Barriers And Facilitators To Implementing Inclusive Education In Rural Primary Schools Of Nainital, Uttarakhand: Perspectives Of Teachers, Parents, And Students

[1]Dr. Ashok Upreti, [2]Dr. Pushpa Adhikari, [3]Ms. Shikha Raturi Kothari, [4]Ms. Vineeta Vishwakarma
[1]Head Department of Education (ITEP), Kumaun University, Nainital
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Education (ITEP), Kumaun University, Nainital
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Education (ITEP), Kumaun University Nainital
[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Education (ITEP), Kumaun University, Nainital.

Abstract
Inclusive education has become a central theme in India's educational discourse, yet its effective implementation in rural and hilly regions remains uneven. This study explores the barriers and facilitators influencing inclusive education in rural primary schools of Nainital district, Uttarakhand, through the perspectives of teachers, parents, and students. Employing a mixed-method explanatory design, data were collected from 20 government primary schools across five rural blocks: Bhimtal, Kotabag, Dhari, Ramgarh, and Okhalkanda. The sample comprised 60 teachers, 80 parents, and student focus groups representing approximately 150 learners. Quantitative data were gathered through structured questionnaires, while qualitative insights were derived from student focus group discussions and structured school observations. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics to identify key determinants of inclusion, whereas qualitative data underwent thematic coding to capture delicate experiences and contextual realities. Findings reveal that inadequate teacher training, limited teaching resources, and infrastructural constraints persist as primary barriers. Conversely, supportive school leadership, positive peer interaction, and community involvement emerged as strong facilitators. The study emphasizes the need for localized teacher capacity-building programs, infrastructural adaptation, and parent–school collaboration to strengthen inclusive education in rural settings. Insights from this research contribute to policy-level strategies aimed at realizing Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality and Inclusive education for all.
Keywords: *Inclusive Education, Rural schools, Teachers' Attitudes, Parental Perceptions.*

1. INTRODUCTION
1.1 Background and Context
Inclusive education has emerged as a global movement to ensure that every child, irrespective of ability, background, or social circumstance, receives equitable learning opportunities within regular classrooms. The idea gained worldwide momentum following the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) and has since been reaffirmed through Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which emphasizes 'inclusive and equitable quality education for all.' Inclusive education extends beyond the integration of children with disabilities, it embodies a broader philosophy of acceptance, participation, and equity, recognizing the diverse learning needs of every child. While the global vision is clear, implementation remains context-dependent. In many developing countries, particularly those with geographical, cultural, and infrastructural challenges, the practice of inclusion faces persistent obstacles. Studies from South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa reveal that teachers often lack sufficient preparation, schools face severe resource constraints, and parents struggle to participate meaningfully in their children's education. Consequently, there exists a considerable gap between policy intent and classroom practice (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010).
1.2 Inclusive Education in the Indian Context
India's commitment to inclusive education is reflected in several policy frameworks and legislative measures. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE, 2009) guarantees education for all children aged 6–14 years, while the National Education Policy (NEP, 2020) reinforces inclusivity as a core principle. Programs such as the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) and Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA 2.0) have further institutionalized inclusive practices by integrating children with special needs (CWSN) into mainstream schools. Despite these commendable initiatives, numerous studies indicate that inclusion in India often remains partial and policy-driven rather than practice-driven. Teacher preparedness for handling diverse learners is limited, assistive materials are scarce, and infrastructural accessibility is often poor (Sharma & Sokal, 2016). Moreover, attitudinal barriers among

educators and communities, coupled with socio-economic constraints, hinder the realization of inclusive classrooms. These issues are more pronounced in rural and hilly regions like Uttarakhand, where access, training, and resources are geographically constrained.

1.3 Regional Context: The Case of Uttarakhand and Nainital

Uttarakhand, a Himalayan state in northern India, presents a distinct context for studying inclusive education. Its topography characterized by steep terrain, scattered settlements, and remote villages creates logistical and infrastructural challenges for school management and attendance. Within the state, Nainital district is socio-economically diverse, comprising both urbanized centers like Haldwani and remote blocks such as Dhari, Ramgarh, and Okhalkanda. Government primary schools in these rural blocks cater to children from varied socio-economic backgrounds, many of whom are first-generation learners. Teachers often handle multi-grade classrooms with limited instructional resources. While state programs have introduced inclusive policies and resource teachers, on-the-ground implementation remains inconsistent. Thus, Nainital offers an appropriate case to explore how inclusion is understood, practiced, and supported in rural primary schools particularly when examined through the eyes of key stakeholders: teachers, parents, and students.

