Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (JIMR)
E-ISSN:1936-6264| Impact Factor: 6.886|
Vol. 16 Issue 3, March- 2021
Available online at: https://www.jimrjournal.com/
(An open access scholarly, peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary, monthly, and fully refereed journal.)

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN INDIA: NEED TO THINK ABOUT THE SKILL OF TEACHERS

M.Singh and N. Maharshi
Department of Education, S. K. D. University, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan, India.
monu.kitu@gmail.com

Abstract

This study looked at how well-equipped normal primary and secondary school teachers in Suratgarh, India are to work with pupils who have disabilities in settings that promote inclusive education. A two-part questionnaire was used to poll a total of 4 primary school teachers and 4 secondary school teachers. The first section of the questionnaire gathered background data on the respondents. The teachers were asked to rate their present ability levels against a list of competencies necessary to implement inclusion in the second part of the exercise. t-tests and descriptive statistics were used to assess the data. The main findings were that around 80% of regular school instructors lacked special education training and had no prior experience working with children who were disabled. Additionally, 85% of the educators lacked access to support the services offered in their classes. Finally, despite rating their own competence for interacting with kids with disabilities as limited or poor, neither primary nor secondary school teachers' assessed ability levels were statistically different. In terms of several strategies that can raise teacher quality for inclusive education, the implications for teacher preparation in India are examined.

Keywords: inclusive education; theory; special need student; amendment; implementation.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are so many disabled individuals in a country like India, their problems are so complicated, there are so few resources accessible, and social attitudes are so harmful, only law can eventually bring about a significant change that is uniform. Long-term, effective legislation would have profoundly liberating effects (p. 273-274). Sharma & Baquer (1997).The Persons with Disabilities (PWD) Act, which was passed in 1995, marked the beginning of a new era for the education of children with disabilities in India. The inclusion and full involvement of kids with impairments in regular classrooms was one of the laws main priorities. It promised against discrimination and the eradication of obstacles, both real and imagined, to promote students' inclusion. Students with disabilities into normal schools. It advised decision-makers in the areas of legislation, education, parenting, and other service providers to take into account the idea that special education should be viewed as both a separate educational setting and an essential component of ordinary education. It sought to introduce research-based special education knowledge and the methodical implementation of effective teaching strategies for the education of disabled children enrolled in regular education classes. Thus, the adoption of social justice, equity, and school effectiveness reform literature from the west gave Indian educators a strong justification for including

students with disabilities in their classrooms. A variety of stakeholders have argued for the 1995 Act's change during the past ten years. The Center for Disability Studies at the University of Hyderabad is creating a working draft of the PWD Act, 2011, which is expected to be passed in 2012 (Deccan Herald, January 14, 2012). Changes have been made to the new draft legislation in a number of areas, including the right to education and the provision for inclusive education. This is due to the fact that, despite efforts, the PWD Act of 1995's activities, including educational accommodations for students with disabilities, remained insufficient. Numerous studies have revealed that India's teacher preparation programs are inadequate, particularly when it comes to inclusive education.

All pupils should have access to educational opportunities (Bindal & Sharma, 2010; Sharma & Desai, 2002; Swaroop, 2001). Although some teachers are able to apply their training to actual teaching practices to encourage the inclusion of people with disabilities, other studies demonstrate that teachers who have received training are still apprehensive about implementing inclusion (Sharma & Desai, 2002).The PWD Act's shortcomings, which forced the current education reform, included the limited application of the Act's provisions and a lack of clarification regarding the circumstances in which specific services might be offered. This ambiguity in terms of inclusive education led to misunderstandings about what inclusive meant and how to apply it in classrooms and schools. Many ordinary school teachers were worried that include students may hinder their capacity to teaching students in the usual way, using a didactic approach (Jangira, Singh, & Yadav, 1995). According to anecdotal data, teachers found it challenging to accept the idea that social skills and peer connections were just as important in the context of school as intellectual topics. 's parents According to reports, non-disabled kids thought inclusion was likely to have unforeseen repercussions including reducing their own kids' scholastic possibilities. Were the reservations or obstacles to acceptance held by these diverse vested interest groups only psychological in nature? Were they just logistics issues? Or were they a hybrid of these two viewpoints? Whatever they were, the following fact stood out: With the passage of the Persons with Disabilities Act in 1995, ordinary school teachers were required to take on a number of new tasks and obligations. Therefore, if the Act's spirit and aim were put into reality, it was anticipated to have a positive impact on the provision of services and the educational condition of India's 12.6 million children with disabilities. The idea that normal classroom teachers would need to have the proper attitudes, knowledge, and abilities in order to execute their new tasks and responsibilities was a natural corollary of this Act. According to Romi and Leyser (2006), teachers who are in favor of including students with disabilities in regular education classes use more effective teaching tactics than those who are against it.

