



Analysis of the Institutional Barriers to Inclusive Education for Diverse Student Needs in Pakistan

Muhammad Anwar ul Haq¹ & Nazia Rafiq²

¹Department of Sociology, PMAS-Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan

²Department of Anthropology, PMAS-Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: February 23, 2025
Revised: April 05, 2025
Accepted: April 09, 2025
Available Online: April 11, 2025

Keywords:

Inclusive education; institutional barriers; diverse student needs; educational equity; Muzaffargarh

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Anwar ul Haq

Email:

anwarbhutta786@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Inclusive education aims to provide all students, regardless of socioeconomic status, special needs, or skill level, with equitable access to high-quality education. However, its implementation is often challenged by institutional barriers, particularly in developing regions. This study investigates these institutional obstacles faced by diverse learners in accessing inclusive education, employing quantitative methods and survey instruments for comprehensive analysis. Specifically, it examines the challenges faced by schools in the Muzaffargarh district of Punjab, Pakistan, in meeting the needs of students from diverse backgrounds. Qualitative data were collected through interviews and focus groups with parents, school administrators, and educators. The findings reveal significant impediments to inclusive education, including inadequate resources, an insufficiently trained teaching workforce, inflexible curriculum requirements, and a lack of governmental financial support. Furthermore, students from marginalized communities and those with disabilities face additional challenges to quality education due to cultural stigma and financial constraints. The study underscores the critical need for policy reforms, enhanced teacher training initiatives, and increased funding to promote inclusive educational practices. The findings offer recommendations for stakeholders, educators, and policymakers to cultivate a more inclusive learning environment in Muzaffargarh, contributing to the broader discussion on educational equity.



Introduction

Education is defined as the process of imparting or acquiring general knowledge, developing reasoning and perceptual abilities, and generally preparing oneself or others rationally for adult life. The objective of education is to dispel ignorance and increase understanding of the world,

thereby reducing susceptibility to manipulation. As Aristotle stated, “It is the mark of an educated mind to be able to entertain a thought without accepting it” (Lawson-Tancred, 1999). The right to education is universal, regardless of group affiliation, including size, race, religion, caste, or creed. UNESCO’s “Education for All” initiative encourages member nations to develop and strengthen frameworks that promote education for all citizens. However, history demonstrates that biases often influence the provision of necessities, including education, to groups perceived as inferior.

Inclusive education (IE) involves integrating students with disabilities into general education classrooms. Advocates of IE argue that children with disabilities are capable of and should be educated alongside their non-disabled peers in mainstream settings. Research, such as that presented by Bennett et al. (1997) and Cowne (2003), suggests that IE can foster improved academic achievement and social integration for both students with and without disabilities. The successful implementation of IE is influenced by beliefs, attitudes, and concerns surrounding disability. As a concept that has evolved, its feasibility is linked to the ongoing development of both special and general education systems, as well as increasing societal understanding and acceptance. This research investigates the obstacles to the implementation of inclusive education.

Incorporation describes the process of becoming a member of a group or framework and actively participating within that system. Many individuals with unrecognized and sometimes overlooked talents find that their rights are inadequately protected. A supportive environment is crucial to encourage these individuals within established societal structures. While “inclusion” is often defined as inviting historically marginalized individuals to participate, this definition is problematic. It raises the critical question of who holds the authority to include or exclude individuals with disabilities. The responsibility for ensuring the inclusion of people with disabilities in all aspects of life rests with everyone, thereby integrating them as integral members of society (Schuelka and Johnstone, 2012; Hehir et al., 2016).

The foundation of inclusive education lies in the recognition of education as a fundamental human right and a cornerstone of a more equitable society. However, the implementation of inclusive education is fraught with challenges in every country. In developing nations, many educational institutions lack even basic, often locally producible, instructional tools such as maps, charts, and other visual aids (Eleweke and Rodda, 2002). While educational professionals understand the rights of students with disabilities and the principles of inclusion, institutions are expected to provide equitable educational opportunities to all children within their communities, regardless of disability status (Foreman et al., 2008).

