

Citation: Rafique, U., & Hameed, A. (2021) Implementation of Inclusive Education in Pakistan: A Case of School Culture. *Global Educational Studies Review*, VI(II), 133-144.
[https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2021\(VI-II\).13](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2021(VI-II).13)



Implementation of Inclusive Education in Pakistan: A Case of School Culture

Uzma Rafique^{*}

Abdul Hameed[†]

Abstract: *There is growing awareness and desire to implement inclusive education in Pakistan. This quantitative study tried to assess the level of implementation of inclusive practices in public and private sector schools through the voices of headteachers and teachers. The status of implementation is explored by using a five-point Likert type scale developed on the framework of Index of Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2002) and Framework of Indicators developed by Kyriazopoulou & Weber (2009). The sample of the study comprised 51 inclusive schools representing four inclusive models. Headteachers and teachers engaged in implementation were asked to unfold their experiences and voices as the evidence for successful inclusivity in schools reflected through school culture. In its quantitative part, the study found that majority of the respondents had a positive opinion regarding the implementation of inclusive enabling indicators pertaining to school culture. Overall the study found that all these 51 inclusive schools are moving forward to achieve inclusivity in schools. This study recommended that a standard definition of inclusive education and a viable model for the implementation of inclusivity in schools.*

Key Words: School Development, Index of Inclusion, Implementation of Inclusive Practice, School Culture, School Policies, and School Practices

Introduction

Inclusive education is based on the notions of social justice and is recognized as the most equitable means to include all students regardless of their abilities, race, gender, and socio-economic status in mainstream schools. Inclusion is built around the individual student's needs and embraces the principle of diversity - all learners naturally exhibit variation in their abilities, interests, and needs. The educational philosophy behind inclusion originated from the worldwide discourse on United Nation's influential agenda of Education for All (EFA) (Jomtien, 1990), which viewed inclusive education as a dynamic approach of responding positively to pupil diversity and of seeing individual differences not as problems, but as opportunities for enriching learning' (UNESCO, 2005, p. 12). Many countries in the world, including Pakistan, became signatories to many international statements and legislation on educational rights, and endorsed United Nations Convention on the Rights of Children and Persons

with Disabilities (UNCRC, 1990), [UNESCO's Salamanca Statement \(1994\)](#) and Dakar Framework of Action for achieving the goal of Education for All (UNESCO, 2000). To accelerate progress toward Millennium Development Goals (MDG), Pakistani governments introduced several national educational policies and educational sector reforms, but the official decision of introducing 'inclusive education and support services for students with disabilities was enacted only in recent years (National Education Policy, NEP, 2009). The paradigm shift from segregation to inclusion in Pakistan has been slow despite the Pakistani government's endorsements and ratifications of international conventions. Although literature in the Pakistani context showed the recent emergence of research interests, there is still a severe dearth of published research that explored the implementation status of inclusive education from implementers' point of view. Few researchers employed quantitative

^{*} Department of Education, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: 1400191007@umt.edu.pk

[†] Department of Education, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

research methods ([Farooq, 2012](#); [Pasha, 2012](#), [Anwer & Sulman, 2012](#); Shaukat, 2013), which focused on the attitudes of school principals, teachers, students, and parents toward inclusive education, and attitudinal and structural barriers in mainstream schools. Even less research exists which utilized qualitative and mixed-methods research to examine attitudes and opinions of regular, special teachers and administrators toward inclusive education ([Haider, 2008](#); [Fazal, 2012](#); [Hassan, Parveen & Nisa, 2010](#); [Hassan, Farooq & Parveen, 2012](#)). Some pioneering attempts at pilot testing of small-scale inclusive projects were also made by international agencies, which documented evidence of good inclusive practices in urban, private schools in Pakistan ([UNICEF, 2003](#)). However, due to the restricted scope of these studies, the efforts for nationwide implementation of inclusion are severely limited ([Hameed & Fazil, 2005](#)).

This study built upon already nurturing academic discourse regarding the need for an educational system that is sensitive to the learning diversities and is willing to undergo transformations for enhancing its capacity to be responsive to learning diversities. The primary focus of this research was to understand the implementation of inclusive education in terms of evidence for the presence of inclusivity enablers within schools relating to culture. This evidence of inclusive-enablers was sought through the headteachers and teachers involved in implementing inclusive education at the school level.

