

Making Inclusion Work: Predictors of Inclusive Teaching Practices in Assam's Schools

Karshika Boruah

Research Scholar, Department of Education Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankaradeva Viswavidyalaya

HOW TO CITE:

Karshika Boruah (2026). Making Inclusion Work: Predictors of Inclusive Teaching Practices in Assam's Schools.

International Journal of Special Education, 41(24s), 1301 - 1312

ABSTRACT:

Inclusive education requires more than formal school access: teachers must be able to recognize barriers to participation, adapt instruction, collaborate with colleagues and families, and obtain meaningful institutional support. Although teacher attitudes and self-efficacy are established concerns in international research, locally grounded evidence on their joint relationship with everyday inclusive practices remains necessary. This paper presents a preregisterable quantitative research protocol for examining preparedness, attitudes, perceived institutional support and self-reported inclusive practices among schoolteachers in Kamrup Metropolitan and Kamrup Rural districts of Assam, India. A cross-sectional, stratified multistage survey is proposed, targeting approximately 400 completed teacher questionnaires. The original 24-item instrument contains four provisional six-item dimensions, supplemented by eight background variables. Expert assessment, cognitive interviewing, a separate pilot and confirmatory measurement analysis will be used to evaluate validity and reliability. Planned analyses include descriptive estimates, district comparisons, correlation and cluster-aware multivariable regression. No fieldwork or statistical analysis has yet occurred; consequently, this manuscript reports no observed associations, significance tests or outcomes. The study is designed to identify actionable relationships between professional preparation, school conditions and inclusive teaching while explicitly acknowledging the limitations of self-report and cross-sectional inference. Findings, when available, could inform targeted teacher development and school-level support in Assam.

Keywords: inclusive education, special education, teacher preparedness, teacher attitudes, institutional support, Assam

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.

Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY)

license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Inclusive education is both a question of educational justice and a practical question about what happens in classrooms. Placement in a school does not automatically ensure that learners can participate in lessons, communicate their understanding or receive appropriate support

(UNESCO, 2020). In ordinary school routines, seemingly small decisions about explanations, assessment, peer participation and feedback determine whether the curriculum becomes accessible to students with varied learning profiles.

Inclusive education is both a question of educational justice and a practical question about what happens in classrooms. Placement in a school does not automatically ensure that learners can participate in lessons, communicate their understanding or receive appropriate support (UNESCO, 2020). This distinction is particularly important when disability is understood relationally: educational barriers emerge through interactions between individual needs, school design, institutional routines and the wider social environment.

Inclusive education is both a question of educational justice and a practical question about what happens in classrooms. Placement in a school does not automatically ensure that learners can participate in lessons, communicate their understanding or receive appropriate support (UNESCO, 2020). For that reason, the present study treats inclusion as a set of supported practices rather than as a simple declaration that all children are welcome.

India's Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009), Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), and National Education Policy (Ministry of Education, 2020) provide an important policy setting for equitable schooling. Yet legal entitlement and policy intention cannot, by themselves, describe how confident teachers feel or whether a school provides sufficient materials, professional guidance and planning time.

India's Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009), Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), and National Education Policy (Ministry of Education, 2020) provide an important policy setting for equitable schooling. Implementation questions must therefore be investigated empirically and locally, without treating the existence of policy as evidence that every classroom already meets its aspirations.

India's Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009), Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), and National Education Policy (Ministry of Education, 2020) provide an important policy

setting for equitable schooling. Assam offers a meaningful setting for such inquiry because teacher experience, management arrangements and school resources may vary across urban and rural educational contexts.

Teacher preparedness, positive attitudes and institutional support are conceptually related but should not be collapsed into a single construct. Preparedness concerns perceived capability; attitudes reflect evaluative commitments; support concerns the organizational conditions under which teaching occurs. A teacher may value inclusion while reporting insufficient training, or may have strong practical skills but little access to specialist consultation.

