

Comparative Study of Inclusive Education Schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Tamseela Naz, Working Folks Grammar Higher Secondary School Dera Township (F) D.I. Khan, KP, Pakistan.

Keywords	Abstract
Inclusive Education, Comparative Study, Mixed Method, KP Schools	<i>There were two schools in KP which provided education in inclusive setting. The aim of the study was to make comparison between both the schools. A mixed method design of the study was followed. Independent t-test was run to identify the difference between both the schools. The qualitative data was analyzed through thematic analysis which was transformed into Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) technique. The result revealed that there was significant difference as $p < .05$ between both the schools regarding “Method and Material” and “Facilities”, whereas no significant difference was found as $p > .05$ between both the schools on “Training and Attitude”, Parent-Teacher Conference” and “Assessment”. The results from qualitative data revealed that students did not perceive any difference regarding “Method and Material” and “Facilities”. Students and Principals of both schools claimed difference regarding parent-teacher conference. Moreover, regarding “Assessment”, there was systems of “Assessment” of students in both schools on the part of teachers, students as well as Principals. The comparison of both the schools enabled the contribution in the field of inclusive education system in KP.</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

It was general opinion during 1950s that students having disability were not capable of learning things as normal students do. Even, at state level their responsibilities for provision of education were also not regarded. Consequently, the community living movement was initiated for the first time in respect of special students to have right of education being a fundamental right. In the last three decades, a big change in policy regarding tradition in separate setting special education has been arrived which gave rise to inclusive approach where students have an opportunity and support to study in the same setting of education in a classroom (Peters, 2007). Bartolo (2010) study revealed that 2% special students go to schools while one third of these 2% have no facility to go to schools. Globally, out of the poorest, the 20% of them are disable person. Behlol (2011) states that differentiation in disability among special children in formal system of education is extended is called inclusive education. In this type of education system all students study together equally based on their age as well as level while not regarding the disability as distinctive thing.

In the year 2014, UNESCO reported that Pakistan has 10% out-of-school children and Pakistan stands at the second in ranking at out-of- school children in the world. Pakistan was declared in state of educational emergency (Barber, 2010). Parliament Times (2017) reported that development in educational programs for disable persons in Pakistan is acutely low and meager in KP. Policy

development, as a part of legal support was initiated in 1985 which lead toward the approval of 1st National Policy regarding disable persons in 2002. Through this policy, various services like assessment, rehabilitation, medical facilities, vocational training, employment, availability of funds, research and development, building and other public places for special persons were emphasized to be made available.

Under the guidance of Directorate General of Special Education (DGSE) of Pakistan, various studies were conducted for the assessment of requirements and facilities for special persons (Farooq, 2012). Through the use of refined methods, the teaching is considered as a continuous process of learning (Ayeni, 2011). Teaching methods practiced by educators are helpful to produce desirable changes in students (Adunola, 2011). Most of the scholars now a days, having development in the concept of initiative learning, use flexible student centered approach to develop learning actively (Greitzer, 2002). This approach is also used by others, as Hesson and Shad (2007) concluded that majority of the teachers were tending toward this student centered approach for producing logical thinking, analytical research and interest development for study.

Educational materials in printed and in the form of electronics equipments are very essential in the profession of teaching, as they are considered additional helpful tool for teachers to explain things for learning purpose of the students. Many studies affirm that sensing organs are activated through learning materials during learning-teaching phase which helps to make learning process easy and enduring. Alternatively, it can be said that the activation of numbers of sensing organs are directly proportionate to the development of learning process (Saglam, 2011). Teachers, in a study showed adverse behavior due to the time they spent on special students as compare to the time spent on normal students (Horne & Farrell, 2011).

While talking about the teaching-learning process, an assessment is considered as a complex concept, especially in the context of special students and the perception of community on its purpose. Besides, it is given more attention on the complexity of assessment due to its core role in educational process. Initially, assessment facilitates professional and educators in the formulation of concerned educational decisions (Brady & Kennedy, 2003; Taylor, 2003; Black & William, 2004). An assessment should be based on culture, gender, physical disability, linguistic, socioeconomic status and other demographics (McAlpine, 2006).