Research reiterates that mainstream schools have the inherent capacity, teaching, and financial resources to undergo progressive transformation to accommodate students with disabilities ([Ainscow, 2005](#); Clark et al., 1995). This also underlines the foundational principle for inclusive education. According to [Villa & Thousand \(1995\)](#), the differential line between an inclusive and non-inclusive school is not merely of a commitment towards inclusion but the establishment of structural and educational practices to accommodate for diverse students' needs.

The researchers noted that successful inclusive education practice necessitates complex interaction of internal (within school) and external conditions and environments.

Peters has identified a division of inclusive education system in "Northern" and "Southern" (Peters, 2003). Multiple large studies have identified the human - resource focus of these systems in "Northern" systems, and it has been calculated that appropriately 80% of the budget allocations are directed towards human resource deployment & development (Markina et al., 2020). These studies indicate the following key features of the inclusive education system: (i) teachers are required to improve their qualification in curriculum development, pedagogy, teaching strategies, and adaptation of students; (ii) learning in the exam rooms is activity-based; (iii) ongoing training of all the stakeholders for sustainable continuation of educational practices and (iv) participation of all the stakeholders in all kinds of decision making vis-à-vis inclusive participation. Contrarily the practices of inclusive education in the south (South Asia included) exhibited four characters: (i) resources; (ii) processes; (iii) outcomes; and (iv) external factors and circumstances in which inclusive education is situated. These inclusive practices not only consider external factors as key determinants of inclusive education but also consider them to be an integral part of the development of an inclusive education system at the school as well as community level.

The most important areas of input resources include: (i) access and support of students; (ii) motivation of students to be part of the educational system; (iii) poverty and its associated issues of exclusion and drops out; (iv) attitudinal bias towards disability & students with disabilities and (v) flexible, accessible, accommodated and functional educational program for providing life skills to the students with disabilities. It has also been noted that focal points in terms of the processes are; (i) providing an accessible educational climate, (ii) co-operation amongst the stakeholders, and (iii) coordinated support structure. The results of inclusive education are a combination of human rights, the decentralized approach towards inclusive education, partnership, and teacher training (Cameron & Valentine, 2001; Markina et al., 2020).

This study looks for evidence of inclusive education vis-à-vis school-wide transformation, including school leadership, school and family collaboration, school staff collaboration, and other inclusivity-enablers through the lens of

experiences and understanding of teachers and headteachers. Using these data points and insights gathered from these experiences and consciousness of the key stake-holders, this study would pave a way for an academic discourse for conceptualizing inclusive education as an alternative and viable educational practice so that inclusive school development as an ideology and practice is aligned to the correct trajectories of theory and practice as per successful international practices.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this research study are to:

1. Explore evidences for implementation of inclusive-culture enablers at the school level in schools claiming to practice inclusive education.

Research Methods

The research study employed a quantitative method approach. A five-point Likert type scale was used for recording responses of headteachers of 51 secondary level schools regarding their experiences and sense of availability of inclusive-enablers relating to inclusive school culture, policies, and practices. The research instrument was developed employing the Index of Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2002) and Framework of Indicators (Kyriazopoulou & Weber, 2009).

Reliability and Validity of the Instrument

The validity of the instrument was performed by a panel of experts. They were asked to assess each item on the basis of its relevance and wording. The instrument was revised in order to address the observations of the experts. For assessment of the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach Alpha was used. The Cronbach's value of .97 indicated that the instrument was highly reliable for the collection of data for this study.

Results and Findings

Descriptive statistics of the current study showed that the mean age of headteachers and teachers was $M=38.39$ and $F=35.30$, respectively. A total of

61% of study participants were male, and 39% were female. Majority of participants (79.6%) had more than five years of teaching experience. The academic level of 59.9% of participants was M.A/M.Sc. Followed by 28% with B.A/B.Sc. A total of 78.3% of participants had received inclusive training, while 21.7% didn't receive such training. In the sample, 32.5% were headteachers, and 67.5% were teachers. Approximately 23.5% of the participants represented Punjab Inclusive Education Project, 47.1% of schools represented Ghazali Education Trust Inclusive Model, 17.6% represented the Inclusive Voucher Scheme, and 11.8% belonged to Amin Maktab Inclusive Model. A total of 70.6% of schools were located in rural areas, and 29.4% were based in urban areas.