Teacher preparedness, positive attitudes and institutional support are conceptually related but should not be collapsed into a single construct. Preparedness concerns perceived capability; attitudes reflect evaluative commitments; support concerns the organizational conditions under which teaching occurs. Likewise, a school may express commitment to inclusion yet lack regular collaborative planning opportunities or accessible learning materials.

Teacher preparedness, positive attitudes and institutional support are conceptually related but should not be collapsed into a single construct. Preparedness concerns perceived capability; attitudes reflect evaluative commitments; support concerns the organizational conditions under which teaching occurs. Measuring these domains separately creates an opportunity to identify more precise and feasible professional-development priorities.

1.1 Statement of the problem and research gap

International studies have examined teachers' attitudes and efficacy for inclusive education (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Sharma et al., 2012), but evidence from one country or teacher group should not automatically be generalized to district-level school systems in Assam. Existing measures also differ in whether they capture beliefs, confidence, resources or reported

behavior, making apparent comparisons difficult when constructs are not defined carefully.

International studies have examined teachers' attitudes and efficacy for inclusive education (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Sharma et al., 2012), but evidence from one country or teacher group should not automatically be generalized to district-level school systems in Assam. An integrated local model can examine whether preparedness and attitudes retain associations with inclusive practices after accounting for perceived school support and selected professional characteristics.

International studies have examined teachers' attitudes and efficacy for inclusive education (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Sharma et al., 2012), but evidence from one country or teacher group should not automatically be generalized to district-level school systems in Assam. The resulting evidence will be correlational, not proof that training or resources cause particular classroom outcomes.

1.2 Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the levels of teacher preparedness, attitudes, institutional support, and inclusive classroom practices among schoolteachers in Assam?
2. What relationships exist among teacher preparedness, attitudes, institutional support, and inclusive classroom practices?
3. How reliable and valid are the proposed measurement scales for assessing the four dimensions of inclusive education?
4. To what extent are teacher preparedness, attitudes, and institutional support associated with inclusive classroom practices after accounting for professional and school characteristics?
5. Are there significant differences in teacher preparedness and inclusive classroom practices based on district, professional training, and school context?

6. What areas of teacher development and institutional support require greater attention to strengthen inclusive education in Assam?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To assess the levels of teacher preparedness, attitudes, institutional support, and inclusive classroom practices in schools of Assam.
2. To examine the relationships among teacher preparedness, attitudes, institutional support, and inclusive classroom practices.
3. To evaluate the reliability and validity of the proposed research instrument for measuring inclusive education practices.
4. To investigate the influence of teacher preparedness, attitudes, and institutional support on inclusive classroom practices, considering professional and institutional characteristics.
5. To examine differences in teacher preparedness and inclusive classroom practices based on district, professional training, and school context.
6. To identify areas for improving teacher training, institutional support, and the implementation of inclusive education.

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses are proposed for statistical testing:

- H1: Teacher preparedness is positively and significantly associated with inclusive classroom practices.
- H2: Teachers' positive attitudes towards inclusive education are significantly associated with higher levels of inclusive classroom practices.
- H3: Perceived institutional support is positively and significantly associated with inclusive classroom practices.
- H4: Teachers who have received recent training in inclusive education demonstrate significantly higher preparedness scores than teachers without such training.

H5: Institutional support significantly moderates the relationship between teacher preparedness and inclusive classroom practices.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research design and study setting

The research was designed as a quantitative, cross-sectional, school-based survey focused on inclusive teaching in Kamrup Metropolitan and Kamrup Rural districts of Assam. The design specified a single assessment of teachers' preparedness, attitudes towards inclusion, perceived institutional support, and self-reported inclusive classroom practices. It was intended to estimate associations rather than causal effects.

2.2 Target population and eligibility

The target population comprised classroom teachers employed in schools within the designated sampling frame. Eligibility was defined as current classroom teaching responsibilities and at least six months of experience in the current setting. Teachers were eligible irrespective of whether they had personally identified a learner with a disability. Planned background characteristics included district, school level, management category, teaching experience, and relevant professional training.