The term “barrier” is defined as an obstacle that hinders agreement, communication, or collaboration between individuals or groups (“Barriers,” n.d.). In this context, a barrier represents a confluence of difficulties impeding the achievement of a specific objective; multiple factors can combine to create a barrier, resulting in incomplete task execution. These obstacles are often influenced by cultural practices, religious beliefs, and traditions. For example, white supremacist ideology historically obstructed the attainment of equal civil rights for people of color. Other groups may also face barriers, not necessarily related to race, but often due to circumstances beyond their control. Individuals with disabilities comprise approximately 15% of the global population, including an estimated 150 million children, with 80% residing in developing countries (Hayes and Bulat, 2017).

A review of global studies by Ainscow (2005) suggested replacing the terms “special educational need” and “special educational provision” with “barriers to learning and participation” and “resources to support learning and participation,” respectively. In this framework, support

encompasses any initiatives that enhance schools' capacity to address diversity. This shift resonates with the work of scholars such as Susan Hart, particularly her research on creative thinking (Hart, 1996, 2000). A significant impediment to inclusive education is the scarcity of facilities and instructional resources (Charema, 2007). Kristensen et al. (2003) posited that developing affordable instructional resources could mitigate this challenge. However, adequate funding is essential for acquiring appropriate materials. Beyond the availability of resources, teachers' experiences and training significantly influence their attitudes (Meng, 2008). Furthermore, many developing countries face a critical shortage of support personnel for training programs, including audiologists, psychologists, speech and language pathologists, communication support workers, and paraphrasers (Eleweke and Rodda, 2002). Negative staff attitudes toward inclusion initiatives can also impede their success (Centra, 1993).

Interpersonal collaboration is a framework for direct interaction among two or more individuals of equal standing who voluntarily engage in joint decision-making as they work towards a shared goal (Friend et al., 2010). Effective inclusive education requires positive intentions and attitudes from teachers and instructors towards students with learning differences, thereby fostering a welcoming and supportive environment for inclusion (Ewing et al., 2018). Their expertise and understanding are crucial for the success of inclusion initiatives (Finkelstein et al., 2021).

Teachers in these contexts often experience significant anxiety regarding their competence and ability to effectively engage with students who have special needs (Moberg et al., 2020). A student struggling with memorization or comprehension may repeatedly ask questions, thereby disrupting the class or lecture.

This persistent interruption can create difficulties for classmates, potentially leading to frustration, an incomplete syllabus, and challenges in adhering to the teaching plan.

Methods

Participants and procedures

To investigate the challenges faced by educators and administrators in implementing inclusive education, a quantitative research methodology was employed. Participants were selected via convenience sampling from primary and secondary schools within the district. Ethical research practices were prioritized, and all participants provided voluntary informed consent. A total of 369 valid questionnaires were collected from respondents across four tehsils: Muzaffargarh, Kot Adu, Alipur, and Jatoi. Participant demographics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Respondents' information

Category	Subcategory	N	Percentage
Gender	Male	295	79.9
	Female	74	20.1
Educational status	Matric to BA	145	39.3
	MA	180	48.8
	MPhil	34	9.2
	PhD	10	2.7
School status (public)	Primary	201	54.5
	Middle	55	14.9
	Secondary	113	30.6

Measures Instrument on institutional barriers to inclusive education

A literature review informed the selection of the Likert scale as the most appropriate instrument for this study, given its suitability for large sample sizes and its established efficacy in measuring attitudes. A five-point Likert scale will be employed. Demographic data, including gender, age, education level, and academic standing, will be collected via a questionnaire. A structured interview schedule was developed to explore institutional barriers to inclusive education. These barriers will be assessed through twelve indicators: segregation of students with disabilities within mainstream classrooms, delayed classroom communication by teachers, teacher shortages, outdated curriculum, infrastructural limitations, ineffective school administration, an inadequate curriculum, insufficient funding, and transportation deficiencies. This study posits that inclusive education promotes social inclusion and positively impacts the social and emotional development of children with special needs.

Reliability and validity

The construct validity of the questionnaire was assessed. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.704 was obtained, and Bartlett's test of sphericity yielded a statistically significant result (χ^2 ; $p < .001$). These findings support the structural validity of the questionnaire and its suitability for binary logistic regression analysis. A reliability analysis examined the internal consistency of the 12-item questionnaire. The overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.704 indicates satisfactory reliability.