According to other researchers, there is a link between teachers' favorable attitudes and the improved performance of disabled students who are integrated in regular education classes (Cook, 2001; Ross-Hill, 2009). According to published research, instructors' classroom behavior is strongly influenced by their understanding of their students' learning qualities and the effects they have (Philpott, Furey, & Penney, 2010; Pinar & Sucuoglou, 2011) on

learning processes. Now more than ever, regular school teachers must be sensitive to the academic requirements, learning preferences, and levels of motivation of students with disabilities. They would be asked to create suitable teaching aids and modify curriculum to accommodate the needs of students with impairments. They would be expected to specifically create, administer, and evaluate the educational program, which had to be based on the evaluated needs of the students. Additionally, they would have to collaborate with parents, other support providers, special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and paraprofessionals, as well as attend IEP meetings (Ashman & Elkins, 2009). Regular school teachers must adhere to certain standards in inclusive education classes, according to Kochhar & West (1996).

Teach content in a unique way: it must be multidisciplinary, integrative, and flexible. The emphasis changes from teaching to learning in the inclusive classroom as opposed to traditional, teacher-centered instructional approaches, which have the teacher stand in front of the class and "lecture" to the entire group. These writers go on to say that it is now mandatory for ordinary classroom teachers to set up environments that maximize active student learning.

For admittance into professional practice in special education, the Council for Exceptional Children (1996) created and verified a shared core of minimal essential knowledge and abilities. In particular, they covered the following topics: 1. the philosophical, historical, and legal underpinnings of special education; 2. learner characteristics; 3. assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation; 4. instructional content and practice; 5. planning and managing the teaching and learning environment; 6. controlling student behavior and social interaction skills; 7. communication and collaborative partnerships; and 8. professionalism and ethical practice. Teachers of conventional classrooms may not necessarily need to be proficient in all of the CEC common core skills, but they still need to be when including students with disabilities in their classes (Daniels & Vaughn, 1999).

According to Philpott et al. (2011) normal school teachers would require a number of accommodations for kids with impairments in the typical classroom setting. Peer tutoring, group learning, mastery learning, and applied behavior analysis are a few of these. The research also shows that in order to support the learning of students with special needs, typical classroom teachers must employ instructional strategies such multi-level education, differentiated instruction, activity-based learning, and personalised and adaptive instruction. an updated. If inclusive education initiatives were to be successfully implemented, conventional school teachers in India would need to possess a wider range of knowledge and abilities.This study carried on that research by examining how Indian normal school teachers, who are pioneering the implementation of inclusion programs in their classrooms, perceive their readiness for inclusion. The study's main research questions were as follows:

1. How well-versed in working with pupils with disabilities do primary and secondary regular school instructors in Delhi, India currently feel they are? Do instructors in primary and secondary schools currently view their ability levels to be at significantly different levels?

Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (JIMR)
E-ISSN:1936-6264| Impact Factor: 6.886|
Vol. 16 Issue 3, March- 2021
Available online at: https://www.jimrjournal.com/
(An open access scholarly, peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary, monthly, and fully refereed journal.)