2.3 Sampling strategy and sample size

A stratified multistage sampling strategy was specified. Schools were to be stratified by district and relevant institutional characteristics, randomly selected within strata, and followed by selection of eligible teachers where feasible. The target was 400 completed questionnaires, provisionally allocated equally across the two districts. An indicative structure of 40 schools with 10 teachers per school informed planning; these school counts were not verified observations.

For a single proportion, the conventional calculation with 95% confidence, $p = .50$, and a .05 margin of error yields approximately 384 participants before finite-population adjustment. An assumed intraclass correlation of .05 and 10 teachers per school imply a design effect of $1 +$

$(10 - 1) \times .05 = 1.45$. These assumptions were intended for planning and do not replace an outcome-specific power analysis accounting for school clustering and nonresponse.

2.4 Research instrument

A structured questionnaire was drafted with eight background items and 24 five-point Likert-type statements. Four six-item domains were specified: preparedness (B1–B6), attitudes (C1–C6), institutional support (D1–D6), and inclusive classroom practices (E1–E6). Responses ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Items avoided requesting identifiable student information or disability diagnoses.

2.5 Instrument review and pilot procedures

The instrument-development protocol specified content review by five to seven specialists in special education, measurement, school practice, and language. Item-level content validity indices and the average scale content validity index were selected to guide revision. If Assamese administration was required, independent translation review and cognitive interviews were specified. Cognitive interviews with approximately 8–12 teachers and a separate pilot with approximately 40 teachers were planned to evaluate comprehension, completion time, missingness, item distributions, and preliminary reliability. These procedures had not been completed in the supplied material.

2.6 Data collection and ethical procedures

The data-collection protocol required institutional ethics approval and relevant school permissions before recruitment. Participation was to be voluntary and based on informed consent, with private questionnaire return, coded records, restricted data access, and a recruitment log documenting eligibility, invitations, refusals, and completions. No field recruitment, ethics approval, or consent records were supplied in the source document.

2.7 Variables, scoring, and data management

The primary outcome was the mean score for self-reported inclusive practices. Preparedness, attitudes, and institutional support were primary

explanatory variables. Training, experience, district, and school characteristics were specified as covariates. A domain score was defined as the mean of its six items when at least five were answered; otherwise, it was missing. Higher scores represented stronger endorsement of the measured domain. Individual Likert responses were treated as ordinal.

2.8 Statistical analysis

The analysis framework included frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and confidence intervals, together with Cronbach's alpha and, when estimable, coefficient omega and ordinal factor analysis. The primary association model specified inclusive practices as the outcome and preparedness, attitudes, institutional support, and prespecified covariates as predictors. District and training contrasts and the preparedness-by-support interaction were designated exploratory. School-clustered standard errors or multilevel models would be required if verified school identifiers were available. Where cluster identifiers were absent, HC3 heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors were used for the illustrative regression.

The conceptual regression equation was: $\text{Practices} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Preparedness}) + \beta_2(\text{Attitudes}) + \beta_3(\text{Support}) + \beta_4(\text{Training}) + \beta_5(\text{Experience}) + \beta_6(\text{District}) + \text{error}$. Estimates were to be interpreted as associations, not effects of interventions.

3. Results

3.1 Sample structure and instrument development

The synthetic dataset comprised 400 teacher records, equally allocated to Kamrup Metropolitan ($n = 200$) and Kamrup Rural ($n = 200$). The 40 schools and average of 10 teachers per school are planning assumptions, not observed school-level characteristics. The proposed instrument-development process also includes 40 pilot participants, seven expert reviewers and 10 cognitive interviews. These activities would help examine content relevance,

clarity and feasibility before real-world data collection; they have not yet been conducted.

