | .526 |
| | Within Groups | 60.075 | 78 | .770 | | |
| | Total | 60.388 | 79 | | | |
| **I can adapt my communication techniques to ensure that all students can be successfully included in the mainstream classroom** | Between Groups | .050 | 1 | .050 | .056 | .814 |
| | Within Groups | 70.150 | 78 | .899 | | |
| | Total | 70.200 | 79 | | | |
| **Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education** | Between Groups | .800 | 1 | .800 | 1.055 | .308 |
| | Within Groups | 59.150 | 78 | .758 | | |
| | Total | 59.950 | 79 | | | |
| **I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities** | Between Groups | 1.800 | 1 | 1.800 | 2.023 | .159 |
| | Within Groups | 69.400 | 78 | .890 | | |
| | Total | 71.200 | 79 | | | |

For all of the items, except for "Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education" and "I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities", the p-values for both tests are greater than or equal to 0.05. This means that we can assume that the variances are equal and that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of government and private schools for these items.

For the item "Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education", the p-value for the test of homogeneity of variances is less than 0.05 (p = 0.006). This means that we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the variances are not equal for this item. However, the p-value for the ANOVA is greater than or equal to 0.05 (p = 0.308). This means that we can fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of government and private schools for this item.

For the item "I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities", the p-value for the test of homogeneity of variances is less than 0.05 (p = 0.025). This means that we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the variances are not equal for this item. However, the p-value for the ANOVA is greater than or equal to 0.05 (p = 0.159). This means that we can fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of government and private schools for this item.

**Table 5.7: Showing the robust tests of equality of means for the eight items that measure the attitudes and perceptions of teachers towards inclusive education**

| Robust Tests of Equality of Means | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Statistic** | **df1** | **df2** | **Sig.** |
| **I need more training in order to appropriately teach students with an IEP for learning problems** | Welch | .196 | 1 | 76.917 | .660 |
| | Brown-Forsythe | .196 | 1 | 76.917 | .660 |
| **I am encouraging my administrators to attend conference and workshops on teaching students with special needs.** | Welch | .582 | 1 | 77.945 | .448 |
| | Brown-Forsythe | .582 | 1 | 77.945 | .448 |
| **I am provided with sufficient in-service training through my school district which allows me the ability to teach students with an IEP.** | Welch | .308 | 1 | 76.683 | .581 |
| | Brown-Forsythe | .308 | 1 | 76.683 | .581 |
| **I know the techniques of teaching units and lessons with the** | Welch | .806 | 1 | 72.871 | .372 |

**Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities**
ISSN (Online): 2583-1712
Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 108-118 https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.16

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **diversity of students in mind** | Brown-Forsythe | .806 | 1 | 72.871 | .372 |
| **I know how to adapt and handle teaching materials to respond to the needs of each of my students** | Welch | .406 | 1 | 77.924 | .526 |
| | Brown-Forsythe | .406 | 1 | 77.924 | .526 |
| **I can adapt my communication techniques to ensure that all students can be successfully included in the mainstream classroom** | Welch | .056 | 1 | 75.254 | .814 |
| | Brown-Forsythe | .056 | 1 | 75.254 | .814 |
| **Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education** | Welch | 1.055 | 1 | 72.432 | .308 |
| | Brown-Forsythe | 1.055 | 1 | 72.432 | .308 |
| **I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities** | Welch | 2.023 | 1 | 75.115 | .159 |
| | Brown-Forsythe | 2.023 | 1 | 75.115 | .159 |
| **a. Asymptotically F distributed.** | | | | | |

Table 5.7 shows the robust tests of equality of means for the eight items that measure the attitudes and perceptions of teachers towards inclusive education. The robust tests of equality of means are used to compare the mean scores of the two groups (government and private schools) for each item when the assumption of homogeneity of variances is violated. For all of the items, except for "Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education" and "I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities", the p-values for both tests are greater than or equal to 0.05. For the item "Both students with and without disabilities can get academic improvement because of inclusive education", the p-value for both tests is greater than or equal to 0.05 (p = 0.308). For the item "I have corresponding knowledge and skills to educate students with disabilities", the p-value for both tests is greater than or equal to 0.05 (p = 0.159).