Out of these schools, 23.5% of schools were public, 58.8% were private, and 17.6% were private schools financed by public funding. The mean number of pupils studying in high schools was $M=114.81$, in primary schools $M=191.59$, and in elementary schools $M=124.85$. Almost 80.4% of schools enrolled students with intellectual disabilities, 70.6% to students with a physical disability, whereas 66.7% of schools enrolled students with visual impairment, 56.9% of schools to students with hearing impairment, 51.0% to students with language disorders, 27.5% to students with emotional behavior disturbances, 13.7% to students with learning disability and 9.8% to students pervasive development disorders (Table 1).

Chi-square test of association was conducted to find an association between study variables. Frequency and percentages of school ownership, location, and inclusive model are varied in the next analyses because of the selection of one headteacher and four teachers from each school. Findings indicated that Punjab project for inclusive mode was implemented in all of the public schools. Majority of the private schools (48) implemented Ghazali Education Trust Inclusive Model, 12 private schools implemented Amin Maktab Inclusive Model, 1 of the private schools implemented Punjab Inclusive Education Project, and 1 school implemented Inclusive Voucher Scheme. All of the privately-financed public education schools implemented Inclusive Voucher Scheme.

Table 1. Distribution of disabilities

| Disability | N (%) |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Intellectual disability | 41(80.4%) |

| Disability | N (%) |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Physical motor disability | 36(70.6%) |
| Hearing impairment | 29(56.9%) |
| Language disorder | 26(51.0%) |
| Visual impairment | 34(66.7%) |
| Learning disability | 7(13.7%) |
| Pervasive development disorder | 5(9.8%) |
| Emotional behavior disturbances | 14(27.5%) |

The distribution of disability indicated a balanced spread of disabilities commonly found in the population. Intellectually challenged students dominate total enrolled children in 51 inclusive schools.

The study further revealed that the majority

of the headteachers (70.6%) included in the study were from schools located in rural areas; likewise, most teachers (66%) were from schools located in rural areas. A total of 29.4% of headteachers were from schools located in urban areas, and 34% of teachers were from schools located in urban areas.

Table 2. Representation of Headteachers and Teachers in Urban and Rural Areas

| School Location | | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Designation | | | |
| Head Teacher | Urban | 15 | 29.4 |
| | Rural | 36 | 70.6 |
| Teacher | Urban | 36 | 34.0 |
| | Rural | 70 | 66.0 |

It was also found that the majority of headteachers (62.7%) were from private schools, whereas the majority of the teachers (36.8%) were from private schools financed by the government.

School Culture

Table 3 indicates the responses of participants

regarding inclusive enabling school climatic practices. The majority of the participants indicated that inclusive enabling climatic enablers were either fully or substantially implemented in their respective schools: for example, 87% of the respondents maintained that their respective schools' mission statement

Table 3. Implementation of Inclusive Enabling School-climate Related Practices

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| | Fully | Substantially | Partially | Not Yet | Un-Decided |
| School mission all children can learn including children with disabilities. | 111 (70.7%) | 25 (15.9%) | 16 (10.2%) | 5 (3.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Everyone is made to feel welcome. | 130 (82.8%) | 17 (10.8%) | 10 (6.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| The school welcomes all students | 97 (61.8%) | 43(27.4%) | 13 (8.3%) | 4(2.5%) | 0(0%) |
| Strives to minimize all forms of discriminations. | 93 (59.2%) | 47 (29.9) | 14 (8.9%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (2%) |
| All students are equally valued in the school. | 98 (62.4%) | 44 (28%) | 8 (5.1%) | 7 (4.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| High expectations for all students | 93 (59.2%) | 26 (16.6%) | 20 (12.7%) | 18 (11.5%) | 0 (0%) |