The parent's involvement in schools and school related different policies and issues are found in different format as like Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Parent-Teacher Conference (PTC) or volunteering at the school. Parent teacher conference helps to develop school's learning process and as a whole education, as well as students development in the form of monitoring school and students. Such type of parental involvement boosts the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of students.

In KP Pakistan, there are only two institutions for inclusive education. One is located in D. I. Khan and other is in Abbotabad. Keeping in view the increasing importance of inclusive education, study was interested to focus on the comparison of the two main Inclusive Education Institutions: The Smart School for Inclusive Education, D I Khan and Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad. It was realized that no comparative study on inclusive schools has been done in the past in the context of province Khyber Pukhtunkhwa. Therefore, to develop awareness about the conditions of inclusive education in KP and to fill the gap of making assessment of schools, based

on the criteria of teaching methods, material used, training aspects, attitudes of teachers, parents involvement, facilities extended toward students, this study was conducted in the context of KP. In the study, it has also been examined that how far these institutions were successful in imparting quality education to disable students without affecting the growth and learning outcomes of normal students.

1.1. Objectives of the Study

1. To compare the methods and materials of teaching used in both the schools.
2. To compare the training and attitude of teachers in both the schools.
3. To compare the facilities available in both the schools.
4. To compare the parent teacher conference mode in both the schools.
5. To compare the mode of assessment of students in both the schools.

1.2. Hypothesis of the Study

- H₀₁:** There is no difference between the mean scores obtained regarding “Method and Material” used in Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad and Smart School for Inclusive Education, D.I.Khan.
- H₀₂:** There is no difference between the mean scores obtained regarding “Training and Attitude” of teachers of Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad and Smart School for Inclusive Education, D.I.Khan.
- H₀₃:** There is no difference between the mean scores obtained regarding “Facilities” available in Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad and Smart School for Inclusive Education, D.I.Khan.
- H₀₄:** There is no difference between the mean scores obtained regarding “Teacher-Parent Conference” of Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad and Smart School for Inclusive Education, D.I.Khan
- H₀₅:** There is no difference between the mean scores obtained regarding “Assessment” used in Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad and Smart School for Inclusive Education, D.I.Khan

2. RESEARCH METHOD

In this study mixed method design was used. The qualitative data was collected from the Principals and students of Kingston School for Inclusive Education (KSIE), Abbotabad and Smart School for Inclusive Education (SSIE), D.I.Khan, whereas the quantitative data was collected from teachers of both the schools. The research was cross sectional. The population of students was 314 in both the schools which comprised special students having different sorts of disabilities. Using the purposive sampling, among 314 numbers of students, there were 73 students in senior classes who were able to understand the interview questions and replied appropriately. However, at the time of interview there were 67 students (KSIE = 26, SSIE = 41) in the senior classes with whom the interview was conducted by the researcher herself. Cronbach’s alpha values of all the research variables were above .74.

3. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this part research hypotheses are tested through independent t-test which is reported in the form of independent sample t-test table and their description for the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. The statistical tests have been executed through IBM SPSS version 20.

Table 1: Mean and t-test of Method & Material

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Method & Material	Kingston School	18	2.484	.498	.117
	Smart School	30	2.942	.230	.042
Independent Sample t-test (Method & Material)					
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	29.831	.000	-4.350	46	0.000
Equal variances not assumed			3.678	21.422	0.001

To find the mean differences between both the schools regarding “Method and Material”, the t-test was run. The mean of Kingston School, Abbotabad was 2.484 as shown in above table whereas the mean of Smart Inclusive School, D.I.Khan was 2.942. The significance difference is evident in t-test result table where p-value is highly significant as $p = .001$ which proved that there is significant difference between both the schools regarding “Method and Material”. Therefore, null hypothesis H_0 is rejected and alternate hypothesis H_a is accepted as true.