1.4 Statement of the Problem

Inclusive education aims to ensure that every child, irrespective of ability, learns together in the same environment. However, in many rural and hilly regions, the practical implementation of inclusive practices faces several challenges. In the primary schools of Nainital district, children with diverse learning needs are enrolled, yet the support systems required to meet these needs are often inadequate. Teachers may struggle with limited training and resources, parents may have restricted awareness or access to guidance, and students themselves may encounter difficulties in participating fully in classroom activities. The geographical terrain, socio-economic conditions, and school infrastructure further influence the teaching-learning environment. As a result, the promise of inclusive education remains only partially realized. There is a need to understand how these factors operate within the rural context, how different stakeholders perceive inclusion, and what conditions can enable effective participation of all learners. This study seeks to examine these issues in order to identify the barriers and opportunities for strengthening inclusive education in government primary schools of Nainital district.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study is guided by the following specific objectives:

1. To identify and analyse the barriers encountered in implementing inclusive education in rural primary schools of Nainital district.

2. To examine the factors that facilitate inclusive practices within these schools.

3. To understand the perceptions and experiences of teachers, parents, and students regarding inclusive education.

4. To explore how school-level and community-level factors influence the inclusion of children with diverse learning needs.

By focusing on rural Nainital, the study provides empirical evidence from an under-researched context, offering insights applicable to other hilly and resource-constrained regions of India and the Global South. The findings aim to inform teacher education programs, district-level policy design, and inclusive school development plans. Ultimately, this study aligns with India's commitment to SDG 4, reinforcing that equity and inclusion must move beyond policy rhetoric to actionable strategies within the classroom and community. In essence, this paper positions inclusive education as both a right and a shared responsibility one that depends as much on trained and motivated teachers as on supportive parents, peers, and policy environments. Exploring barriers and facilitators through this lens in Nainital's rural schools promises not only to diagnose the challenges but also to illuminate pathways toward a more inclusive and equitable educational future.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Global policy and conceptual foundations

The global movement for inclusive education has its roots in the Salamanca Statement (1994), which argued that regular schools with an inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes and achieving education for all. Salamanca reframed special needs education from segregation toward mainstreaming, emphasising rights, access, and the removal of social barriers. This normative foundation continues to guide international agendas, including the Sustainable

Development Goals, and remains a useful benchmark when assessing local practice and policy implementation. At the national level, India has progressively institutionalised inclusion through policy instruments. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009) established universal access for 6–14-year-olds, while the National Education Policy (NEP 2020) explicitly endorses equitable and inclusive education, calling for curricular, infrastructural, and capacity investments to address diverse learner needs. NEP 2020's emphasis on foundational learning, mother-tongue instruction, and teacher professional development sets an enabling policy tone but the policy's translation into consistent classroom practice remains uneven across states and localities.

2.2 What international reviews tell us about barriers and facilitators

Recent systematic and scoping reviews synthesise a common pattern: implementation gaps are rarely due to a single cause. Instead, multiple interlocking factors teacher preparedness, school leadership, material and infrastructural resources, community attitudes, and systemic supports such as special educators and referral mechanisms determine whether inclusion moves from policy to practice. A scoping review of interventions and barriers in India concluded that while many promising initiatives exist (teacher mentoring, inclusive resource centres, cluster-level supports), evidence about their sustained impact is limited and unevenly distributed; the review highlighted the need for more rigorous evaluations focused on rural and hard-to-reach areas. Global evidence further shows that teacher knowledge and attitudes are central mediators: positive teacher attitudes and strong self-efficacy correlate with greater use of inclusive pedagogies, whereas lack of confidence, large class sizes, and training gaps constrain practice. Intervention studies point to the effectiveness of sustained, practice-oriented in-service training and school-based coaching (rather than one-off workshops) as a facilitator of classroom change. More recently, reviews of classroom-level strategies (including peer support, differentiated instruction, and use of low-cost assistive materials) demonstrate modest improvements in engagement and learning when combined with teacher support systems.