Method Subjects and Environment

For this study, participants were chosen using a cluster sampling technique. To choose participants from both primary and secondary schools, the identical process was carried out again. selection of primary school instructors. Schools of Suratgarh area were selected for this. Then, all educators from the chosen schools were invited to take part in the research. From 9 schools in Suratgarh, a total of 4 primary school teachers were polled. A total of 223 complete questionnaires were received, for a response rate of 63.77%.. These school districts were chosen because they included both urban and rural schools, as well as several that had an inclusive education program in place. There are 5 secondary schools in all across these areas. Every teacher from the chosen schools received an invitation to take part in the study. 18 instructors in total from 9 schools were polled. With 130 complete questionnaires returned, the response percentage was 40.85%.

Instrumentation and research design

For this investigation, a survey design was used. The data from the respondents was gathered in this study using a two-part questionnaire.

The purpose of the first section of the questionnaire was to gather background data about the primary and secondary school instructors. The respondents were specifically questioned about their (a) special education training, (b) experience teaching students with disabilities, and (c) access to support services like paraprofessionals (e.g., speech therapists, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, etc.), special education teachers, and the availability of resource room services.

A modified version of the Essential Teacher Competencies Questionnaire, created by Gear and Gable in the United States in 1979, used as the second component of the survey termed "Inclusion Competencies of Indian Teachers" (ICIT). The 50 items made up the initial questionnaire, which was organized into ten competency groups. The instrument was designed with the utmost care to be sensitive to the distinct socio-politico-economic and educational traditions of India. Terminology was changed to conform to the Indian legal, social, and educational systems. For instance, mainstreaming was replaced by integration. A group of Indian special education specialists were then shown the tool to review the questionnaire items. The experts' recommendations were examined and added to the questionnaire. The 52 items that made up the final survey instrument were. The ten competency categories formed a cluster of these components. Participants in the poll used a Likert scale, which 1 = Not at all capable to 4 = Highly proficient was the response. These were the groups: (1) Expertise about children with special needs (2) An accepting classroom environment (3) Open contact with parents, the community, and coworkers (4) Needs analysis of the children (five) School management (6) goal-setting (7) classroom learning resources (8) teaching methods (9) customized curricula (10) student progress evaluation. The respondents had access to two versions of the ICIT questionnaire. One was written in English, and the other was prepared in Hindi after being carefully translated by two professionals in Delhi.

Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (JIMR)
E-ISSN:1936-6264| Impact Factor: 6.886|
Vol. 16 Issue 3, March- 2021
Available online at: https://www.jimrjournal.com/
(An open access scholarly, peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary, monthly, and fully refereed journal.)

Pilot Exams

Before being administered to the sample chosen for the study, the survey tool was pre-tested on a small population. The purpose of the pilot study was to provide the researchers to (a) assess whether the questionnaire's items would generate information from which conclusions may be made to address research questions. (b) generate data that could help the questionnaire be improved in some way, ensuring that respondents would accept it in its whole. 22 teachers from Suratgarh's primary schools and 16 teachers from secondary schools made up the pilot group. These educators were tasked with analyzing the questionnaire seriously by answering the following inquiries:

(A) Are the skills stated in the questionnaire those that regular school teachers need to have in order to effectively work with children with disabilities? What may be changed—added, corrected, modified, or removed?

(b) Are the instructions obvious? If not, how might they be made better?

(c) Is the language precise? If if not, how can it be made better?

The pilot group offered both written and vocal input. The majority of the ideas were related to abstract ideas, things that weren't relevant to the classroom settings of these teachers, and things that weren't important enough to be asked about in the survey. The primary issue raised by the pilot respondents related to the survey's length. The pilot group's suggestions were taken into account, and a few small changes were made to the questionnaire. The majority of the modifications involved rewording and rephrasing the survey items. Nothing was changed or removed. The final data analysis did not contain the pilot data.

