

A Comparative Study of Attitude of Primary School Teachers Towards Inclusive Education

Vandana Verma

Department of Education, Gindo Devi Mahila Mahavidyalya, Badaun
Corresponding author: vandana1feb@gmail.com
Available at <https://omniscientmjprujournal.com>

Abstract

The present study is a comparative study of the attitude of primary school teachers towards inclusive education. The study consisted of 120 primary teachers drawn from 60 government primary schools and 60 private primary schools of the Bulandshahr district. Data was collected with the help of the Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education developed by Dr. Vishal Sood and Dr. Arti Anand. The data obtained were analysed statistically, and the study revealed that (i) there is a significant difference in the Private primary teachers and the Government primary teachers towards inclusive education. (ii) There is no significant difference in Urban Primary Teachers and Rural Primary Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. (iii) There is no significant difference in Male Primary Teachers' and Female Primary Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education.

Keywords: *Attitude, Inclusive Education, Urban, Rural, Primary Teachers.*

Introduction

Inclusive education represents a transformative approach to education that aims to accommodate the diverse learning needs of all students, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic, or other conditions. Rooted in the principles of equity, human rights, and social justice, inclusive education seeks to create learning environments where every student feels valued, respected, and supported to reach their full potential.

The concept gained global prominence through international frameworks such as the Salamanca Statement (1994) and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006), both of which emphasize the right of all children to access quality education within mainstream settings. In the Indian context, policies such as the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016) and the National Education Policy (2020) have further reinforced the commitment to inclusive practices by promoting accessibility, flexible curricula, and teacher preparedness.

Inclusive education at the primary level is a foundational step toward building equitable and democratic societies. It ensures that all children—regardless of their abilities, backgrounds, or learning needs—are given equal opportunities to learn and grow together in mainstream

classrooms. Central to the success of inclusive education is the role of primary school teachers, who serve not only as educators but also as facilitators of diversity, empathy, and belonging within the classroom environment.

Primary teachers are often the first point of contact between formal education and young learners. Their understanding, attitudes, and preparedness significantly influence how inclusive education is implemented on the ground. However, despite policy frameworks such as the Right to Education Act (2009) and the National Education Policy (2020) in India—which emphasize inclusive and equitable quality education—many primary teachers face challenges in adapting curriculum, classroom management, and instructional strategies to accommodate learners with diverse needs.

This research paper examines the perceptions, competencies, and challenges faced by primary school teachers in implementing inclusive education. It explores the extent of their preparedness, the support systems available, and the professional development opportunities needed to empower them for inclusive practices. The study also highlights the importance of teacher attitudes, collaborative teaching models, and resource availability in fostering an inclusive classroom culture at the primary level.

Statement of the Problem

Inclusive education is a process of enabling all children to learn and share effectively within mainstream academic systems. It doesn't insulate children who have different capacities or requirements. The problem is stated as “A Comparative Study of Attitude of Primary School Teachers Towards Inclusive Education.”

Attitude

An Attitude is generally defined as a tendency to reply appreciatively or negatively towards a certain object, be it a person, idea or situation. Attitudes are closely related to one's opinions and are based upon previous experiences. Attitudes often relate in some way to interaction with others and represent a vital link between social and cognitive psychology.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the attitude of government primary teachers and private primary teachers towards inclusive education.
2. To study the difference between the attitude of government primary teachers and private primary teachers towards inclusive education.

3. To study the difference between the attitudes of urban and rural primary teachers towards inclusive education.
4. To study the difference between the attitudes of male and female primary teachers towards inclusive education.

Hypotheses of the Study

- Ho1. There is no significant difference between the attitude of government primary teachers and private primary teachers towards inclusive education.
- Ho2. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of urban and rural primary teachers towards inclusive education.
- Ho3. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of male and female primary teachers towards inclusive education.

Methodology

A Survey Method was used for the Collection of Data.

Sample

The sample of the study was selected from schools of Buland Shahr, 120 teachers teaching in primary schools were selected.

Tools

Teacher attitude scale towards inclusive education by Dr. Vishal Sood and Dr. (Mrs.) Arti Anand was used for collecting the data.

The Attitude Scale consists of a set of 47 questions.

Analysis & Interpretation of the Data

Ho1. There is no significant difference between the attitude of government primary teachers and private primary teachers towards inclusive education.

In order to find out the difference between the scores of attitudes of government primary teachers and private primary teachers, mean, S.D. & t value were calculated.