Data Analysis

Data for this study were collected through questionnaires. Following collection, data were rigorously screened, and outliers were removed. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS (version 20) to assess data reliability and validity and to identify any discrepancies. The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the participants. Second, cross-tabulation was employed to explore the relationship between institutional barriers and inclusive education. Finally, binary logistic regression was used to analyze the impact of institutional barriers on the implementation of inclusive education.

Results

This section provides a concise and precise description of the results, their interpretation, and the conclusions drawn from them.

Table 2 shows that 153 respondents (68.6% of the sample) acknowledged the influence of the challenges of inclusive education, while 52 (35.6%) denied any impact. The odds ratio for the perceived difficulty of teaching students with and without disabilities in a shared classroom was four times greater for those who acknowledged an influence on inclusive education than for those who did not. This odds ratio demonstrates the relationship between respondents' perception of the challenge and its impact on inclusive education. Specifically, the odds of perceiving this challenge as impacting inclusive education were four times higher among those who agreed there was an impact than among those who disagreed. This indicates a strong association between the perceived difficulty of teaching heterogeneous student groups and the perceived impact on inclusive education. The 95% confidence interval for this odds ratio was (3.00, 8.256), suggesting that the true odds ratio lies within this range with a high degree of confidence. These findings suggest that

a substantial proportion of respondents consider teaching children with and without disabilities in a unified classroom to be a challenging endeavor for educators.

In the selected sample, a majority of 161 respondents (43.6%) strongly agreed that teachers segregate learners with impairments, leading to their isolation within classrooms and negatively impacting inclusive education. Conversely, 54 (37%) respondents believed there was no impact on inclusive education. This indicates that a substantial proportion of respondents perceive a relationship between the segregation and isolation of learners with impairments and the effectiveness of inclusive education.

The odds ratio for those who strongly agreed was six times greater than that of those who disagreed, demonstrating a statistically significant association between the perception of teacher-led segregation and isolation of learners with impairments and the perceived impact on inclusive education (odds ratio: OR = 6, 95% CI: 4.173, 11.599). This finding suggests that teachers' segregation of learners with impairments, resulting in their classroom isolation, has a significant negative impact on inclusive education.

The study sample consisted of respondents, the majority of 139 respondents (62.3%) strongly agreed that teacher communication delays influence barriers to inclusive education, while a smaller proportion, i.e. 52 (35.6%) agreed that such delays have no influence. The odds ratio for perceived influence on these barriers was 5.56, indicating that respondents who agreed or strongly agreed were over five times more likely to perceive teacher communication delays as a hindrance to inclusive education than those who disagreed. This suggests that communication delays among teachers are perceived as a substantial obstacle to the effective implementation of inclusive education. Furthermore, classroom communication lag by teachers demonstrated a statistically significant association with the outcome variable, with a confidence interval of (2.402-6.137). These findings confirm a statistically significant relationship between perceived influence on barriers to inclusive education and the outcome variable. In conclusion, classroom communication lag, especially on the part of teachers, emerges as a significant factor impacting the success of inclusive education.

Of the total sample, 167 respondents (75%) agreed that there is an influence on the barriers to inclusive education, while 54 (24%) disagreed. The odds ratio for agreement versus disagreement regarding the influence on barriers to inclusive education was 6, indicating that respondents who agreed were six times more likely to perceive such an influence. The results indicate a statistically significant relationship between the perceived influence of barriers to inclusive education and the outcome variable. Specifically, the findings suggest that issues within inclusive education are significantly associated with a shortage of teachers, outdated curricula, and inadequate infrastructure. The 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio was (3.872, 10.408), further supporting the statistical significance of these findings. Therefore, it is concluded that a majority of respondents perceive an influence on the barriers to inclusive education, and this perceived influence is statistically significant. The identified contributing factors to these challenges are a shortage of teachers, outdated curricula, and infrastructural barriers.

Furthermore, within the study sample, 158 respondents (70.9%) strongly agreed that a lack of technical support and resources influences the barriers to inclusive education, while 64 respondents (43.8%) agreed that it does not. The odds ratio for the influence of this factor on barriers to inclusive education was four times higher for respondents who agreed compared to those who disagreed. This finding indicates a statistically significant association between the lack of technical support and resources and the hindrance of inclusive education. This association is

further supported by a confidence interval of 2.855 to 8.014, confirming the statistical significance of this factor.