Inclusion Competencies of Indian Teachers (ICIT) Factor analysis: Psychometric Properties. The original questionnaire's ten competency areas were created based on if not, how can it be made better? based on suggestions made by US special education specialists (Gear & Gable, 1979). As recommended by Indian experts, two more questions were included to the questionnaire. The combined data from the study sample (N = 223 primary school teachers and N = 130 secondary school teachers) was subjected to factor analysis in order to confirm the adequacy of the categories and to offer statistical support for the factors to be utilized with the updated instrument. Ten components with eigenvalues larger than 1 were found by the principal axis factor analysis (see Table 1). According to the primary and secondary school teachers' responses, the collected elements offered some support for the competency categories that had been developed in the redesigned questionnaire. Ten factors that were not rotated and accounted for 68% of the variance are shown in Table 1. It should be emphasized that the use of both the 10 distinct category subtotals and the total-scale score was supported by the strong first factor checking for dependability. According to DeVellis (2003), a dependability co-efficient of.70 is enough for research. The redesigned ten-factor scale's reliability research revealed that the ICIT was a valid tool for assessing instructors' present levels of competency. The overall scale's alpha value was.94. Furthermore, each ICIT sub-scale has an alpha value of at least.80. As a result, the overall ICIT scale and its ten subscales corresponded favorably with the recognized dependability standards (See Table 2).

Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (JIMR)
E-ISSN:1936-6264| Impact Factor: 6.886|
Vol. 16 Issue 3, March- 2021
Available online at: https://www.jimrjournal.com/
(An open access scholarly, peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary, monthly, and fully refereed journal.)

Results

Analysis of part-one of the questionnaire of primary school teachers indicated that a vast majority of them, 146 (67.59%) had not received any training in special education skills. Further, a greater number of the teachers, 169 (77.88%), indicated that they did not have any experience working with special needs children. These issues were further compounded when 184 teachers (86.38%) reported that they did not have access to support services such as special education teachers, paraprofessionals or resource room services in their schools. Table 3 provides information on primary school teachers' background variables.

Table 1. Principal Axis Factors Un-rotated Solutions: Eigenvalues and Explained Variance

Factors	Sum Squares of Loading	% Variance	Cumulative %
1	20.597	39.609	39.609
2	3.658	7.304	46.644
3	2.011	3.867	50.511
4	1.763	3.391	53.902
5	1.584	3.046	56.947
6	1.355	2.606	59.553
7	1.231	2.367	61.921
8	1.123	2.159	64.080
9	1.059	2.036	66.116
10	1.043	2.006	68.122

Table 2. Alpha Values for the ICIT Sub-scales and the Total-scale

Sub-scales (competency categories)	Alpha
Professional Knowledge	.80
Classroom Climate	.86
Collaboration	.87
Assessment	.83
Classroom Management	.85
Goal Setting	.85
Resource Management	.86
Instructional Techniques	.83
Individualized Instruction	.83
Evaluation	.82
ICIT Total	.90

Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (JIMR)
E-ISSN:1936-6264| Impact Factor: 6.886|
Vol. 16 Issue 3, March- 2021
Available online at: https://www.jimrjournal.com/
(An open access scholarly, peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary, monthly, and fully refereed journal.)

Table 3. Distribution of Primary School Teachers by their Background Variables

Variable		No. of Respondents	% of Sample
Training in Special Education	Yes	7	32.41
No		46	67.59
Experience in Teaching Students with Disabilities	None	69	77.88
	0-2 years	3	10.60
	2-5 years	3	6.91
	5-10 years	1	1.38
	10 above years	0	3.23
Access to Support Services	Yes	2	13.62
	No	18	86.38

Similar results were obtained when secondary school teachers' responses were analyzed. Of the total number of respondents only 41 (32.28%) indicated that they had received some training to work with students with disabilities. 80 (62.99%) teachers indicated that they did not have any experience teaching students with disabilities. An overwhelming majority of the teachers, 111 (87.40%) did not have access to support services in their schools. Table 4 provides information on secondary school teachers' background variables.

Table 4. Distribution of Secondary School Teachers by their Background Variables

Variable		No. of Respondents	% of Sample
Training in Special Education	Yes	41	32.28
	No	86	67.72
Experience in Teaching Students	None	80	62.99
with Disabilities	Under 2 years	19	14.96
	3-5 years	10	7.87
	6-10 years	11	8.66
	Over 10 years	7	5.51
Access to Support Services	Yes	16	12.60
	No	111	87.40

The second questionnaire section was examined to ascertain teachers' perceived ability levels at the time. To determine the teachers' perceived present competence levels in each of the 10 ICIT competency categories, the following approaches were used:

(a) Means were calculated for each competency category by aggregating instructors' ratings of their present skill levels for each competency statement in the category, then dividing the total score by the category's number of items.