2.3 Empirical studies from India: teacher preparedness and attitudes

Empirical work across India reinforces the reviews' conclusions. Studies of in-service and pre-service teacher cohorts report mixed attitudes toward inclusion: many teachers endorse the principle of inclusive education but feel inadequately prepared to enact it. Research shows a recurring pattern a gap between belief (support for inclusion) and practice (ability to adapt pedagogy, manage classroom diversity, and use assistive resources). For instance, cross-national analyses of teachers' attitudes identify self-efficacy and collective efficacy as important predictors of inclusive practice; Indian studies mirror these findings and also draw attention to contextual constraints such as workload and inadequate time for individualized support. More locally, studies in Uttarakhand and neighbouring hill regions point to particular challenges: multi-grade teaching, long travel distances for students, and sporadic availability of trained special educators. A study of pre-service teacher self-efficacy in Nainital observed that while trainees expressed positive intentions toward inclusive practice, their confidence in applying differentiated strategies was limited suggesting that local teacher education and mentoring must be adapted to rural realities. These findings support the view that teacher training needs to be context-sensitive (addressing multi-grade classrooms, large classes, and resource constraints) rather than an off-the-shelf package.

2.4 Community and parental roles: evidence from India

Parental attitudes and community support substantially shape inclusion outcomes. Studies from diverse Indian states report variability in parental awareness of inclusion, with stigma and low expectations still operating in some communities. Where parents are engaged participating in PTAs, supporting remediation at home, or collaborating with teachers' children with diverse needs show better attendance and participation. Conversely, economic pressures, distance, and seasonal migration often limit parental involvement in rural contexts. The literature therefore frames parental engagement as both a challenge and a potential facilitator when programs actively involve caregivers through awareness campaigns and school-based interventions.

2.5 Gaps in the literature and implications for the present study

Two gaps stand out clearly from the reviewed literature. First, much of the rigorous evidence on effective interventions is concentrated in urban or better-resourced settings; evaluations addressing rural, hilly, or geographically isolated contexts are comparatively scarce. Second, while teacher-focused interventions are well documented, fewer studies simultaneously integrate the voices of teachers, parents, and students in the same communities to triangulate perceptions and lived experiences. These gaps limit the transferability of promising practices to districts like Nainital, where terrain, multi-grade teaching, and

sparse resources create unique implementation constraints. Consequently, research that combines a robust, mixed-method empirical design with purposive sampling of diverse rural blocks can contribute directly to both knowledge and practice. By documenting not only barriers but also locally emergent facilitators (for example, committed head teachers, peer-led remediation, or community mobilization strategies), studies in Nainital can inform scalable, context-sensitive interventions and support policy translation at the district level. The present study is designed to fill this niche by collecting quantitative measures of prevalence (teacher training, resource availability, parental engagement) alongside qualitative narratives from student FGDs and observations thereby producing evidence that is both generalisable across similar rural contexts and rich in local detail.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted a convergent mixed-methods design to examine barriers and facilitators of inclusive education in rural Nainital. Quantitative data measured teacher preparedness, infrastructure, and parental awareness, while qualitative data explored classroom experiences and perceptions. Integration through triangulation ensured both breadth and contextual depth.

3.2 Study Area and Sampling

The research covered five rural blocks of Nainital - Bhimtal, Kotabag, Dhari, Ramgarh, and Okhalkanda selected for socio-geographic diversity. Using multistage stratified sampling, 20 government primary schools (four per block) were chosen. Respondents included 60 teachers, 80 parents, and approximately 150 students engaged in focus groups. One observation checklist was completed per school (n = 20). This multi-stakeholder design captured perspectives from classroom to community.

3.3 Instruments and Data Collection

Four tools were employed:

Teacher questionnaire (10 Likert items; α = 0.82) on training, attitudes, and institutional support.

Parent questionnaire (10 semi-structured items; α = 0.77) on awareness and constraints.

Student focus-group guide (10 prompts) on participation and peer relations.

School observation checklist (10 indicators) covering access, pedagogy, and leadership climate.

Tools were piloted, translated into Hindi, and refined. Data were collected with official permissions and informed consent.