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | |
|--|----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| | Fully | Substantially | Partially | Not Yet | Un- Decided |
| Teachers students with disabilities treat each other with respect. | 115 (73.2%) | 22 (14%) | 5 (3.2%) | 8 (5.1%) | 7 (4.5%) |
| All students \ feel safe at school. | 120 (76.4%) | 29 (18.5%) | 8 (5.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| All students have a sense of ownership of their school. | 130 (82.8%) | 14 (8.9%) | 13 (8.3) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| All students have a sense of belongingness at school. | 130 (82.8%) | 25 (15.9%) | 1 (.6%) | 1 (.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| All staff interacts with students having learning disabilities respectfully. | 107 (68.2%) | 35 (22.3%) | 4 (2.5%) | 9 (5.7%) | 2 (1.3%) |

reflected that all children including children with disability could learn in mainstream schools; 93% of the respondents maintained that in their respective schools' all kinds of students were made to feel welcome; 89% of the respondents maintained that their respective schools' did not discriminate students on the basis of their disabilities; 90% of the respondents maintained that their respective schools' had made conscious efforts to minimize all forms of discrimination met out to the students with disabilities; 90% of the respondents maintained that in their respective schools' all kinds of students were equally valued; 76% of the respondents maintained that their respective schools had high educational and behavioral expectations from the students having learning and behavioral disabilities; 87% of the respondents maintained that the teachers, other allied staff and students including students with disabilities treated each other with respect and honor; 95% of the respondents maintained that all students including students with disabilities felt safe and secured in the school premises; 92% of the respondents maintained that all students including students with disabilities manifested a sense of ownership of their schools; 98% of the respondents maintained that students with disabilities felt a strong sense of identification and belongingness towards their schools; and 90% of the respondents maintained that all teachers and other allied staff shared with each the responsibility of interaction with the students

having learning disabilities.

Table 4 indicates the responses of participants regarding the availability of inclusive enabling leadership practices. The majority of the participants indicated that inclusive enabling leadership practices were either fully or substantially implemented in their respective schools. For example: 98% of the respondents maintained that headteachers had a positive attitude towards inclusive education; 66% of the respondents maintained that their respective headteachers had an updated knowledge of various inclusive strategies; 63% of the respondents maintained that the headteachers provided all kinds of resources for implementing inclusive education; 85% of the respondents maintained that their respective headteachers had facilitated the collaborative strategies; 90% of the respondents maintained that the headteachers monitored implementation of collaborative strategies in the schools; 85% of the respondents maintained that their respective headteachers ensured regular planning of collaborative strategies by the teachers in the schools; 80% of the respondents maintained that their respective headteachers used teachers feed-back to identify training needs for teachers and other allied staff; 79% of the respondents maintained that their respective headteachers used achievements of all kinds of students including students with disabilities to identify training needs for teachers and other allied staff.

Table 4. Implementation of School-leadership Related Practices

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Fully | Substantially | Partially | Not Yet | Un-Decided |
| School Head has a positive attitude towards inclusion. | 122 (77.7%) | 31 (19.7%) | 4 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| The headteacher has up-to date knowledge of various inclusive strategies. | 45 (28.7%) | 59 (37.6%) | 52 (33.1%) | 1 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| The headteacher provides all kinds of resources to implement inclusion. | 42 (26.8%) | 57 (36.3) | 45 (28.7%) | 13 (8.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| The Head Teacher facilitates the collaboration strategies. | 102 (65.0%) | 31 (19.7%) | 18 (11.5%) | 6 (3.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Head Teacher monitors the collaboration strategies. | 108 (68.8%) | 34 (21.7%) | 14 (8.9%) | 1 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Head Teacher ensures that Collaborative Planning is done by teachers on a regular basis. | 88 (56.1%) | 46 (29.3%) | 23 (14.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| The headteacher uses teachers feedback to identify training needs for teachers and other allied staff. | 60 (38.2%) | 65 (41.4%) | 26 (16.6%) | 5 (3.2%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| The headteacher uses the achievements of all kinds of students, including students with disabilities, to identify training needs for teachers and other allied staff. | 75 (47.8%) | 49 (31.2%) | 30 (19.1%) | 3 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| The headteacher offers incentives to teachers who show positive progress in implementing inclusion. | 62 (39.5%) | 39 (24.8%) | 24 (15.3%) | 27 (17.2%) | 5 (3.2%) |

Additionally, it also brought out that, and 65% of the respondents held that their respective headteachers offered incentives to teachers who showed positive progress in implementing inclusion.