(b) To show the teachers' respective current skill levels in each competency category, the categories were then ranked from highest to lowest in terms of mean scores.

Teachers who thought they were moderately or extremely skilled in that competency would have a mean score above 3.0. A mean score of less than 3.0 would suggest that teachers felt they lacked that skill. Competency categories would also be subject to the scoring structure

Current Skill Levels of Primary School Teachers

For each of the ICIT competency areas, the averages and standard deviations of primary school teachers' perceived ability levels are shown in Table 5. Additionally shown are the mean and standard deviation for the entire ICIT scale. The order of the means was used to determine the ranks for each category. Primary school teachers in Delhi evaluated themselves as not competent in each competency category since all of the mean scores were below 3.0. A overall scale-score of 2.40 backed up that claim as well. However, they evaluated themselves higher in comparison to others in Professional Knowledge (rank #10) against Classroom Climate (rank #1). Individual competencies were further examined, and it was discovered that competency #9 (Provide a friendly, supportive classroom climate, mean = 3.11) revealed the greatest rated present skill level for each participant. The elementary school teachers in Delhi only regarded themselves as being moderately skilled in this one area. Competency #8 (Build a trustworthy relationship with students via fairness, consistency, and openness, mean = 2.93) was the next one, but it failed to fulfill the requirements for being moderately competent. They identified competency #2 (Compare and contrast different administrative methods, such as traveling teachers, resource rooms, and special courses for students with disabilities) as their lowest ability level disabilities, mean = 1.91).

Current skill levels as perceived by secondary school teachers

For each of the ICIT competency areas, the averages and standard deviations of secondary school teachers' perceived ability levels are shown in Table 6. Additionally included are the total ICIT scale's adjusted mean and standard deviation. The order of the means was used to determine the ranks for each category. Secondary school teachers in Delhi evaluated themselves as not competent in each competency category since all of the mean scores were below 3.0. A overall scale-score of 2.38 backed up that claim as well. However, when compared to professional knowledge (rank #10), they evaluated themselves higher in the classroom climate (rank #1). This outcome was comparable to what was discovered with primary school

Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (JIMR)
E-ISSN:1936-6264| Impact Factor: 6.886|
Vol. 16 Issue 3, March- 2021
Available online at: https://www.jimrjournal.com/
(An open access scholarly, peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary, monthly, and fully refereed journal.)

instructors. When individual competencies were examined, it was discovered that secondary school teachers ranked competency #9 (Create a welcoming, supportive classroom climate, mean = 2.98) as their highest assessed present skill level. Despite the fact that this result was quite near to qualifying them as reasonably competent, they fell short of the requirements because it lacked a mean of at least 3.0. They identified competency #2 (Compare and contrast various administrative approaches such as itinerant instructors, resource rooms, and special classes for supporting students with disabilities, mean = 1.77) as having the lowest skill level as their lowest competency.

Table 5. Primary School Teachers' Perceived Current Skill Levels

Competency Category	Mean	SD	Rank
Professional Knowledge	2.18	.70	10
Classroom Climate	2.79	.79	1
Collaboration	2.33	.82	5.5
Assessment	2.24	.77	8
Classroom Management	2.52	.74	3
Goal Setting	2.44	.76	4
Resource Management	2.21	.74	9
Instructional Techniques	2.59	.73	2
Individualized Instruction	2.33	.74	5.5
Evaluation	2.30	.77	7
TOTAL ICIT	2.40	.63	

Table 6. Secondary School Teachers' Perceived Current Skill Levels

Competency Category	Mean	SD	Rank
Professional Knowledge	1.97	.69	10
Classroom Climate	2.67	.90	1
Collaboration	2.18	.74	8.5
Assessment	2.18	.74	8.5
Classroom Management	2.52	.93	3
Goal Setting	2.38	.82	4
Resource Management	2.26	.87	7
Instructional Techniques	2.64	.73	2
Individualized Instruction	2.37	.73	5
Evaluation	2.34	.80	6
TOTAL ICIT	2.38	.60	