3.4 Analytical Techniques

Quantitative data were analysed in SPSS 27 and AMOS 24.
- Descriptive statistics profiled inclusion status.
- Exploratory Factor Analysis (KMO = 0.83; Bartlett's $p < 0.001$) identified three latent factors - Pedagogic Preparedness, Institutional Support, and Perceived Barriers.
- Regression modelling estimated predictors of inclusive teaching efficacy.
- Reliability: Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.80$ across scales.

Qualitative transcripts were thematically coded in NVivo 14, yielding themes of Classroom Practice, Peer Acceptance, and School-Community Interface. Inter-coder reliability (κ = 0.78) confirmed consistency. Observation scores were converted into an Inclusion Index and correlated with teacher attitude scores for validation.

3.5 Validity

Construct validity was confirmed through factor loadings > 0.60 and correlation between observed inclusion and teacher attitudes (r = 0.58, $p < 0.01$). Ethical clearance, consent, and anonymity were maintained. Quantitative and qualitative findings were triangulated to enhance credibility and minimize bias.

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Data were analysed using both quantitative and qualitative techniques to address the study's objectives: identifying barriers, exploring facilitators, and understanding perceptions of teachers, parents, and students regarding inclusive education in rural Nainital. Quantitative data (from 60 teachers and 80 parents) were analysed through descriptive statistics, *t*-tests, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), multiple regression, and correlation tests using SPSS 27 and AMOS 24. Qualitative data (from student Focus Group Discussions and observation checklists) were coded thematically in NVivo 14 to interpret behavioural and social dimensions of inclusion. Integration of these results through triangulation

provided a comprehensive, credible interpretation consistent with advanced mixed-method research standards.

Table 1. Profile of Teacher and Parent Respondents

Variable	Teachers (n=60)	Parents (n=80)	Interpretation
Gender	Male 40%, Female 60%	Male 48%, Female 52%	Gender balance supports representativeness.
Experience (Teachers)	<5 yrs: 18%, 5–10 yrs: 32%, >10 yrs: 50%	–	Experienced teachers dominate rural staff.
Training in Inclusion	Received: 45%, Not: 55%	–	Majority lack formal inclusion training.
Education (Parents)	–	Illiterate: 26%, Primary: 38%, Secondary: 27%, College: 9%	Parents mostly have basic schooling; awareness likely limited.
Family Type	–	Nuclear: 41%, Joint: 59%	Strong family support networks in rural areas.

Source: Author's calculations based upon primary data.
The profile reflects the typical composition of rural government school communities experienced female teachers, modest parental literacy, and community dependence on joint family structures.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables

Dimension	Teachers (Mean)	Parents (Mean)	Interpretation
Awareness about inclusion	3.92	3.35	Teachers more aware than parents.
Confidence/Preparedness	3.46	–	Moderate teacher preparedness.
Institutional Support	3.08	–	Limited administrative backing.
Perceived Barriers	3.87	3.74	High perceived constraints.
Parental Cooperation	3.32	3.21	Weak parent–teacher collaboration.
Infrastructure adequacy	2.94	3.05	Moderate but uneven facilities.

Source: Author's calculations based upon primary data.

Teachers displayed conceptual clarity about inclusion but rated actual implementation low due to lack of training and resources. Parents understood inclusion in general but not as support for learners with disabilities.

Table 3. Independent Sample t-Test for Teacher Preparedness

Group	Mean	SD	t	p-value	Interpretation
Trained (n=27)	4.18	0.45	3.26	0.002	Training significantly enhances preparedness.
Untrained (n=33)	3.54	0.58	–	–	Untrained teachers rely more on experience.

Source: Author's calculations based upon primary data.

Teacher training was tested for its influence on preparedness. A significant difference ($p < 0.01$) shows trained teachers feel more capable of adapting lessons, supporting Sharma & Sokal (2016), who

emphasized training as a catalyst for inclusion. A one-way ANOVA for years of experience also showed a modest significant effect $F(2,57) = 4.12$, $p < 0.05$), indicating more experienced teachers score higher on inclusive attitude due to classroom maturity and local familiarity.

Table 4. Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation)

Item	Pedagogic Preparedness	Institutional Support	Perceived Barriers
Confident in teaching diverse learners	0.79	–	–
Adapts lessons for all needs	0.75	–	–
Encourages peer collaboration	0.68	–	–
Head teacher encourages inclusion	–	0.81	–
Access to aids/resources	–	0.74	–
Receives regular training	–	0.70	–
Large class size limits teaching	–	–	0.77
Lack of parental cooperation	–	–	0.72
Inadequate infrastructure	–	–	0.69

Source: Author's calculations based upon primary data.