Table 2: Mean and t-test of Training & Attitude

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Training & Attitude	Kingston School	18	2.527	.372	.087
	Smart School	30	2.422	.333	.060
Independent Sample t-test (Training & Attitude)					
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	.156	.695	1.017	46	.315
Equal variances not assumed			.986	32.562	.332

The mean of Kingston Inclusive School, Abbotabad was 2.527 while it was 2.422 for Smart Inclusive School, D.I.Khan for “Training and Attitude”. Though there was slightly difference of mean between both the schools but to find the significant difference the t-test was run. The value of t-test was highly insignificant as $p = .315$ which provide that there was no significant mean difference between both the schools regarding “Training and Attitude”. Therefore, null hypothesis H_0 was accepted as true.

Table 3: Mean and t-test of Facilities

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
----------	--------	---	------	----------------	-----------------

Facilities	Kingston School	18	2.026	.421	.099
	Smart School	30	2.502	.133	.024
Independent Sample t-test (Facilities)					
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	22.010	.000	-5.769	46	0.000
Equal variances not assumed			-4.661	19.057	0.000

The mean table shows that there is slightly mean difference between both the schools regarding “Facilities”. However, to find the significance of this mean difference t-test was executed and shown in above table. The p-value was highly significant as $p = .000$ which indicates that there is significant mean difference between both the schools regarding “Facilities”. Hence, null hypothesis H_03 is rejected and alternate hypothesis H_a3 is accepted as true.

Table 4: Mean and t-test of Teachers-Parents Conference

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Teachers-Parents Conf	Kingston School	18	2.278	.683	.161
	Smart School	30	2.527	.520	.094
Independent Sample t-test (Teachers-Parents Conference)					
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	4.537	.039	-1.432	46	0.159
Equal variances not assumed			-1.337	28.812	0.192

The table above shows that the mean of Kingston Inclusive School, Abbotabad is 2.278, whereas it was 2.527 for Smart Inclusive School, D.I. Khan regarding “Teacher-Parents Conference. The p value of t-test is highly insignificant as $p = .192$ which indicates that there was no significant difference between the mean of both the schools on “Teacher-Parents Conference”. Therefore, H_{a4} is rejected and H_{o4} is accepted as true.

Table 5: Mean and t-test of Assessment.

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Assessment	Kingston School	18	2.555	.563	.133
	Smart School	30	2.511	.483	.088
Independent Sample t-test (Assessment)					
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	0.247	0.621	.290	46	.773
Equal variances not assumed			.279	31.721	.782

The mean score on “Assessment” was 2.555 by Kingston Inclusive School, Abbotabad and 2.511 by Smart Inclusive School, D.I.Khan. The t-test was run to find the mean difference. The independent sample t-test table shows that p value is not significant as $p = .773$ which negates that

there is significant difference between the means of both the schools regarding “assessment”. Therefore, the result confirms that H_{a5} is rejected and H_{o5} is accepted as true.

3.1. Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data was collected through interview which was transcoded and then each response from interview was entered into the relevant column for the respondents of both the schools to make comparison on the criteria of asked question similar to all the respondents. The results from the qualitative analysis are shown in given below table.

Table 6: Students Qualitative Data.

	Kingston School, Abbotabal			Smart School, D.I.Khan		
	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%
A) Method & Material						
Are the machines, instruments or AV aids used in your school to teach you?	26	0	100	41	0	100
Whether your teachers allow you to sit in front rows of the class?	25	1	96	38	3	93
Do you participate in different activities of class like your other class fellows?	21	5	81	37	4	90
Do you study same books/course/syllabus as like your other class fellows?	18	8	69	41	0	100
Overall average response on Method & Material			87	96		
B) Training & Attitude						
Do your teachers treat equally with all the students of your class?	24	2	92	36	5	88
Do you enjoy your class activities?	26	0	100	41	0	100
Do you feel pleasure with your friends?	26	0	100	41	0	100
Do your teachers inquire from you about your difficulties/problems, time to time?	25	1	96	41	0	100
Do you like studying with the all type of students (i.e normal and special)?	23	3	88	41	0	100
Average response on Training & Attitude			95	98		
C) Facilities						
Is there arrangement of school bus facility in your school?	0	26	-	0	41	-
Do you reach your school in time regularly?	26	0	100	41	0	100
Is the school timing feasible for you?	26	0	100	41	0	100
Is there any arrangement of physical therapy equipment?	0	26	-	0	41	-
Average response on Facilities			50	50		
D) Parents Teachers Conference						
Do your teachers inform your progress to your parents?	18	8	69	35	6	85
Are your parents happy with your study in this school?	25	1	96	41	0	100
Do your parents come to school to meet your teachers?	17	9	65	39	2	95

