

Comparative Study of Inclusive Education Schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Tamseela Naz, *Working Folks Grammar Higher Secondary School Dera Township (F), Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan*

Keywords	Abstract
Inclusive Education, Comparative Study, Mixed Method, KP Schools.	<p><i>There were two schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) which provided education in an inclusive setting. The aim of the study was to make a comparison between both the schools. A mixed-method design of the study was followed. An 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 the Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) technique. The result revealed that there was a significant difference at $p < .05$ between both the schools regarding "Method and Material" and "Facilities", whereas no significant difference was found at $p > .05$ 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 differences regarding parent-teacher conferences. Moreover, regarding "assessment", there was a system of "assessment" of students in both schools on the part of teachers and students as well as principals. The comparison of both the schools enabled the contribution in the field of inclusive education system in KP.</i></p>

INTRODUCTION

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

In the year 2014, UNESCO reported that Pakistan has 10% out-of-school children, and Pakistan stands at second in the ranking of out-of-school children in the world. Pakistan was declared in a state of educational emergency (Barber, 2010). Parliament Times (2017) reported that

development in educational programs for disabled persons in Pakistan is acutely low and meager in KP. Policy development, as a part of legal support, was initiated in 1985, which led toward the approval of the 1st National Policy regarding disabled 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 the 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 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 day, having development in the concept of initiative learning, use a flexible student-centered approach to develop learning actively (Greitzer, 2002). This approach is also used by others, as Hesson and Shad (2007) concluded that the 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 print and in the form of electronic equipment are very essential in the profession of teaching, as they are considered additional helpful tools for teachers to explain things for the learning purposes of the students. Many studies affirm that sensing organs are activated through learning materials during the learning-teaching phase, which helps to make the learning process easy and enduring. Alternatively, it can be said that the activation of numbers of sensing organs is directly proportionate to the development of the learning process (Saglam, 2011). Teachers, in a study, showed adverse behavior due to the time they spent on special students as compared to the time spent on normal students (Horne & Farrell, 2011).

While talking about the teaching-learning process, an assessment is considered a complex concept, especially in the context of special students and the perception of the community on its purpose. Besides, it is given more attention on the complexity of assessment due to its core role in the educational process. Initially, assessment facilitates professionals 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 different school-related policies and issues is found in different formats, like Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Parent-Teacher Conference (PTC) or volunteering at the school. Parent-teacher conferences help to develop the school's learning process and education as a whole, 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 the other is in Abbottabad. Keeping in view the increasing importance of inclusive education, the study was interested in focusing 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, Abbottabad. It was realized that no comparative study on

inclusive schools has been done in the past in the context of the province of Khyber Pukhtunkhwa. Therefore, to develop awareness about the conditions of inclusive education in KP and to fill the gap of making assessments of schools based on the criteria of teaching methods, material used, training aspects, attitudes of teachers, parent involvement, and facilities extended toward students, this study was conducted in the context of KP. In the study, it has also been examined how far these institutions were successful in imparting quality education to disabled students without affecting the growth and learning outcomes of normal students.

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.

Hypotheses of the Study

Ho1: 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.

Ho2: 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.

Ho3: 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.

Ho4: 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.

Ho5: 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.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this study a 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 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.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this part, research hypotheses are tested through an independent t-test, which is reported in the form of an 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 and Material

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Method and Material	Kingston School	18	2.484	.498	.117
	Smart School	30	2.942	.230	.042
Independent Sample T-Test (Method and 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 the above table, whereas the mean of Smart Inclusive School, D. I. Khan, was 2.942. The significant difference is evident in the t-test result table, where the *p*-value is highly significant as *p* = .001, which proves that there is a significant difference between both the schools regarding “Method and Material”. Therefore, the null hypothesis H_01 is rejected, and the alternate hypothesis H_a1 is accepted as true.

Table 2: Mean and T-Test of Training and Attitude

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Training and Attitude	Kingston School	18	2.527	.372	.087
	Smart School	30	2.422	.333	.060
Independent Sample T-Test (Training and 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 a slight difference of mean between both the schools, to find the significant difference, the t-test was run. The value of the t-test was highly insignificant, as *p* = .315, which provides that there was no significant mean difference between both the schools regarding “Training and Attitude”. Therefore, null hypothesis H_02 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 a slight mean difference between both the schools regarding “Facilities”. However, to find the significance of this mean difference, a t-test was executed and shown in the above table. The p -value was highly significant, as $p = .000$, which indicates that there is a 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, Abbottabad, is 2.278, whereas it was 2.527 for Smart Inclusive School, D. I. Khan, regarding “Teacher-Parents Conference”. The p -value of the t-test is highly insignificant, as $p = .192$, which indicates that there was no significant difference between the means of both the schools on the “Teacher-Parents Conference”. Therefore, H_a4 is rejected and H_04 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 the *p*-value is not significant, as *p* = .773, which negates that there is a significant difference between the means of both the schools regarding “assessment”. Therefore, the result confirms that H_a5 is rejected and H_05 is accepted as true.