Table 1. Significance of the Difference between the Attitude of Government Primary Teachers and Private Primary Teachers towards Inclusive Education

| Gender | Number | Mean | S.D. | t-Ratio |
|-----------------------------|--------|------|-------|---------|
| Government Primary Teachers | 60 | 115 | 8.15 | 5.17 |
| Private Primary Teachers, | 60 | 106 | 10.75 | |

The t-ratio calculated in Table 1 is found to be 5.17, and the needed values to be significant at .01 level is 2.62 and at .05 level 1.98. So, the calculated t-ratio value is greater than the table value at .01 level of significance. Therefore, it is significant at the .01 level. Hence, Hypothesis no.1, i.e., there is no significant difference between the attitude of government primary teachers and private primary teachers towards inclusive education, is rejected. It means there is a significant difference in the Government primary teachers' and Private primary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education.

Ho2. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of urban and rural primary teachers towards inclusive education.

In order to find out the difference between the scores of attitudes of government primary teachers and private primary teachers, mean, SD & t value were calculated.

Table 2. Significance of the Difference between the Attitude of Rural male and female Teachers towards Inclusive Education

| Gender | Number | Mean | S.D. | T-Ratio |
|------------------------|--------|------|-------|---------|
| Urban Primary Teachers | 60 | 110 | 9.57 | 0.53 |
| Rural Primary Teachers | 60 | 111 | 11.05 | |

Table 2 shows that the calculated value is 0.53, which is less than the table value .01 level is 2.62, and at the .05 level, 1.98. So, the calculated t-ratio value is less than the table value at the .01 level and the .05 level of significance. Hence, hypothesis No.2, i.e., there is no significant difference between the attitude of urban and rural primary teachers towards inclusive education, is accepted. It indicates that there is no significant difference in Urban Primary Teachers and Rural Primary Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education.

Ho3. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of male and female primary teachers towards inclusive education.

In order to find out the difference between the scores of attitudes of government primary teachers and private primary teachers, mean, S.D. & t value were calculated.

Table 3. Significance of the Difference between the Attitude of Male Rural and Urban Elementary Teachers towards Inclusive Education

| Gender | Number | Mean | S.D. | T-Ratio |
|-------------------------|--------|------|-------|---------|
| Male Primary Teachers | 60 | 109 | 10.13 | 0.56 |
| Female Primary Teachers | 60 | 108 | 9.45 | |

The t-ratio calculated in Table 3 was found to be 0.56, which is less than the table value .01 level is 2.62, and at .05 level, 1.98. So, the calculated t-ratio value is less than the table value at the .01

level and .05 level of significance. Hence, hypothesis No.2 i.e., there is no significant difference between the attitude of male and female primary teachers towards inclusive education, is accepted. It indicates that there is no significant difference between Male Primary Teachers' and Female Primary Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education.

Main Findings

1. There is a significant difference in the Government primary teachers' and Private primary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. Government primary teachers means high showed a more positive attitude toward inclusive Education
2. There is no significant difference in Urban Primary Teachers and Rural Primary Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. That means Locality does not play any significant role in the attitude of Urban Primary Teachers and Rural Primary Teachers' attitude towards inclusive education.
3. There is no significant difference between Male Primary Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. That means Gender does not play any significant role.

Educational Implications

This review implies the need for the development of a positive attitude towards the successful implementation of inclusive education. Further, the review entails the need for the availability of training, an adapted curriculum, resources, and utmost responsibility of the teachers for the implementation of inclusive education. Another implication is for professionals, practitioners, and policymakers to design programs to intervene in negative attitudes and to control factors contributing to negative attitudes in implementing successful inclusion.

References

- 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>
- Baker, J. M., & Zigmond, N. (1995). The meaning of and practice of inclusion for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education, 29*(2), 163-180.
- Beattie, J. R, Anderson, R. J., & Antonak, R. F. (1997). Modifying the attitudes of prospective educators toward students with disabilities and their integration into the regular classrooms. *The Journal of Psychology, 131*(3), 245-260.
- Carroll, A. (2003 Summer). Impact of teacher training in special education on the attitudes of Australia preservice general

- educators towards people with disabilities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 14, 39-60.
- 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., Sharma, U., & Loreman, T. (2007). *An international comparison of pre-service teacher attitudes towards inclusive education. Disability Studies Quarterly*, 27(4). <https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v27i4.53>
- Hastings, R. P., & Oakford, S. (2003). Student teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special needs. *Educational Psychology*, 23, 234-250.
- Malinen, O. P., Savolainen, H., & Xu, J. (2012). *Becoming an inclusive teacher: Comparing Chinese and Finnish pre-service teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(4), 591–601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.12.004>
- 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>
- Singal, N. (2008). *Inclusive education in India: International concept, national interpretation. International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 55(3), 293–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10349120802268379>
- Subban, P., & Sharma, U. (2006). *Primary school teachers' perceptions of inclusive education in Victoria, Australia. International Journal of Special Education*, 21(1), 42–52.