Table 1. Sample structure and instrument-development targets

Component	Value	Basis
Kamrup Metropolitan	200	Synthetic records
Kamrup Rural	200	Synthetic records
Total teacher records	400	Synthetic records
Schools	40	Planning assumption
Teachers per school	10	Planning average
Pilot participants	40	Proposed
Expert reviewers	7	Proposed
Cognitive interviews	10	Proposed

Figure 1. District-wise composition of synthetic records

District	Editable proportional bar	Records (%)
Kamrup Metropolitan		200 (50%)
Kamrup Rural		200 (50%)

Figure 1. Equal allocation of the 400 constructed teacher records across the two districts.

3.2 Interpretation of district distribution

The equal district allocation is useful for demonstrating a balanced comparison between

metropolitan and rural settings. It does not establish that either district has the same number of teachers or schools in the target population, nor does it represent a probability sample.

3.2 Descriptive statistics and internal consistency

The constructed records yielded the highest mean for reported practices ($M = 3.280$, $SD = 0.569$), followed by preparedness ($M = 3.204$, $SD = 0.578$), institutional support ($M = 3.107$, $SD = 0.512$) and attitudes ($M = 3.065$, $SD = 0.572$). Assuming a five-point scale, the four domain means cluster near the midpoint. The differences are modest and no inferential test of mean differences is reported. All four domains show 0.0% missingness in the demonstration data, which should not be assumed for field surveys.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and internal consistency

Domain	Mean (SD)	Cronbach's α	Missing (%)
Preparedness	3.204 (0.578)	0.762	0.0
Attitudes	3.065 (0.572)	0.749	0.0
Institutional support	3.107 (0.512)	0.669	0.0
Reported practices	3.280 (0.569)	0.751	0.0

Figure 2. Mean scores across four domains

Domain	Mean score (editable bar; scale 0–5)	Mean
Preparedness		3.204
Attitudes		3.065

Institutional support		3.107
Reported practices		3.280

Figure 2. Rounded bars represent the domain means on an assumed five-point scale; numeric means are exact as supplied.

3.3 Interpretation of domain means

The chart makes the modest ordering of domain means easier to see. It should not be read as evidence that teachers in Assam report stronger inclusive practices than attitudes. That proposition can only be tested using observations collected from the target population.

Figure 3. Internal consistency coefficients

Domain	α (editable bar; scale 0–1)	α
Preparedness		0.762
Attitudes		0.749
Institutional support		0.669
Reported practices		0.751

Figure 3. Illustrative Cronbach's alpha values. Institutional support has the lowest coefficient.

3.3 Reliability of the illustrative scales

Cronbach's alpha was 0.762 for preparedness, 0.751 for reported practices, 0.749 for attitudes and 0.669 for institutional support. The first three values suggest reasonably consistent responses in the constructed dataset; institutional support is comparatively weaker and would merit item-level review in a real pilot. Reliability does not establish validity, and synthetic coefficients cannot substitute for instrument testing with actual respondents.

3.4 Adjusted associations with reported practices

All four displayed adjusted coefficients were positive, with HC3 confidence intervals excluding zero. Institutional support was associated with reported practices ($B = 0.363$, 95% CI [0.280, 0.446], $p < .001$). Preparedness ($B = 0.270$, 95% CI [0.197, 0.344]) and attitudes ($B = 0.268$, 95% CI [0.195, 0.342]) were likewise positive, as was recent training ($B = 0.174$, 95% CI [0.086, 0.261]); each displayed $p < .001$. These are associations within constructed records and cannot establish causal effects of institutional support or training.

Table 3. Adjusted association model

Predictor	Adjusted B	95% CI (HC3)	p
Preparedness	0.270	[0.197, 0.344]	< .001
Attitudes	0.268	[0.195, 0.342]	< .001
Institutional support	0.363	[0.280, 0.446]	< .001
Recent training (yes)	0.174	[0.086, 0.261]	< .001

Figure 4. Adjusted regression coefficients

Predictor	Positive B (editable bar; scale 0–0.40)	B
Preparedness		0.270
Attitudes		0.268
Institutional support		0.363
Recent training (yes)		0.174

Figure 4. Unstandardised coefficients. Differences in predictor scales mean bar length alone should not be interpreted as relative importance.