Primary School Teachers' Perceived Skill Levels Compared to Secondary School Teachers

In each of the ten competency categories of the ICIT, mean ratings for primary and secondary school teachers' perceived current skill levels were compared using t-tests. The findings showed that, with the exception of Professional Knowledge, there were no significant variations between primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions of their current ability levels. There was no discernible difference between the two groups of instructors' estimated present ability levels when the total-scale score of the ICIT was compared ($p>.05$).

Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (JIMR)
E-ISSN:1936-6264| Impact Factor: 6.886|
Vol. 16 Issue 3, March- 2021
Available online at: https://www.jimrjournal.com/
(An open access scholarly, peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary, monthly, and fully refereed journal.)

Discussion

This study has a dual goal in mind. The first section sought to determine whether Suratgarh's regular school teachers (a) had special education training (b) had access to auxiliary services & (c) the duration of their employment with students with disabilities. The second section of the study was to learn how participants perceived their proficiency in the competencies mentioned in ICIT.

The findings revealed that approximately 70% of Suratgarh's regular school instructors had neither special education training nor prior experience working with children who were disabled. Even more concerning was the discovery that almost 87% of the professors lacked access to services for support in their classrooms. Therefore, it is not unexpected that teachers rate their own competency in each of the ten competency categories as being low. According to research, instructors' unfavorable attitudes and a lack of necessary abilities make it difficult to implement inclusive education programs successfully (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996; Swaroop, 2001). Western country experiences show that implementing such educational reforms has not been simple. Several authors have noted that school institutions are particularly resistant to change, hostile to the introduction of new ideas, and resistant to implementation of novel concepts, particularly if they have educators who lack the necessary expertise to bring about the desired transformation.

Table 7. Differences between Means for Primary and Secondary School Teachers' Perceived Current Skill Levels in Competency Categories with Significance Tests

Competency Category	Primary School Teachers (N=223) M	SD	Secondary School Teachers (N=130) M	SD	t
Professional Knowledge	2.18	.70	1.97	.69	2.76**
Classroom Climate	2.79	.79	2.67	.90	1.25
Collaboration	2.33	.82	2.18	.74	1.75
Assessment	2.24	.77	2.18	.74	.71
Classroom Management	2.52	.74	2.52	.93	.05
Goal Setting	2.44	.76	2.38	.82	.61
Resource Management	2.21	.74	2.26	.87	-.51
Instructional techniques	2.59	.73	2.63	.73	-.56
Individualized Instruction	2.33	.74	2.37	2.37	-.55
Evaluation	2.30	.77	2.34	.80	-.48
TOTAL ICIT	2.40	.63	2.38	.60	.32

** p<.01

According to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2006), people feel scared and steer clear of circumstances in which they are incompetent. The overwhelming majority of research has proven this to be true, showing that regular education teachers who have not received sufficient training to work with students with disabilities are more likely to oppose the implementation of inclusive education programs (Bindal & Sharma, 2010; Kuyini & Desai, 2008).The research on effective education also shows that change in education happens in classrooms. The person in authority and the driving force behind change in the classroom is the teacher. The program's likelihood of success could be in peril if the teacher lacks confidence in their ability to address the educational needs of kids with impairments. The findings of this study have significant ramifications for university staff in India who are in charge of pre-service and in-service teacher training.

First and foremost, university staff in India who is in charge of creating programs for educating regular school teachers must make a deliberate effort to assess their teacher preparation programs, especially in light of the PWD Act's adoption and the proposed revisions. Existing pre-service programs need to be updated to add more curriculum and practicum opportunities pertaining to the education of students with special needs. The competences (professional knowledge, assessment, teamwork, and evaluation) where teachers indicated significantly lower skill levels should receive extra attention. Other developing skills, such mastery of the use of The inclusion of assistive technology in teacher preparation programs may also need to be taken into account.