In the selected sample, the majority of 168 respondents (75.3%) strongly agreed with the assertion of administrative influence on barriers to inclusive education, while a smaller proportion (76, 52%) agreed. The odds ratio of 2 indicates that respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with the influence were twice as likely to disagree. This suggests that school administrations may be hesitant to enroll students with special needs due to concerns about potential negative impacts on school performance metrics. The confidence interval (1.774-4.966) indicates statistical significance. These findings suggest a statistically significant association between perceived administrative influence on barriers to inclusive education and the outcome variable. The reluctance of school administrations to enroll students with special needs, potentially driven by concerns about school performance, emerges as a salient factor impeding inclusive education.

The selected sample comprised 223 respondents. A majority of 125 respondents (56.1%) strongly agreed that influence exists regarding barriers to inclusive education, while 49 (33.6%) agreed there was no such influence. The odds ratio for perceived influence on barriers to inclusive education was two times greater for those who agreed or strongly agreed compared to those who disagreed. This suggests that the available curriculum may be inadequate to meet learners' needs at both macro and micro levels. A statistically significant association was found between perceived influence on barriers to inclusive education and the outcome variable. The 95% confidence interval for this association was 1.574 to 4.018.

Among the selected respondents, i.e. 23 (10.3%) agreed that teacher influence constituted a barrier to inclusive education, while 27 (18.5%) disagreed. The odds ratio for teacher influence as a barrier was 0.4, indicating that respondents who disagreed with this factor were 0.4 times as likely to perceive it as a barrier compared to those who agreed. The availability of sufficient funds for inclusive education implementation was not statistically significantly associated with the outcome variable. The 95% confidence interval for this association was 0.239 to 0.811.

Of the total respondents, 123 (55.2%) agreed that transportation issues influence the dropout of special pupils from inclusive education, while 52 (34.2%) disagreed. Many respondents (55.2%) strongly agreed with this assertion, suggesting a perceived strong connection between transportation challenges and the discontinuation of inclusive education for these pupils. The odds ratio for agreement on the influence of transportation barriers was two times higher than for those who disagreed. This perceived connection is further supported by the finding that most respondents (55.2%) strongly agreed that transportation problems contribute to the dropout of special pupils from inclusive education.

Statistical analysis revealed a significant difference in opinions between those who strongly agreed or were neutral and those who strongly disagreed. The 95% confidence interval for this difference was 1.550 to 3.810. These findings highlight a clear link between transportation challenges and dropout rates in inclusive education, with statistical analyses confirming a significant difference in respondent opinions.

Of the total sample, a majority of 118 respondents (80.8%) strongly disagreed with the notion of the influence on barriers to inclusive education, while 97 respondents (43.5%) agreed. The odds ratio for agreement on influence was 0.2 times that of disagreement. This suggests that if the odds of agreeing about influence are 0.2 times the odds of disagreeing, it implies that Ministry of Education officers do not visit schools monthly. This, in turn, suggests infrequent visits by Ministry of Education officers. A statistically significant association was found between perceived

influence on barriers to inclusive education and the outcome variable. The odds ratio and statistical significance analysis indicate a significant association, with a negative influence on inclusive education barriers being more likely when Ministry of Education officers do not conduct monthly school visits. The 95% confidence interval for this association is (0.131, 0.415).

Of the study participants, 169 (75.8%) strongly agreed with the concept of influence on barriers to inclusive education, while 64 (43.8%) agreed that such influence existed. The odds of agreeing with this influence were five times greater than the odds of disagreeing. This suggests a strong association between perceived influence and barriers to inclusive education. Specifically, this addresses the question of whether teachers agree that budget and physical infrastructure pose obstacles to sustainable inclusive education. The findings indicate a statistically significant association between perceived influence and the identified barriers ($p < .05$). This significance is further supported by the odds ratio of 5 (95% CI: 3.058, 8.559).

A majority of the 197 respondents (80.4%) strongly agreed with the notion of influence, while 75 respondents (60.5%) agreed that there was no influence on barriers to inclusive education. The odds ratio for influence on barriers to inclusive education was 3 times greater than that of respondents who disagreed. This suggests the institutional problems faced when dealing with these children daily. The findings indicate a statistically significant association between the influence of barriers to inclusive education and the outcome variable, with a confidence interval of (2.146, 6.302).