3.5 Interpretation of adjusted coefficients

Institutional support has the largest displayed unstandardised coefficient. Because the predictors may differ in coding and variability, coefficient magnitude alone should not be used to rank their substantive importance. The adjusted model also included district, experience category, school type and gender. School identifiers were unavailable, so school-clustered uncertainty could not be calculated.

Figure 5. Model-explained variance

Portion	Share	Editable visual
Explained by model (R^2)	40.0 %	
Unexplained variation	60.0 %	

Figure 5. The synthetic model accounts for 40% of variation in reported practice scores. The bars show complementary shares, each out of 100%.

3.5 Model explanatory power

The regression model yielded $R^2 = 0.400$ and adjusted $R^2 = 0.381$, meaning that the included predictors explained 40.0% of the variation in synthetic practice scores, before adjustment for model complexity. The remaining 60.0% was not explained by this model. This is not an estimate of explained variance for actual Assam teachers. Additional factors worth examining in a field study include class size, specialist support, teaching resources and student needs.

3.6 Summary of Major Illustrative Findings

The analysis of the synthetic dataset produced the following observations:

1. The dataset contained 400 teacher records, equally distributed between Kamrup Metropolitan and Kamrup Rural districts.
2. Reported inclusive teaching practices obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.280$), while attitudes recorded the lowest ($M = 3.065$).
3. Preparedness, attitudes, and reported practices demonstrated acceptable illustrative internal consistency, whereas institutional support showed comparatively lower reliability.
4. Preparedness, attitudes, institutional support, and recent training were positively associated with reported inclusive teaching practices in the adjusted model.
5. Institutional support had the largest displayed unstandardised regression coefficient, suggesting its potential relevance for further investigation.
6. The regression model explained 40.0% of the variation in constructed practice scores.
7. The findings demonstrate the proposed analytical approach but require verification through actual field data before conclusions can be drawn about inclusive education in Assam.

Overall, the illustrative analysis provides a preliminary statistical framework for examining the relationship between teacher-related and institutional factors in inclusive education. It indicates how the proposed study could identify patterns of preparedness, attitudes, institutional support, and classroom practices. The findings should therefore be understood as methodological demonstrations rather than empirical evidence of educational conditions in Kamrup Metropolitan and Kamrup Rural districts.

4. Discussion

5.1 Contribution to knowledge

The study brings together three conditions that may shape inclusive teaching: teachers' preparedness, their attitudes towards inclusion, and the support provided by schools. Examining these factors in the same model would help distinguish their respective associations with

reported classroom practices in Kamrup Metropolitan and Kamrup Rural. Beyond comparing average scores, the analysis is intended to identify whether instructional confidence, willingness to accommodate diverse learners, or access to practical assistance merits closer attention. Any interpretation must consider the quality of the questionnaire and the precision of the estimates.

5.2 Implications for professional learning

Professional development is likely to be more useful when it addresses identifiable classroom tasks. For example, teachers may need guided practice in adapting lessons, varying assessment methods, communicating with families, or working with specialist personnel. Training could combine demonstrations, classroom-based assignments, peer observation, and feedback rather than relying solely on short awareness programmes. Comparisons by recent training exposure could indicate priorities for further investigation, but a cross-sectional association would not establish training effectiveness.

5.3 Institutional and policy implications

Inclusive practice also depends on school-level conditions. Headteachers and education authorities can examine whether teachers have accessible instructional materials, planning time, referral pathways, and opportunities to collaborate with colleagues. Aggregate results may help prioritise resources and professional support across different school contexts. Such comparisons should account for differences in staffing, enrolment, management, and location so that structural constraints are not mistaken for individual shortcomings.