3.1. Qualitative Data Analysis

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

Table 6: Students’ Qualitative Data

	Kingston School, Abbotabad			Smart School, D. I. Khan		
	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%
A) Method and 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 and Material				87		96
B) Training and 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 and 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 Conference					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 the above table, wherein in the first column the questions that 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 terms 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, 96% of the respondents from KSIE and 93% from SSIE confirmed that their teachers allow them to sit in the front rows of the class. In KSIE 69% of respondents confirmed that they study the same syllabus and books, whereas 100% of respondents of SSIE confirmed that they study the same syllabus. All the students of both the schools were enjoying and feeling good about studying in their schools. 100% of 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 said that they were studying the same syllabus for all students, while 69% of KSIE said that they were using the same syllabus. 69% of respondents of KSIE said that their teachers inform their parents of their progress, whereas 85% of respondents of SSIE confirmed this. 96% of respondents of KSIE and 100% of SSIE confirmed that their parents were happy for them studying in the school. Parents of 65% of 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 tests before the commencement of exams, and there is completely the same exam system for board exams.

Qualitative Analysis of Principal's Response

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

Table 7: Themes of Interview Data Collected From Principals of Schools

Themes	Patterns	Kingston School	Smart School
Method and Material	Teachers' expertise in teaching.	2	2
	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 and 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 abnormal 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
% Score		21%	43%
Patterns	Kingston School	Smart School	
Parent-Teacher Conference	Parent-teacher conference held frequently	1	2
	Parents were interested in school policy and procedure	2	1
	of education		
	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 has been shown in the 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 a very low score of KSIE for "Facilities" at 21%, while SSIE had approximately twice as much as this score, which was 43%. The "Parent-Teacher Conference"

score for KSIE was 88%, and for SSIE it was 63%. There was a 100% score for KSIE on "Assessment" as well as a 100% score for SSIE on the same.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The results were generated quantitatively to make comparisons quantitatively, while the results of the hypothesis were matched and contrasted with qualitative results presented in the form of quantitative data. It has been concluded that method and material were different at 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 et al., 2000). In the current study there seems to be shared responsibility 100% in Kingston School for Inclusive Education, Abbotabad, where the principal perceived appropriate use of "methods and material".

Regarding the "Training and Attitude" of teachers, there was no difference in both the schools as responded to 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 a lack of knowledge on inclusion and need more training. The importance of teachers' attitudes has been endorsed by the response of SSIE's principal, who indicated that though the teachers' competency of teaching was good, regarding the misbehavior of normal and special students, there needs to be more patience by teachers, but the response of KSIE indicated that their teachers require training and more patience regarding the misbehavior of normal and special students. The principals were satisfied with 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 need 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 the facilities were different at 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 the inclusion setup of education and sufficient resources are required to implement inclusive education in Pakistani schools.

It has also been concluded that there was a 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 pr-planned meetings with teachers, while some visit schools casually. Some parents may keep in contact with teachers and also with principals.

It has been concluded that there were 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 has also been 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 the needs of students with disabilities (Ehsan, 2018). Keeping in view the development of inclusive educational setups in international contexts, there is a need for improvement in inclusive education in Pakistan.

Recommendations and Implications

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 for 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, Abbottabad, should be trained for improvement in teaching, particularly for special students. The principal and teachers should make parents aware of the problems of students and tell them the importance of updating the performance of their students. Both the schools should provide the facility of a playground for healthy and physical activities of the students. There should be the availability of medical facilities, especially for special children, and trained therapists should also be there in both the schools. Both the schools should make connections with local and international donors who donate for inclusive education. The study to be conducted in the future on inclusive education may include more schools for comparison among them so that a complete picture about inclusive education can be seen on a national level. In future studies the longitudinal data may be obtained for reaching a 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, Abbottabad, and Smart School for Inclusive Education, D. I. Khan. This research study will be helpful practically for the stakeholders, such as concerned government departments regarding policy formulation; parents will also be able to understand 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.

Acknowledgement: We would like to thank all the participants for their cooperation and input.

Conflict of Interest: There are no conflicts of interest between the authors.

Funding Information: To complete this research, no financial support was provided.

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.

Ehsan, M. (2018). Inclusive Education in Primary and Secondary Schools of Pakistan: Role of Teachers. *ASRJETS*, 40 (1).

Farooq, M. S. (2012). Problems Faced by Students with Special Needs in Ordinary Pakistani Schools. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 8(1), 13-27.

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.

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.

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>.