Exploratory Factor Analysis: EFA was conducted on 10 inclusion-related teacher items to identify latent factors. Sampling adequacy (KMO = 0.83) and Bartlett's Test ($\chi^2 = 214.56$, $p < 0.001$) confirmed suitability. Three factors explained 67.3% of total variance, confirming that inclusion depends on teacher competence, school support, and environmental constraints.

Table 5. Regression Coefficients

Predictor	β	t	p	Interpretation
Pedagogic Preparedness	0.48	4.65	< 0.001	Strongest predictor of inclusion.
Institutional Support	0.31	3.08	0.003	Leadership and resources critical.
Perceived Barriers	-0.26	-2.74	0.008	Barriers negatively affect efficacy.

Source: Author's calculations based upon primary data.

Regression Analysis: To identify predictors of Inclusive Teaching Efficacy (ITE), multiple regression was conducted using the three extracted factors as independent variables.
Model Summary: $R^2 = 0.59$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.56$; $F(3,56) = 25.3$, $p < 0.001$
Findings confirm that preparedness and leadership drive inclusion, while structural constraints significantly hinder it.

Table 6. Correlation Matrix

Variables	Preparedness	Institutional Support	Parental Cooperation
Inclusion Index	0.62**	0.54**	0.47**

Preparedness	–	0.51**	0.43*

Source: Author's calculations based upon primary data.

Correlation Analysis: To cross-verify findings, correlation between teacher preparedness, inclusion index (from observations), and parental cooperation was examined. ($p < 0.01$, $p < 0.05$) Schools with confident teachers and strong leadership exhibited visibly inclusive classrooms and better parent participation. This triangulated relationship reinforces inclusion as a shared ecosystem rather than an individual effort.

▪ **Student Perspectives: Focus Group Findings**

Student FGDs across 20 schools revealed strong peer inclusion values but limited exposure to diversity-related sensitivity training. Many students expressed willingness to help classmates who struggled academically or physically. A student in Dhari block said, "If someone can't read, we take turns to help them. Teacher tells us to learn together."

However, subtle exclusion persisted in some classes due to lack of awareness. These observations indicate that social inclusion exists naturally but requires guided reinforcement.

▪ **Parental Perceptions**

Parents largely valued schooling but viewed inclusion narrowly as access rather than active participation. Around 58% believed all children 'should study together,' while 42% were uncertain about special provisions or aids. Low literacy and economic dependence limited their involvement in school committees. Yet, in Bhimtal block, where awareness sessions were conducted by local NGOs, parental engagement improved noticeably suggesting that information exposure transforms perception into participation.

▪ **Observation Data**

Observation checklists rated schools on accessibility, classroom practice, and leadership. The average Inclusion Index was 6.8/10, varying from 8.0 in Bhimtal (better roads and NGO support) to 5.2 in Okhalkanda (remote, resource-poor). Schools scoring high on leadership and teamwork displayed tangible inclusion—peer assistance, modified seating, visual aids, and equitable participation.

▪ **Thematic Integration and Interpretation**

The integrated interpretation reveals a three-level pattern:

- At the teacher level, confidence and experience are vital facilitators.
- At the institutional level, leadership, training access, and teamwork determine sustainability.
- At the community level, awareness and collaboration influence participation.

Quantitative findings confirmed statistically significant relationships among these levels, while qualitative insights contextualized them in the daily realities of rural schools. Teachers' emotional commitment, students' empathy, and occasional parental participation form the human foundation of inclusion, though systemic fragility continues to limit reach. In essence, inclusion in Nainital's rural primary schools reflects a process of transitional progress driven by intent, sustained by leadership, and constrained by infrastructure. The overall findings demonstrate that inclusion is not an abstract policy but a lived experience shaped by context, cooperation, and capacity.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal that inclusive education in rural government primary schools of Nainital is progressing in intent but remains limited in implementation. Teachers, parents, and students collectively recognize the value of inclusion, yet several institutional, infrastructural, and social barriers continue to restrict its practice. The quantitative and qualitative evidence from this research presents an intricate picture: teachers' willingness and empathy coexist with inadequate resources, insufficient training, and weak parental collaboration. This confirms that inclusion, while accepted as a concept, still lacks the operational capacity required to translate policy vision into classroom reality. The most decisive determinant of inclusive practice emerged as teacher preparedness, which strongly influenced overall inclusion outcomes ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$). Teachers who received formal training on inclusive education displayed greater self-confidence, adapted instructional materials, and engaged students more effectively. This supports earlier research by Sharma and Sokal (2016) and Majoko (2019), who argued that pedagogical preparedness is central to implementing inclusion in developing contexts. However, only 45% of teachers in this study had ever attended structured inclusion training, indicating a significant gap between policy and practice. Many teachers expressed that available workshops were brief, generic, and lacked classroom-oriented guidance. Despite this, experience played a notable compensatory role teacher