5.4 Limitations

A cross-sectional survey captures perceptions at one point in time and cannot determine the direction of relationships. Teachers who use inclusive strategies may subsequently feel more prepared, while other factors, such as workload or leadership, may influence both preparedness and practice. Self-reported behaviour is also vulnerable to recall and social-desirability bias. Participation patterns and clustering within

schools can affect representativeness and statistical precision. Moreover, evidence from two districts cannot automatically be generalised to all schools in Assam.

5.5 Future research

A logical next step is to combine questionnaire responses with classroom observations, student-participation indicators, and interviews with teachers, families, and learners. Longitudinal studies could examine how practices change over time. Where feasible, intervention studies should compare structured professional learning or school-support programmes with appropriate comparison conditions, using baseline and follow-up measures to assess changes rather than relying only on participants' confidence.

5.6 Reporting and interpretation

The final empirical report should document recruitment, response rates, missing values, instrument revisions, and departures from the analysis plan. It should present effect sizes and confidence intervals alongside significance tests, and retain null or unexpected results. If multiple exploratory comparisons are performed, their exploratory status and risk of chance findings should be made clear. Ethical approval, funding, competing-interest declarations, and any journal-required reporting statements should be supplied accurately.

5.7 Equity and participant protection

Questionnaire wording should focus on teaching adjustments and barriers to participation without inviting respondents to identify children or speculate about diagnoses. Language adaptation should be checked with educators and, where possible, disability advocates. Findings should be reported in sufficiently large groups to protect respondents and avoid stigmatising particular schools. Lower scores in resource-constrained settings should be interpreted in light of the support available to teachers.

5. Conclusion

The present study was designed to examine the relationships among teacher preparedness, attitudes towards inclusive education,

institutional support, and inclusive classroom practices in Kamrup Metropolitan and Kamrup Rural districts of Assam. Inclusive education is not merely concerned with providing access to mainstream schools; it also requires creating supportive learning environments where students with diverse educational needs can participate meaningfully. In this context, teachers play a central role in translating inclusive education policies into everyday classroom practices.

The study adopted an integrated quantitative approach to examine how teachers' professional competencies, attitudes, and institutional conditions relate to their reported inclusive teaching practices. By considering these factors together, the research framework offers a broader understanding of the conditions that may facilitate or constrain inclusive education. It also recognises that teachers' willingness and preparedness alone may not be sufficient when schools lack appropriate instructional resources, professional guidance, accessible infrastructure, and administrative support.

An important contribution of the proposed research lies in its focus on the educational context of Assam, where differences in school resources, professional development opportunities, and institutional facilities may influence the implementation of inclusive education. Examining these dimensions across two districts could provide useful evidence for identifying areas requiring greater attention from educational administrators, teacher education institutions, and policymakers.

The study also emphasises the importance of strengthening teachers' professional competencies through continuous training, collaborative learning, and practical classroom support. Professional development programmes need to move beyond theoretical awareness of inclusive education and provide opportunities for teachers to develop skills in differentiated instruction, flexible assessment, classroom management, and addressing diverse learning needs. Similarly, institutional support should be viewed as an essential component of inclusive

education rather than an additional responsibility placed entirely on individual teachers.

Although the proposed research offers a systematic framework for investigating inclusive classroom practices, its cross-sectional design and reliance on self-reported information limit the conclusions that can be drawn about causal relationships and actual classroom performance. Future studies incorporating classroom observations, student participation indicators, and longitudinal research designs would provide a more comprehensive understanding of inclusive education.

In conclusion, meaningful inclusive education requires coordinated efforts involving teachers, school administrators, teacher education institutions, and educational authorities. Strengthening teacher preparedness, encouraging positive attitudes, and developing supportive school environments are important priorities for advancing inclusive education. The proposed study can contribute to these efforts by generating context-specific evidence to inform professional development, institutional planning, and future educational research in Assam.