Average response on Parents Teacher Conf		77					93
E) Assessment							
Are your exam conducted in the same room for all students including normal & special class fellow?	26	0	100	41	0	100	
Do your teachers take tests from you to practice for exam?	26	0	100	41	0	100	
Do all the students of your school have same board of examination?	26	0	100	41	0	100	
Average response on Assessment.		100					100

The qualitative comparative results are shown in above table where in the first column the questions those were asked about different criteria (method and material, training and attitude, facilities, parent-teacher conference, and assessment) are shown. The response against each question has been recorded in term of frequency into two categories as “Yes” and “No” for both of the schools. For enhancement of comparison between schools the response of students was converted into the percentage. The results show that there was no difference between both the schools regarding the use of AV aids as all the responding students confirmed it.

When it was asked from the students that whether your teachers allow you to sit in front rows of the class, the 96% respondents of KSIE and 93% of SSIE confirm that their teaches allow them to sit in front rows of the class. In KSIE 69% respondents confirmed that they study the same syllabus and books whereas 100% respondents of SSIE confirmed that they study same syllabus. All the students of both the schools were enjoying and feeling good to study in their schools. 100% respondents of both the schools found school timing feasible for them and they all reach the school in time. 100% of the respondents of SSIE told that they were studying same syllabus for all students while 69% of KSIE told that they were using same syllabus. 69% of respondents of KSIE told that their teachers inform their progress to their parents whereas 85% respondents of SSIE confirmed this. 96% of respondents of KSIE and 100% of SSIE confirmed that their parents were happy for them being study in the school. Parents of 65% responding students of KSIE came to school to meet teachers whereas, parents of 95% of SSIE visit school to meet teachers enquiring about the progress of their children. 100% of the respondents confirmed that their exams are conducted in the same room including normal and special children and their teachers take test before the commencement of exams and there is completely same exam system for board exams.

3.2. Qualitative Analysis of Principals Response

The interview conducted with the Principals of both the schools and questions were asked while the response was allowed free without any restriction to have brief information about the schools. The output of the qualitative data is given below.

Table 7: Principals Qualitative Data

The main themes of interview data collected from Principals of both the schools.

Themes		Patterns	Kingston School	Smart School
Method &	Teachers’ expertise in teaching.		2	2
Material	Common study for normal/abnormal students.		2	2

	Socialization of abnormal students	2	2
	Flexible teaching for abnormal students	2	0
	Usage of colour charts/cards/boards etc	2	2
	Completion of syllabus in time	2	2
	% Score	100%	83%
	Patterns	Kingston School	Smart School
Training & Attitude	Conducted training for teachers	0	2
	Need for teachers training	0	2
	Availability of trained teachers	1	2
	Teachers patience on normal students' misbehave	1	0
	Teachers patience on ab-normal students' misbehave	2	1
	Satisfaction from teachers attitude	2	2
	%Score	50%	75%
	Patterns	Kingston School	Smart School
Facilities	Availability of transport	0	0
	Sufficient No of class rooms	0	2
	Availability of stationery	1	2
	Use of Audio-Video Aids	2	2
	Availability of playground	0	0
	Therapeutic facility for abnormal students	0	0
	Availability of Govt funds	0	0
%Score	21%	43%	
	Patterns	Kingston School	Smart School
Parent-Teacher Conference	Parent-teacher conference held frequently	1	2
	Parents were interested in school policy & procedure of education	2	1
	Parents suggestion are made as part of institutional policy/procedure	2	1
	Parents give feedback on part of their children	2	1
	%Score	88%	63%
	Patterns	Kingston School	Smart School
Assessment	Planning is made toward target area	2	2
	Specified need assessment of students	2	2
	Specify type of disability	2	2
	Students performance checked through weekly/monthly test	2	2
	Teachers take tests to assess students	2	2
%Score	100%	100%	
	Overall % score on all criteria of comparison	71.8%	72.8%

The comparison regarding Method and Material between both the schools have been shown in above table where the overall score of KSIE was 100% while the SSIE was 83% regarding Method

and Material. Similarly the overall score for Training and Attitude was 50% for KSIE and 75% for SSIE. There was very low score of KSIE for “Facilities” as 21% while SSIE had approximately twice time more than this score that was 43%. The “Parent-Teacher Conference” score for KSIE was 88% and for SSIE it was 63%. There was 100% score of KSIE on “Assessment” as well as 100% score of SSIE on the same.

4. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The results were generated quantitatively to make comparison quantitatively while the results of hypothesis were matched and contrasted with qualitative results presented in the form of quantitatively. It has been concluded that Method and Material were different on both the schools as reported by teachers and principals of both the schools. However, these overall differences were not observed by the students of both the schools. Peer mediation, in which the student with a challenging disability and peers who are not disabled develop a shared responsibility, is an effective method of instruction (Ryndak, Jackson & Billingsly, 2000). In the current study there seems that shared responsibility was 100% in Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad where Principal perceived appropriate use of "Methods and Material".

Regarding “Training and Attitude” of teachers, there was no difference on both the schools as responded by teachers and students. But Principals reported some extent of difference. According to David and Kuyini (2012), teachers in the classroom are crucial in promoting constructive discussions among students with and without disabilities. Teachers must have a positive attitude towards children with special needs and a high level of self-efficacy in order to encourage constructive discussion in the classrooms. Ehsan (2018) in a qualitative research study reported that teachers in Pakistan have lack of knowledge on inclusion and need more training. The importance of teachers attitude has been endorsed by through the response of SSIE’s Principal who indicated that though the teachers’ competency of teaching was good but regarding misbehavior of normal and special students there need more patience by teachers, but the response of KSIE indicated that their teachers require trainings and more patience on misbehavior of normal and special students. Bo the Principals were satisfied from the overall behavior of their teachers. Kuini and Desai (2007) reported that, there are a number of behaviours, activities, and talks that need to take place on the parts of different professionals, including principals and teachers, in order to adopt effective inclusive practises. The attitudes of the educators towards inclusive education, their understanding of the needs for new practises to be introduced on inclusive education, as well as subjective norms like the principals' expectations, all have an impact on these behaviours, activities, and interactions.

It has been concluded that Facility were different on both the schools as reported by teachers and principals of both the schools. However, these overall differences were not observed by the students of both the schools. Ehsan (2018) in a research study reported that there are no adequate facilities in inclusion setup of education and sufficient resources is required to implement inclusive education in Pakistani schools.

It has also been concluded that there was trend of conducting conferences and meetings between parents and teachers in both the schools and no difference was observed on the part of teachers, but on the part of students and principals, it was observable. Lack of parental cooperation is another issue that is crucial in the transition to inclusive education (Lamofsky & Lazarus, 2001). Some

parents may attend pre planned meetings with teachers while some visit schools casually. Some parents may keep themselves in contact with teachers and also with Principals.

It has been concluded that there was systems of “Assessment” of students in both the schools on the part of teachers, students and Principals also. Children with Disabilities in Azerbaijan is a project that has been started by the non-profit Center for Innovative Education (CIE) in Azerbaijan which aims to improve education. The project supports inclusive education's long-term viability. The Early Childhood Program of the Open Society Institutes, which provided funding for it, aims to help instructors become more capable of including students with disabilities in the regular Kindergarten curriculum. Since 1994, South Africa is also improving its inclusive educational institutes. An academic staff member at a university in Prague has created a one-semester course named Fundamentals of Inclusive Education in the area of teacher development in the Czech Republic. The specific training helps teachers enhance their understanding of the inclusive education concept and familiarises them with how different inclusive education ideas are implemented in schools. They also participate in research projects that work to advance the didactic method of instruction. They also take part in the Models of Inclusive Practice initiative, which looks at how schools are creating environments that accommodate to the needs of students with disabilities (Ehsan, 2018). Keeping in view the development in inclusive educational setup in international context, there is need for improvement in inclusive education in Pakistan.