In conclusion, the study found that there is no significant difference between the awareness of inclusive education in private and government middle schools in Jagun, Tinsukia District of Assam.

## VI. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The observation schedules have two different prospects in Jagun, Tinsukia District of Assam. In the interpretation and analysis the findings are summarized as: both the government and private school teachers are aware about the inclusive education. The descriptive statistics of which measured the attitude and perception of teachers towards inclusive education of teachers in government and private schools with mean score of the items ranging from 2.6280 to 3.4280, indicates that the teachers generally have positive and neutral attitude towards inclusive education. The value of 'P' and 'F' statistics in Welch and Forsythe is higher or equal than the table values which indicate that there in no significant difference between the awareness of inclusive education in private and government elementary schools in Jagun, Tinsukia District of Assam.

## VII. CONCLUSION

On the basis of the results of the study it is concluded that the government and private schools have no differences in between availability of teachers, infrastructural facilities, educational technologies, teaching techniques etc. Findings revealed that both the government and private elementary schools has no different between the status and awareness of inclusive education. As we know that elementary level education is the base of higher education, so it is a very significant level to develop more human resources to make the foundation level stronger leading to economic growth of our nation. Therefore, elementary level education is very important from economic point of view also. Hence both government and private funded elementary education need to be stronger and more sufficient to support towards nation building.

## REFERENCE

[1] Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective Schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal*, *83*(4), 427–452. https://doi.org/10.1086/461325

[2] Priti, R. Majhi, Praful K. Khatua (2016). Research Methodology. Himalya publication house. (n.d.). *Priti, R. Majhi, Praful K. Khatua (2016). Research Methodology. Himalya Publication House.*

[3] C. R. Kothari. (2014). Research methodology: methods and techniques. Pearson publication. (n.d.). *C. R. Kothari. (2014). Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. Pearson Publication.*

[4] R. Paneerselvam (2012-13). Research Methodology. PHI Learning Private Limited.

(n.d.). *R. Paneerselvam (2012-13). Research Methodology. PHI Learning Private Limited.*

[5] S. Pawar- Salunkhe, (2017). Business Research Methods. Sheth Publications. (n.d.). *S. Pawar-Salunkhe, (2017). Business Research Methods. Sheth Publications.*

[6] Deale RN. Assessment and Testing in the Secondary Schools, School Council Examination Bulleting, 32, The Chaucer Press Cation Review. Elesvier Science Ltd., 1975; 15(2). (n.d.). *Deale RN. Assessment and Testing in the Secondary Schools, School Council Examination Bulleting, 32, the Chaucer Press Cation Review. Elesvier Science Ltd., 1975; 15(2).*

[7] Hyeneman Loxly. The Effect of Secondary School Quality on Academic Achievement across 29 High- and Low-income Countries. American Journal of Sociology. 1983; 88(6). (n.d.). *Hyeneman Loxly. The Effect of Secondary School Quality on Academic Achievement Across 29 High- and Low-income Countries. American Journal of Sociology. 1983; 88(6).*

[8] Jangira NK (1994). Learning Achievement of Secondary School Children in Reading and Mathematics. Research Based Interventions in Secondary Education. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training. (n.d.). *Jangira NK (1994). Learning Achievement of Secondary School Children in Reading and Mathematics. Research Based Interventions in Secondary Education. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training.*

[9] Dave PN (1988-92). 1994 Fifth Survey of Educational Research. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training. (n.d.). *Dave PN (1988-92). 1994 Fifth Survey of Educational Research. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training.*

[10] LeRoy. B. and Simpson. C. (1996) Improving student outcomes through inclusive education. Support for Learning. (n.d.). *LeRoy. B. and Simpson. C. (1996) Improving Student Outcomes Through Inclusive Education. Support for Learning.*

[11] Lewis, A. (1995).Children's understanding of disability. London: Routledge. (n.d.). *Lewis, a. (1995).Children's Understanding of Disability. London: Routledge.*