Table 5 indicates the responses of participants regarding the availability of inclusive enabling team collaboration amongst school staff for ensuring participation of all kinds of students. The majority of the participants indicated that inclusive team collaboration enablers were either fully or substantially implemented in their respective schools. For example: 64% of the respondents held that all teachers of their respective schools supported all kinds of students including students with disabilities; 54% of the respondents held that all teachers and other allied staff including psychologist and physiotherapist etc. of their respective schools worked well together and

with the head teachers of their respective schools; 62% of the respondents held that all teachers and other allied staff including psychologist and physiotherapist etc. collaborated with each other for implementing inclusive education; 78% of the respondents maintained that the knowledge of parents about their children's educational and behavioral needs was valued in their respective schools; 69% of the respondents held that the knowledge of parents about their children's educational and behavioral needs was used by the teachers in the class; 53% of the respondents held that the teachers of their respective schools used achievements of the students with learning disabilities for adapting curriculum according to their needs; and 51% of the respondents held that all teachers used achievements of the students with learning disabilities for differentiating teaching strategies including mode of presentation and methods of response. However,

contrastingly, majority of the participants indicated a lack of full or substantial evidence of implementation of team collaboration inclusive enablers in various areas. For example, 54% of the respondents held that all teachers did not possess the commitment to teach

all kinds of students, including students with disabilities; 61% of the respondents maintained that all teachers of their respective schools did not possess skills needed to teach all kinds of students including students with disabilities.

Table 5. Implementation of Team Collaboration Related Practices

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Fully | Substantially | Partially | Not Yet | Un-Decided |
| All teachers possess the commitment to teach all kinds of students including students with disabilities. | 58 (36.9%) | 13 (8.3%) | 30 (19.1%) | 35 (22.3%) | 20 (12.7%) |
| All teachers possess the skills needed to teach all kinds of students, including students with disabilities. | 17 (10.8%) | 30 (19.1%) | 50 (31.8%) | 48 (30.6%) | 12 (7.6%) |
| All teachers support all kinds of students including students with disabilities. | 63 (40.1%) | 38 (24.2%) | 37 (23.6%) | 19 (12.1%) | 0 (0%) |
| All teachers and other allied staff, including psychologists and physiotherapists, etc., work well together and with the headteacher. | 38 (24.2%) | 47 (29.9%) | 58 (36.9%) | 8 (5.1%) | 6 (3.8%) |
| All teachers and other allied staff, including psychologist and physiotherapists, etc., collaborate with each other. | 43 (27.4%) | 54 (34.4%) | 33 (21%) | 27 (17.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| The knowledge of parents about their children’s educational and behavioral needs is valued. | 72 (45.9%) | 50 (31.8%) | 32 (20.4%) | 3 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| The knowledge of parents about their children’s educational and behavioral needs is used by the teacher in the class. | 43 (27.4%) | 65 (41.4%) | 29 (18.5%) | 20 (12.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Special education staff works within the general education classroom. | 29 (18.5%) | 15 (9.6%) | 59 (37.6%) | 49 (31.2%) | 5 (3.1%) |
| The teachers use the achievements of the students with learning disabilities for adapting the curriculum according to their needs. | 15 (9.6%) | 68 (43.3%) | 34 (21.7%) | 38 (24.2%) | 2 (1.2%) |
| The teachers use achievements of the students with learning disabilities for differentiating teaching strategies including mode of presentation and methods of response. | 26 (16.6%) | 54 (34.4%) | 54 (34.4%) | 21 (13.4%) | 2 (1.3%) |

Similarly, table 5 indicates that 69% of the respondents held that special education staff did

not work within the general education classroom in their respective schools.