4.1. Recommendations and Implications of the Study

Some recommendations are given on the basis of findings of this study. As both the schools reported that there was no support from the government financially or administratively to these schools, therefore, the concerned ministry should extend help to these schools so that they may solve their problems more efficiently. The teachers of KSIE, Abbotabad should be trained for improvement in teaching particularly for special students. The Principal and teachers should aware parents about the problems of students and telling them the importance of updating the performance of their students. Both the schools should provide the facility of playground for healthy and physical activities of the students. There should be the availability of medical facilities especially for special children and trained therapist also be there in both the schools. Both the schools should make connection with local and international donors who donate for Inclusive Education. The study to be conducted in future on Inclusive Education may include more schools for comparison among them so that a complete picture about inclusive education can be seen on national level. In future studies the longitudinal data may be obtained for reaching at conclusion keeping in view the element of time duration.

This study may help to understand the perception of Principles, teachers and also students provided a different point of view which will help the entire stakeholder to understand the point of view of Principles, teachers and also students of Kingston Schools for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad and Smart School for Inclusive Education, D.I.Khan. This research study will be helpful practically for the stakeholder, such as concerned government departments regarding policy formulation; parents will also be able to understanding the structure and problems of Inclusive Schools. This study will also help the donor agencies to sort out the area for investing funds to overcome the problems of Inclusive Schools situated in KP.

REFERENCES

- Adunola, O. (2011). *The Impact of Teachers' Teaching Methods on the Academic Performance of Primary School Pupils in Ijebu -Ode Local cut Area of Ogun State*. Ego Booster Books, Ogun State, Nigeria..
- Ayeni, A.J. (2011). Teachers professional development and quality assurance in Nigerian Secondary Schools, *World Journal of Education*, 1(2), 143-149.
- Bartolo, P. A. (2010). The process of teacher education for inclusion: The Maltese Experience. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 10(1), 139–148.
- Behlol, M.G. (2011). Inclusive Education: Preparation of Teachers, Challenges in Classroom and future prospects. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 28(1).
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2004). *Working Inside the Black Box: Assessment for Learning in the Classroom*. Phi Delta Kappan, Bloomington: United States of America.
- Brady, L., & Kennedy, K. (2003). *Celebrating Student Achievement: Assessment and Reporting*. Pearson Education: Australia.
- 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), 157-168.
- Greitzer, F. A. (2002). Cognitive Approach to Student-Centered E-Learning, Human Factors and Society,” 46th Annual Meeting, Sept 30 – Oct 4.
- Hesson, M. & Shad, K.F. (2007). A student-centered learning model. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(11), 628-636.
- Horne, P. E., & Timmons, V. (2011). Making it work: Teachers' perspectives on inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13(3), 273-286.
- Kuyini, A. B., & Desai, I. (2007). Principals' and teachers' attitudes and knowledge of inclusive. *JOEL*, 4(10).
- Lamofsky, L., & Lazarus, S. (2001). First step in the development of an inclusive education system. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31.
- McAlpine, M. (2006). *The Principles of Assessment*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Ehsan, M. (2018). Inclusive Education in Primary and Secondary Schools of Pakistan: Role of Teachers. *ASRJETS*, 40 (1).
- Peters, S. J. (2007). A Historical Analysis of International Inclusive Education Policy and Individuals with Disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 18 (2): 98 – 108.

- Ryndak, D. L., Jackson, L., & Billingsley, F. (2000). Defining school inclusion for students with moderate to severe disabilities: What do experts say?. *Exceptionality*, 8(2), 101-116.
- S.M. Farooq. (2012). Problems faced by students with special needs in ordinary Pakistani schools. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 3(1), PP. 13-27.
- Saglam, H. I. (2011). An Investigation on Teaching Materials Used in Social Studies Lesson. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(1), 36–44.
- Taylor, R. W., & Ringlaben, R. P. (2012). Impacting preservice teachers' attitudes toward inclusion. *Higher Education Studies*, 2(3).
- Times, P. (2017). <https://www.dailyparliamenttimes.com/2017/01/03/disable-pesrson-scenario-2017>.