According to this study, there is a pressing need to close the ability gap between teachers' existing skill levels and what is required to conduct successful inclusive education programs. There should be enough possibilities for professional growth for regular school teachers who are already employed. One-time lectures or workshops don't seem to be the solution in this case. The availability of continual professional development opportunities for ordinary school instructors is preferable. According to the literature, in-service programs that are a part of a long-term, systematic staff development strategy are better for instructors than one-off, short-term programs (David & Kuyini, 2012). The planning of development programs in India should also take into account a "bottom up" strategy rather than a "top down" one for deciding on the structure and content of training programs. This would increase the program's relevance and significance for the participants while also assisting in reducing teacher isolation. There has been a shift in recent years from training that is loosely based on the expressed needs and preferences of teachers to training that is more closely aligned with those needs and preferences, away from a narrow control of in-service education programs by school administrators and/or university professors (Sharma & Deppeler, 2005).

It is also suggested that the training programs for these educators be made more accessible due to India's vast teacher population and the country's limited financial resources. The train-the-trainer model should be used while working with teachers. In the initial phase,

training should be given to one teacher from each school. This teacher will then be required to lead training sessions for all of the instructors in his or her school. Although the India-Australia Training and Capacity Building Program has successfully adopted this methodology, others (Wedell, 2005) have issued a warning that this model does not lead to sustainability. According to Wedell (2005), educational change planners must work to make sure that teachers are supported as fully as possible by their immediate and larger working environments in order for educational change to be implemented in classrooms more or less as intended (p. 12). Because of this, policymakers might think about implementing programs for teacher preparation and development that are located on schools.

It has the potential to long-term increase teaching quality by allowing for on-the-job and in-residence teacher training. This is a choice for policymakers in India, particularly in light of the requirement in Article 23L(2) of the draft modified PWD Act's section on teacher qualifications that all educators have received training in teaching students with disabilities in inclusive settings (p. 71). This would more sustainably increase teacher capabilities for inclusive education across India. In this study, a sizable majority of participants (almost 87%) said they lacked access to support services in their schools. The availability of support services is universally acknowledged in the special education educational reform literature as being essential to the success of programs for inclusive education. Many scholars have claimed that the implementation of inclusion in regular schools is synonymous with the provision of suitable support services (Bindal & Sharma, 2010; Sharma & Desai, 2002; Singal, 2006). If the Indian government wants ordinary school teachers to be able to address the requirements of kids with disabilities in their classrooms, it follows that they must have access to the required support services.

Conclusion

While the findings of this study offer insightful understandings about teachers'. They support the claim that knowing how teachers' values are incorporated inside the classroom may be the first step in finding the best ways to train teachers (Taylor & Sobel, 2001). They also demonstrate preparedness to implement inclusive education initiatives in their schools. Future studies should take into account additional techniques for assessing teacher preparedness, such as in-person or focus group interviews, as well as classroom observations. Other stakeholders' replies, such as those from administrators, teacher educators, special education teachers, and parents of disabled children, might also be useful in confirming the answers from regular school instructors. Additional research is also needed to determine the causes of decreased perceived skill levels. the number of students with disabilities in the class, the size of the class, and the degree of the disability. Teachers' preparation for inclusive education may also be influenced by the environment and support provided by school staff.

References

Ashman, A. & Elkins, J. (2009). *Educating students with diverse disabilities*. French Forest (NSW): Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (2006). *Social cognitive theory.* In S. Rogelberg (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Baquer, A. & Sharma, A. (1997). *Disability: Challenges vs. response*. New Delhi: Concerned Action Now.

Bender, W. N., Vail, C.O., & Scott, K. (1995). Teachers' attitudes toward increased mainstreaming: Implementing effective instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 28(2), 87-94.

Bindal, S. & Sharma, S. (2010). Inclusive education in Indian context. *Journal of Indian Education*, 35(4), 34-45.

Buell, M., Hallam, R. & Gamel McCormick, M. (1999). A survey of special and general education teachers' perceptions and inservice needs concerning inclusion. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 46(2), 143-156.