Table 2: Institutional factors and inclusive education

Institutional factors	Inclusive education		Odds Ratio (95% C.I)	P-Value
	No Influence	Influence		
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)		
Teaching children with and without disabilities in the same classroom is a difficult task for teachers.				
Strongly Agree	52 (35.6%)	153 (68.6%)	4.97 (3.00, 8.256)	.000
Neutral	28 (19.2%)	31 (13.9%)	1.87 (.982, 3.576)	.057
Strongly Disagree	66 (45.2%)	39 (17.5%)	1.00	
Teachers segregate the disabled learners and put them isolated in the classrooms				
Strongly Agree	54 (37%)	161 (43.6%)	6.957 (4.173, 11.599)	.000
Neutral	15 (10.3%)	29 (13%)	4.511 (2.142, 9.501)	.000
Strongly Disagree	77 (52.7%)	33 (14.8%)	1.00	
Classroom communication lag by teachers impedes the way in inclusive classrooms.				
Strongly Agree	52 (35.6%)	139 (62.3%)	3.840 (2.402, 6.137)	.000
Neutral	15 (10.3%)	29 (13%)	2.777 (1.362, 5.660)	.005
Strongly Disagree	79 (54%)	55 (24.7%)	1.00	
Inclusive education problems occur due to the shortage of teachers, and outdated syllabuses.				
Strongly Agree	54 (37%)	167 (75%)	6.348 (3.872-10.408)	.000
Neutral	14 (9.6%)	18 (8%)	2.639 (1.187, 5.867)	.017
Strongly Disagree	78 (53.4%)	38 (17%)	1.00	

Lack of technical support and resources creates barriers to implementing inclusive education				
Strongly Agree	64 (43.8%)	158 (70.9%)	4.783 (2.855, 8.014)	.000
Neutral	20 (13.7%)	33 (14.8%)	3.197 (1.587, 6.440)	.001
Strongly Disagree	62 (42.5%)	32 (14.3%)	1.00	
School administration is reluctant to enroll special children due to the fear of poor school results.				
Strongly Agree	76 (52%)	168 (75.3%)	2.968 (1.774, 4.966)	.000
Neutral	23 (15.8%)	20 (9.0%)	1.168 (0.556, 2.452)	.682
Strongly Disagree	47 (32.2%)	35 (15.7%)	1.00	
The available curriculum in the school is incapable of fulfilling the needs of the learners.				
Strongly Agree	49 (33.6%)	125 (56.1%)	2.515 (1.574, 4.018)	.000
Neutral	28 (19.2%)	28 (12.6%)	0.986 (0.530, 1.833)	.964
Strongly Disagree	69 (47.3%)	70 (31.4%)	1.00	
Sufficient funds are being allocated for the implementation of inclusive education in your schools.				
Strongly Agree	92 (63.0%)	178 (79.8%)	0.440 (0.239, 0.811)	.008
Neutral	27 (18.5%)	22 (9.9%)	0.421 (0.227, 0.780)	.006
Strongly Disagree			1.00	
Transportation lags correspond to the dropout of special pupils from inclusive education involvement.				
Strongly Agree	50 (34.2%)	123 (55.2%)	2.430 (1.550, 3.810)	.000
Neutral	15 (10.3%)	18 (8.1%)	1.185 (0.559, 2.512)	.657
Strongly Disagree	81 (55.5%)	82 (36.8%)	1.00	
The Ministry of Education officer does not come to your school once a month.				
Strongly Agree	118 (80.8%)	97 (43.5%)	0.233 (0.131, 0.415)	.000
Neutral	9 (6.2%)	59 (26.5%)	1.859 (0.781, 4.423)	.161
Strongly Disagree	19 (13%)	67 (30%)	1.00	
You agree that budget and physical infrastructure lag in the way of inclusive education.				
Strongly Agree	64 (43.8%)	169 (75.8%)	5.116 (3.058, 8.559)	.000
Neutral	20 (13.7%)	22 (9.9%)	2.131 (1.016, 4.470)	.045
Strongly Disagree	62 (42.5%)	32 (14.3%)	1.00	
Institutional problems do you face when dealing with these children daily?				
Strongly Agree	75 (60.5%)	197 (80.4%)	3.677 (2.146, 6.302)	.000
Neutral	7 (13.7%)	18 (7.3%)	3.600 (2.337, 9.696)	.011
Strongly Disagree	42 (33.9%)	30 (12.2%)	1.00	