Table 6. Implementation of Family-school Partnership Related Practices

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Fully | Substantially | Partially | Not Yet | Un-Decided |
| Parents’ educational priorities for disabled children are reflected in the student’s IEP. | 18 (11.5%) | 49 (31.2%) | 30 (19.1%) | 35 (22.3%) | 25 (15.9%) |
| Parents’ behavioral priorities for disabled children are reflected in the student’s IEP. | 42 (26.8%) | 58 (36.9%) | 35 (22.3) | 18 (11.5%) | 4 (2.5%) |

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Fully | Substantially | Partially | Not Yet | Un-Decided |
| Parents acknowledge the teachers' efforts for their children with disabilities. | 61 (38.9%) | 39 (24.8%) | 23 (14.6%) | 32 (20.4%) | 2 (1.3%) |
| Parents' attend meetings regarding academic progress and issues with the school teacher on a regular basis. | 32 (20.4%) | 47 (29.9%) | 52 (33.1%) | 18 (11.5%) | 8 (5.1%) |
| Parents give input about their disabled child's social behavior to the teachers. | 39 (24.8%) | 58 (36.9%) | 31 (19.7%) | 21 (13.4%) | 8 (5.1%) |
| Parents receive regular information about their child's social behavior from school. | 26 (16.6%) | 36 (22.9%) | 65 (41.4%) | 23 (14.6%) | 7 (4.5%) |
| Parents help their disabled children to reinforce academic lessons and behavioral skills on a daily basis. | 24 (15.3%) | 50 (31.8%) | 38 (24.2%) | 38 (24.2%) | 7 (4.5%) |

Table 6 indicates the responses of participants regarding the availability of inclusive enabling family-school partnership practices. The majority of the participants indicated that inclusive enabling family-school partnership practices were either fully or substantially implemented in their respective schools. For example: 43% of the respondents held that parents' educational priorities for disabled children were reflected in the student's IEP; 64% of the respondents held that parents' behavioral priorities for disabled children were reflected in the student's IEP; 64% of the respondents held that parents of the children of their respective schools acknowledged the teachers' efforts for their children with disabilities; 50% of the respondents held that parents of the special needs children attended meetings regarding academic progress and issues with the school teacher on a regular basis; and 62% of the respondents indicated that parents gave input about their disabled child's social behavior to the teachers. Contrastingly, however, majority of the participants indicated that family-school partnership was missing fully or partially in various areas. For example: 56% of the respondents maintained that parents did not receive regular information about their child's social behavior from school and 48% of the respondents held that parents of the special needs students did not help their disabled children to reinforce the academic lessons and behavioral

skills on daily basis.

Conclusion

Based on the findings in the contexts of implementation status of inclusive education and the way key stakeholders find and interpret it, the research study offers several implications for implementing and improvising inclusive education for students with disabilities and SEN. Firstly, there is a significant need for schools to reform their existing school policies, which focus on individualizations. Such decisions should be made on a 'case-by-case' basis and reviewed by a panel of stakeholders within the school community. Efforts should be directed to regularly include mainstream teachers, parents, and school psychologist during placement decisions. Secondly, special support services such as special needs assistants and special needs coordinators should be a regular part of special service units in schools which include students with disabilities. Thirdly, all staff, including administrators and principals, should participate in continuing professional development programs related to inclusive education, special educational needs, and pedagogical practices. Such programs should address four important considerations based on inclusive principles: (1) strong knowledge and practical understanding of inclusive education including philosophical tenets of inclusion, 3) knowledge and understanding about various

disabilities and SEN, (3) assessment strategies and analysis of individual students' special needs to devise support services, and (4) evidence-based teaching and learning strategies to achieve academic, behavioral and social outcomes of students with disabilities and SEN. Additionally, such trainings should consider practical strategies to document individualized education plans (IEP) for students with special needs, for modifications and adaptations in curriculum and learning materials. Finally, the study implicates a strong necessity for all schools to organize and keep written records of accommodations and adaptations provided to students with special

needs. Additionally, it is also very important that the views of the teachers and headteachers regarding "what is inclusive education?", "what constitutes as an evidence of an inclusive enabler?" and "how an evidence for existence or absence is to be interpreted by school level administration for taking steps to improve the situation?" Given the level of implementation of inclusive education in Pakistan and conceptual and practical implications of inclusive education, it is the need of the hour that academicians take on this dialogue and come up with practical and local solutions.