Cook, B. G. (2001). A comparison of teachers' attitudes toward their included students with mild and severe disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, 34(4), 203-213.

Daniels, V. I. & Vaughn, S. (1999). A tool to encourage best practices in full inclusion. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 31(5), 48-55.

David, R. & Kuyini, A.B. (2012) Social inclusion: Teachers as facilitators in peer acceptance of students with disabilities in regular classrooms in Tamil Nadu, India. *International Journal of Special Education*, 27(2), 1-12. Deccan Herald (Jan. 14, 2012). New law soon to replace Persons with Disabilities Act: Govt. URL:http://www.deccanherald.com/content/129195/law-soon-replace-persons-disabilities.html

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and implications.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Gable, R. K., Pecheone, R. L., & Gillung, T. B. (1981). A needs assessment model for establishing personnel training priorities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 4(4), 8-15.

Gear, G. & Gable, R. (1979). Educating handicapped children in the regular classroom: Needs assessment in teacher preparation. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 12(4), 36-45.

Jain, S. (2011). Knowledge, attitude and practice of regular school teachers with reference to inclusive education for children with disabilities. *Indian Journal of Community Psychology*, 7(1), 59-64.

Jangira, N. K., Singh, A., & Yadav, S. K. (1995). Teacher policy, training needs and perceived status of teachers. *Indian Educational Review*, 30(1), 113-122.

Kochhar, C. A. & West, L. L. (1996). *Handbook for successful inclusion.* . Kuyini, A. B. & Desai, I. (2008). Providing instruction to students with special needs in inclusive classrooms in Ghana: Issues and challenges.

Lewin, K. M. & Stuart, J. S. (2003). Researching teacher education: New perspectives on practice, performance and policy, Multi-site Teacher Education Research Project (MUSTER) Synthesis Report, (London, Department of International Development).
Leyser, Y., Zeigler, T. & Romi, S. (2011). Changes in self-efficacy of prospective special and general education teachers: Implication for inclusive education. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 58(3), 241-255.

Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (1996). The Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights, and Full Participation) Act, 1995, Government of India.
Nevin, A. & Thousand, J. (1986). What the research says about limiting or avoiding referrals to special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 9, 149-161.

Philpott, D. F., Furey, E. & Penney, S.C. (2010). Promoting leadership in the ongoing professional development of teachers: Responding to globalization and inclusion. *Exceptionality Education International*, 20(2), 38-54.
Pinar, E. S. & Sucuoglu, B. (2011). Turkish teachers' expectancies in inclusive classrooms. *Theory and Practice*, 11(1), 395-402.
Romi, S. & Leyser, Y. (2006). Exploring inclusion preservice training needs: A study of variables associated with attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 21(1), 85-105.

Ross-Hill, R. (2009). Teacher attitude towards inclusion practices and special needs students. *Journal ofresearch in Special Needs education*, 9(3), 188-198.

Sharma, U. & Deppeler, J (2005) Inclusive Education in India: Challenges and Prospects. *Disabilities Studies Quarterly*, 25, 1.

Sharma, U. & Desai, I. (2002) Measuring concerns about integrated education in India. *The Asia-Pacific Journal on Disabilities*, 5(1), 2-14.

Sharma, U., Moore, D. & Sonawane, S. (2009). Attitudes and concerns of pre-service teachers regarding inclusion of students with disabilities into regular schools in Pune, India. *Asia Pacific Journal of TeacherEducation*, 37(3), 319-331.
Singal, N. (2006). Inclusive education in India: international concept, national interpretation.
International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 53 (3), 351-369.

Scruggs, T. E. & Mastropieri, M. A. (1996). Teachers' perceptions of mainstreaming/inclusion, 1958- 1995: A research synthesis. *Exceptional Children,* 63, 59-74.

Swaroop, S. (2001, Feb.-March). Inclusion and beyond. Paper presented at the North South Dialogue on Inclusive Education, Mumbai, India.The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). (1996). Core competencies for special educators. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Wedell, M. (2005). Cascading training down into the classroom: The need for parallel planning.25(6), 637-651.