Table 3: Institutional and Parental barriers to inclusive education

Barrier	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7
AOR, 95% CI	AOR, 95% CI	AOR, 95% CI	AOR, 95% CI	AOR, 95% CI	AOR, 95% CI	AOR, 95% CI	AOR, 95% CI
Teaching with/without disabilities is difficult	1.898 (1.033-3.488)	2.071 (1.116, 3.846)	1.689 (0.908, 3.142)	1.453 (0.762-2.770)	1.522 (0.804, 2.880)	1.611 (0.853, 3.042)	1.496 (0.791, 2.828)
Teachers segregate disabled learners	3.364 (1.833, 6.171)	2.684 (1.426, 5.051)	2.859 (1.524, 5.363)	2.836 (1.519, 5.295)	3.025 (1.623, 5.638)	3.162 (1.712, 5.841)	3.319 (1.772, 6.218)
Shortage of teachers, outdated syllabus	3.170 (1.801, 5.582)	2.659 (1.479, 4.779)	3.018 (1.700, 5.356)	2.592 (1.432, 4.691)	3.084 (1.723, 5.519)	3.061 (1.728, 5.422)	2.966 (1.651, 5.329)
Poverty obstructs special people	2.221 (1.261-3.914)		2.079 (1.176-3.674)				
Parental illiteracy							
Parents fear children with special needs.				2.488 (1.369, 4.521)			
Parents prefer girls to special children.					3.083 (1.698, 5.595)		
Parents take an interest in the education of children with disabilities.						1.968 (1.108, 3.493)	
Parents not involved/informed about inclusive education.							3.622 (2.060, 6.366)

Table 3 presents the results regarding institutional barriers to inclusive education. The data indicates that teaching students with and without disabilities in the same classroom is perceived as challenging, with an adjusted odds ratio of 1.898 (1.033, 3.488). In the first model, the odds of agreeing that this practice is difficult are 1.898 times higher compared to the reference group, a statistically significant result. Teacher segregation of disabled learners is also a significant concern, with an adjusted odds ratio of 3.364 (1.833, 6.171). The odds of agreeing that teachers segregate disabled learners are 3.364 times higher compared to the reference group, again a statistically significant finding. A shortage of teachers and an outdated syllabus are perceived as significant barriers, with an adjusted odds ratio of 3.170 (1.801, 5.582). This indicates that the likelihood of these factors being seen as barriers is 3.170 times higher compared to the reference group, a statistically significant result. Finally, environmental factors are believed to affect the education of children with disabilities, with an adjusted odds ratio of 2.483 (1.369, 4.504), demonstrating a strong and significant belief in the impact of environmental factors.

Recommendations

Based on the preceding findings, the following recommendations are offered:

- (i) **Promote inclusive school policies:** Advocate for the implementation of inclusive education policies at both institutional and governmental levels. These policies should guarantee equitable opportunities and comprehensive support for all students, irrespective of their abilities.
- (ii) **Enhance awareness programs:** Develop and execute targeted awareness campaigns designed to educate parents regarding the advantages and legal entitlements associated with inclusive education. These programs should address prevailing misconceptions and emphasize the significance of inclusive practices.
- (iii) **Address socioeconomic needs:** Implement policies and initiatives to mitigate socioeconomic barriers that impede access to education for children with special needs. This

may encompass financial assistance programs, scholarships, and resource allocation for inclusive educational facilities.

By implementing these recommendations, we can strive to create more inclusive educational environments that cater to the diverse needs of all students, thereby ensuring their equitable access to quality education and opportunities for personal growth and development.

Conclusion

This study emphasizes the critical need to address institutional barriers hindering inclusive education for children with diverse needs. Key challenges include delayed classroom communication, the isolation of students with impairments by educators, the instruction of both students with and without disabilities within the same classroom without adequate support or differentiated strategies, a shortage of qualified teachers, and the use of an outdated curriculum. Furthermore, insufficient technical support and resources, coupled with reluctance from school management to admit children with special needs, pose significant obstacles. Financial constraints, transportation delays, and inadequate physical infrastructure are also identified as major impediments.