References

- Ahmad, S., & Yousaf, M. (2011). Special education in Pakistan: In the perspectives of educational policies and plans. *Academic Research International*, 1(2), 228-236. <http://www.savap.org.pk>
- Ainscow, M. (2000a). Reaching out to all learners: Some lessons from international experience. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(1), 1-9.
- Ainscow, M. (2000b). The next step for special education. *British Journal of Special Education*, 27(2), 76-80.
- Ainscow, M. (2002). *Using research to encourage the development of inclusive practices*. In: Farrell, P., & Ainscow, M. (Eds.). *Making special education inclusive*. London: Fulton.
- Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: What are the levers for change? *Journal of Educational Change*, 6(2), 109-124. DOI: [10.1007/s10833-005-1298-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-005-1298-4)
- Ainscow, M. (2005). Understanding the development of inclusive education system. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 3(3), 5-20.
- Ainscow, M., Farrell, P., & Tweddle, D. (1999). *Effective practice in inclusion and in special and mainstream schools working together*. London: Department for Education and Employment.
- Ainscow, M., Farrell, P., & Tweddle, D. (2000). Developing policies for inclusive education: A study of the role of local education authorities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(3), 211-229.
- Akram, B., & Bashir, R. (2012). Special education and deaf children in Pakistan: An overview. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 2(2), 33-44.
- Andrews, J., & Lupart, J. L. (2000). *The inclusive classroom: Educating exceptional children*. (2nd Ed.), Scarborough, ON: Nelson Canada.
- Anwer, M., & Sulman, N. (2012). Regular school teachers' attitude toward inclusive education the through critical professional development. Paper presented at the Inclusive and Supportive Education Congress (ISEC). International Special Education Conference: Glasgow, Scotland. http://www.isec2005.org.uk/isec/abstracts/papers_a/avramidis_e.shtml
- Bashir, R. (2009). *Causes and remedies of social exclusion of students with hearing impairment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Punjab, Lahore: Pakistan.
- Beaton, L. (Ed.). (2007). *Stepping stones to success II. Collaboration: Working together for all students*. Developed by the collaboration writing team and the CTE resource center. Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education.
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: UK. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE).
- Department for Education and Skills. (2001). *Special educational needs: Code of practice*. London: DfES.
- Department for Education and Skills. (2007). *Pedagogy and personalization*. London: DfES.
- Farooq, M. S. (2012). Problems faced by students with special needs in ordinary Pakistani schools. *Journal of Quality & Technology Management*, 8(1), 13-27.
- Fazal, R. (2012). Readiness for inclusion in Pakistani schools: Perceptions of school administrators. *International Journal of Social Science & Education*, 2(4), 825-832.
- Government of Pakistan. (1959). *Report of the Commission on National Education*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Ministry of Education.
- Government of Pakistan. (1998). *National Education Policy 1998-2010*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Ministry of Education.
- Haider S. I. (2008). Pakistani teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of students with special educational needs. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 24(4), 632-636.
- Hameed, A. (2003). *Inclusive schools: An emerging trend in Pakistan*. Proceedings for the International Conference on Inclusive Education: A Framework for Reform. Hong Kong.
- Hameed, A., & Fazil, H. (2005). *Inclusive education in South Asia*. Paper presented at Special Education Conference. Inclusion: Celebrating Diversity. Glasgow.
- Hameed, A., & Manzoor, A. (2016). Defeating inequalities in school access: A case of children with disabilities in Pakistan. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 16(1), 345-350.