7. Suggestions and Recommendations

1. Strengthening Teacher Training: Regular professional development programmes should be organised to improve teachers' knowledge and practical skills in inclusive teaching, differentiated instruction, and classroom management.

2. Improving Institutional Support: Schools should be provided with adequate teaching-learning materials, accessible infrastructure, assistive technologies, and professional guidance to support students with diverse educational needs.

3. Promoting Positive Teacher Attitudes: Awareness programmes, workshops, and collaborative activities should be encouraged to

develop positive attitudes towards students with disabilities and inclusive classroom practices.

4. Practical and Continuous Professional Development: Teacher training should emphasise classroom-based activities, practical demonstrations, peer learning, and follow-up support rather than relying exclusively on theoretical instruction.

5. Strengthening Collaboration: Greater cooperation among general teachers, special educators, school administrators, parents, and educational specialists should be encouraged to address learners' individual educational needs.

6. District-Specific Educational Planning: Educational authorities should assess differences in school resources, teacher training opportunities, and institutional facilities between Kamrup Metropolitan and Kamrup Rural to develop context-sensitive support programmes.

7. Monitoring Inclusive Classroom Practices: Schools should establish supportive monitoring and feedback mechanisms to assess the implementation of inclusive teaching strategies and identify areas requiring improvement.

8. Improving Teacher Education Programmes: Inclusive education should receive greater practical emphasis in pre-service teacher education programmes, including B.Ed. and integrated teacher education courses.

9. Strengthening Policy Implementation: Educational authorities should focus on translating the provisions of the National Education Policy 2020 and the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 into practical school-level initiatives.

10. Encouraging Further Research: Future studies should incorporate larger samples, classroom observations, student learning outcomes, and longitudinal or experimental designs to examine the effectiveness of inclusive education interventions.

6. References

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17(2), 129–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (3rd ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- de Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(3), 331–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903030089>
- Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., van Ewijk, R., & Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about inclusive education and insights on what contributes to those beliefs: A meta-analytical study. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34, 2609–2660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0>
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096>
- Forlin, C., & Chambers, D. (2011). Teacher preparation for inclusive education: Increasing knowledge but raising concerns. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2010.540850>
- Guillemot, F., Lacroix, F., & Nocus, I. (2022). Teachers' attitude towards inclusive education from 2000 to 2020: An extended meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 3, Article 100175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100175>
- Ismailos, L., Gallagher, T., Bennett, S., & Li, X. (2022). Pre-service and in-service teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs with regards to inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1642402>
- Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C. (2013). Do pre-service teachers feel ready to teach in inclusive classrooms? A four country study of teaching self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(1). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n1.10>
- Ministry of Education. (2020). *National education policy 2020*. Government of India. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf
- Mittler, P. (2000). *Working towards inclusive education: Social contexts*. David Fulton Publishers.
- Norwich, B. (2013). *Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: Living with uncertainty*. Routledge.
- Oliver, M. (1990). *The politics of disablement*. Macmillan.
- Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Nel, M., & Malinen, O.-P. (2012). Understanding teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy in inclusive education: Implications for pre-service and in-service teacher education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 27(1), 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2011.613603>
- Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 12(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x>
- Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*. Routledge.
- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718>

-
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. <https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>
- Wray, E., Sharma, U., & Subban, P. (2022). Factors influencing teacher self-efficacy for inclusive education: A systematic literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 117, Article 103800. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103800>
- Yada, A., Leskinen, M., Savolainen, H., & Schwab, S. (2022). Meta-analysis of the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes toward inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, Article 103521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103521>

7. Author Declaration

Originality Declaration: The author declares that this manuscript is an original work and that all sources have been appropriately acknowledged and cited. The statistical analysis is based on a synthetic dataset developed for illustrative and methodological purposes and does not represent actual field data.

Conflict of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest concerning the research, authorship, or publication of this paper.

Funding Declaration: No external funding was received for this study.