[12] Lewis, A. (2002). Accessing, through research interviews, the views of children with difficulties in learning. Support for Learning. (n.d.). *Lewis, a. (2002). Accessing, Through Research Interviews, the Views of Children With Difficulties in Learning. Support for Learning.*

[13] Lewis, A. and Lindsay, G. (2000). Researching children's perspectives. Buckingham: Open University Press. (n.d.). *Lewis, a. and Lindsay, G. (2000). Researching Children's Perspectives. Buckingham: Open University Press.*

[14] Lewis, Norwich, B. (2001). A critical review of systematic evidence concerning distinctive pedagogies for pupils with difficulties in learning. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs. (n.d.). *Lewis, Norwich, B. (2001). A Critical Review of Systematic Evidence Concerning Distinctive Pedagogies for Pupils With Difficulties in Learning. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs.*

[15] Lewis, A. Norwich, B. (2005). Special teaching for special children? Pedagogies for inclusion. Maidenhead: Open University Lewis. (n.d.). *Lewis, a. Norwich, B. (2005). Special Teaching for Special Children? Pedagogies for Inclusion. Maidenhead: Open University Lewis.*

[16] MH, C. (2019). Role of Technology in Indian Education. Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research towards Inclusive Education, 6(3), 266-272. https://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIRDL06047.pdf. (n.d.). *MH, C. (2019). Role of Technology in Indian Education. Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research Towards Inclusive Education, 6(3), 266-272. https://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIRDL06047.pdf.*

[17] Altschuld, J. W. and Kumar, D. D. (2010). Needs assessment: An overview (ISBN-13:978-1412975841; ISBN: 1412975840). CA: Sage Publications. (n.d.). *Altschuld, J. W. and Kumar, D. D. (2010). Needs Assessment: An Overview (ISBN-13:978-1412975841; ISBN: 1412975840). CA: Sage Publications.*

[18] Experts, D. (2021). (Free Sample) NTA UGC NET Paper 1 Topic-wise 52 Solved Papers (2020 to 2004) 2nd Edition. Disha Publications. (n.d.). *Experts, D. (2021). (Free Sample) NTA UGC NET Paper 1 Topic-wise 52 Solved Papers (2020 to 2004) 2nd Edition. Disha Publications.*

[19] Dipesh, B. (2020, September 14). Status and problems of inclusive education at the elementary level a study in the schools of kamrup metropolitan district. https://hdl.handle.net/10603/299238. (n.d.). *Dipesh, B. (2020, September 14). Status and Problems of Inclusive Education at the Elementary Level a Study in the Schools of Kamrup Metropolitan District. https://hdl.handle.net/10603/299238*.

[20] Swargiary, J. (2016, October 18). A study of the inclusive education programme for disabled children under sarva Shiksha Abhijan mission in Assam. https://hdl.handle.net/10603/116358. (n.d.). *Swargiary, J. (2016, October 18). A Study of the Inclusive Education Programme for Disabled Children Under Sarva Shiksha Abhijan Mission in Assam. https://hdl.handle.net/10603/116358*.

[21] *In Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/roleinclusive education= Role of education in inclusive education=929802398*. (n.d.). In Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/roleinclusive Education= Role of Education in Inclusive Education=929802398.

[22] Patankar, (2010), A critical study of inclusive education in the state of Goa. http://hdl.handle.net.10603/62666. (n.d.). *Patankar, (2010), a Critical Study of Inclusive Education in the State of Goa. http://hdl.handle.net.10603/62666*.

[23] Anita & Tulka,. (2013), A study of inclusiveness of schools at the elementary level. https://hdl.handle.net.10603/67059 https://dictionary.apa.org>child-with special needs. (n.d.). *Anita & Tulka,. (2013), a Study of Inclusiveness of Schools at the Elementary Level. https://hdl.handle.net.10603/67059 https://dictionary.apa.org>Child-with Special Needs*.

[24] Pappu, R., & Goswami, N. (2015). Introduction. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, *22*(2), 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971521515574605