- Hameed, A., & Manzoor, A. (2014). Identifying biases in National Policy for persons with disabilities 2002 using BIASE Free Framework. *Pakistan Journal of Special Education*, 15, 275-286.
- Hassan, M. U., Farooq, M. S., & Parveen, I. (2012). Recognition or Rebuff? Inclusion of Students with Special Education Needs in Ordinary Schools in Pakistan. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(1), 73-91. DOI: [10.5901/jesr.2012.02.01.73](https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2012.02.01.73)
- Hassan, M. U., Parveen, I., & Nisa, R. (2010). Exploring teachers' perspectives: Qualms and possibilities for inclusive classes in Pakistan. *Journal of International Association of Special Education*, 11(1), 49-56. Retrieved from <http://www.iaser.org/>
- Helping Hand for Relief and Development. (2012). *Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) Statistics in Pakistan*. Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Hussain, K. (2012). *Fostering inclusive education in Pakistan: Access and quality in primary education through community school networks*. Working Paper 6. Center for Universal Education: Brookings Institute. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/fostering-inclusive-education-in-pakistan_khadim-hussain.pdf
- JICA. (2002). *Country profile on disability: Islamic Republic of Pakistan*. Japan International Cooperation Agency Planning and Evaluation Department. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DISABILITY/Regions/South%20Asia/JICA_Pakistan.pdf
- Kennedy, C. H., & Fischer, D. (2001). *Inclusive Middle Schools*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Khan, I. K., & Behlol, M. G. (2014). Inclusive Education at Primary Level: Reality or Phantasm. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 1(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.vii.14>.
- Ministry of Health, Special Education and Social Welfare. (2002). *National policy for persons with disabilities*. Islamabad, Pakistan. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PAKISTANEXTN/Resources/pdf-Files-in-Events/Pak-Disabled-Policy.pdf>
- Ministry of Social Welfare and Special Education. (2006). *National plan of action to implement the National Policy for Persons with Disabilities*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Directorate General of Special Education.
- Mitchell, D. (2008). *What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Pasha, S. (2012). Readiness of urban primary schools for inclusive education in Pakistan. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 6(2), 113-128. <http://www.ue.edu.pk/journal.asp>
- Thousand, J. S., & Villa, R.A. (1991). *Accommodating for greater student variance*. In M. Ainscow. (ed.). *Effective Schools for All*. London: Fulton.
- UNESCO. (1990). *World Declaration on Education for All and framework for action to meet basic learning needs*. World Conference on Education for All for meeting basic learning needs. Jomtien: Thailand. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0008/000862/086293eb.pdf>
- UNESCO. (1994). *Salamanca statement and framework for action on special education needs*. Paris: United Nations. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pfoo00098427>
- UNESCO. (2000). *The Dakar framework for action - Education for all*. Dakar: UNESCO. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/%20001211/121147e.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2006). *Situation analysis of teacher education in Pakistan: Towards a strategic framework for teacher education and professional development*. Islamabad, Pakistan. UNESCO. (2008). *Inclusive education: the way of the future. Conclusions and recommendations of the 48th session of the International Conference on Education*, (ICE) Geneva. www.ibe.unesco.org/National_Reports/ICE_2008/brazil_NRo8.pdf.
- UNESCO. (2012). *Youth and skills: Putting education to work* (summary). EFA global monitoring report 2012. Paris: UNESCO. http://unesco.org.pk/gmr_launch.html
- UNICEF. (2003). *Examples of inclusive education: Pakistan. Nepal: UNICEF*. <https://www.unicef.org/rosa/InclusivePak.pdf>
- US Department of Education. (2004). *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act*. [Stat. 2647].

- <http://idea.ed.gov/download/statute.html>
- Van Manen, M. (1994). Pedagogy, virtue, and narrative identity in teaching. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 24(2), 135-170.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1180112>
- Villa, R., & Thousand, J. (1995). *The rationales for inclusive schooling*. In Villa, R., & Thousand, J. (Eds.). *Creating an inclusive school*. (pp. 28-44). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Warnock, M. (1978). *Special educational needs: Report of the committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people*. London: HMSO.
- Wedell, K. (2008). Confusion about inclusion: Patching up or system change? *British Journal of Special Education*, 35(3), 127-135.
[DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8578.2008.00386.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8578.2008.00386.x)
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WHO. (2001). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)*. Geneva: WHO.
- Winter, E., & O'Raw, P. (2010). *Literature review of the principles and practices relating to inclusive education for children with special educational needs*. Trim, Ireland: National Council for Special Education.
- Woodcock, S. Hemmings, B & Russell, K. (2012). Does study of an inclusive education subject influence pre-service teachers' concerns and self-efficacy about inclusion? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(6), 1-11.
<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol37/iss6/1>