Addressing infrastructural deficiencies is crucial for cultivating inclusive learning environments. Inclusive education often requires specialized infrastructure and facilities to support students with varying needs. The absence of accessible structures, ramps, and assistive technologies can severely restrict the participation of students with disabilities. Compounding this issue is insufficient teacher training; educators may be inadequately prepared to meet the diverse needs of students in inclusive classrooms. This includes understanding varied learning modalities, adapting instructional methods, and implementing individualized education plans. Inadequate resources, such as a lack of appropriate textbooks, instructional materials, and support staff, further hinder the effective implementation of inclusive education.

Bureaucratic obstacles, such as complex administrative procedures, can also impede progress. Streamlining these processes can enhance the efficiency of inclusive initiatives. Finally, insufficient policy implementation presents a major challenge. Despite the existence of policies promoting inclusive education, their effective implementation is often problematic. Inconsistent enforcement and oversight can diminish the impact of these policies at the practical level.

Continuous research and monitoring of these initiatives are essential for the advancement of inclusive education policies and practices. This ongoing evaluation will contribute to fostering a more inclusive society where every child can achieve academic and social success.

Conflicts of interest

No conflicts of interest are reported by authors.

Data Availability Statement

This study utilizes primary data collected from the district of Muzaffargarh, Punjab, Pakistan.

Ethical statement

This research work was not previously published or submitted in any form.

References

1. Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: what are the levers for change? *Journal of educational change*, 6(2), 109-124.
2. Bennett, T., DeLuca, D., and Bruns, D. (1997). Putting inclusion into practice: Perspectives of teachers and parents. *Exceptional Children*, 64(1), 115-131.
3. Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass. (Originally published in 1990).
4. Charema, J. (2007). From special schools to inclusive education: The way forward for developing countries south of the Sahara. *Journal-International Association of Special Education*, 8(1), 88.
5. Cowne, E. A. (2003). *Developing inclusive practice: The SENCO's role in managing change*. David Fulton Publishers.
6. Eleweke, C. J., and Rodda, M. (2002). The challenge of enhancing inclusive education in developing countries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 6(2), 113-126.
7. Ewing, D. L., Monsen, J. J., and Kielblock, S. (2018). Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: a critical review of published questionnaires. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 34(2), 150-165.
8. The inclusive practices of classroom teachers: A scoping review and thematic analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(6), 735-762.
9. Foreman, M. G. G., Callendar, W., MacFadyen, A., Hickey, B. M., Thomson, R. E., and Di Lorenzo, E. (2008). Modeling the generation of the Juan de Fuca Eddy. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 113(C3).
10. Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., and Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of educational and psychological consultation*, 20(1), 9-27.
11. Hart, S. (1996). *Beyond special needs: Enhancing children's learning through innovative thinking*. Paul Chapman Publishing.
12. Hart, G. (2000). Development critiques in the 1990s: culs de sac and promising paths. *Progress in Human Geography*, 25(4), 649-658.
13. Hayes, A. M., and Bulat, J. (2017). *Disabilities inclusive education systems and policies guide for low-and middle-income countries*.
14. Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., and Burke, S. (2016). *A Summary of the Evidence on Inclusive Education*. Abt Associates.
15. Kristensen, K., Omagor-Loican, M., and Onen, N. (2003). The inclusion of learners with barriers to learning and development into ordinary school settings: a challenge for Uganda. *British Journal of Special Education*, 30(4), 194-201.
16. Lawson-Tancred, H. (1999). *Aristotle Metaphysics*. Translated with an Introduction.
17. Meng, P. (2008). Attitudes of Teachers towards Inclusive Education in China. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 8(2), 70-78.
18. Moberg, S., Muta, E., Korenaga, K., Kuorelahti, M., and Savolainen, H. (2020). Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *European journal of special needs education*, 35(1), 100-114.
19. Schuelka, M., and Johnstone, C. J. (2012). Global trends in meeting the educational rights of children with disabilities: From international institutions to local responses. *Reconsidering Development*, 2(2).