with more than ten years of service showed higher adaptability, as reflected in the positive correlation between experience and inclusive attitude ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.05$). This suggests that in low-resource rural environments, experiential learning and peer exchange can partially substitute for formal training, reinforcing the argument of Avramidis and Norwich (2002) that inclusion skills often evolve through reflective classroom practice.

Institutional leadership and school culture emerged as equally critical in enabling inclusion. The analysis showed that institutional support significantly influenced inclusive efficacy ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$). Schools where head teachers promoted collaboration, encouraged regular staff dialogue, and provided moral encouragement achieved higher inclusion index scores. Teachers in such schools also reported lower stress and greater peer cooperation. This aligns with the work of Ainscow and Sandill (2010), who emphasized that inclusive schooling depends on collective institutional vision rather than isolated teacher effort. In the Nainital context, schools with proactive leadership demonstrated visible evidence of inclusion modified seating arrangements, group learning, and equitable participation even when physical resources were limited. The leadership effect thus extends beyond administrative oversight to the creation of a participatory, empathetic school environment. However, the study's findings also highlight persistent systemic and environmental barriers. High scores on the Perceived Barriers factor (M = 3.87 for teachers, 3.74 for parents) illustrate that teachers still face overcrowded classrooms, lack of specialized support, inadequate aids, and poor accessibility. These findings mirror the observations of Miles and Singal (2010) and Kumar and Raj (2021), who both documented that resource scarcity undermines inclusive practice across rural India. In Nainital's hilly terrain, these barriers are compounded by physical distance, irregular supervision, and infrastructural neglect. Teachers reported emotional fatigue and frustration when asked to include all learners without parallel structural support. This "commitment–capacity gap" underscores the mismatch between teacher motivation and system readiness a challenge that remains central to the implementation of inclusion across low-resource settings.

Parental engagement presented a mixed pattern. Parents expressed broad acceptance of inclusion but lacked clarity on their role in supporting it. Most associated inclusion with "every child attending school," reflecting a narrow understanding of participation and differentiated instruction. Only 9% of parents in the sample had college-level education, and over a quarter were illiterate, suggesting that awareness remains a key limitation. Yet, the study found promising variations across blocks: in Bhimtal and Kotabag, where awareness campaigns had been organized, parental involvement was notably higher. This reinforces findings by Jha (2017) and Lindsay (2011), which highlight community awareness as an indispensable component of successful inclusion. Thus, while teachers drive classroom-level change, the sustainability of inclusion depends on collective parent–school collaboration. Student perspectives added a crucial social dimension to these results. Focus group discussions revealed that students naturally embraced peer support, often helping classmates who struggled to read or write. Such organic cooperation reflects that inclusion is not only a pedagogical goal but a social habit that can develop even in resource-poor environments when guided by caring teachers. However, occasional teasing and exclusion also surfaced in some schools, revealing that social inclusion requires consistent teacher monitoring and value-based classroom practices. These patterns correspond with Florian and Black-Hawkins' (2011) notion of "inclusive pedagogy," where inclusion succeeds when classrooms promote cooperation rather than mere coexistence.

Observation data confirmed that inclusive behavior was most visible in schools where leadership and teacher preparedness converged. Schools with engaged principals and trained teachers scored higher on inclusion indicators (M = 7.8/10) compared to those without such synergy (M = 5.4). The correlation between preparedness and observed inclusion ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$) further substantiated that attitudes translate into action when institutional support reinforces teacher capacity. This finding emphasis inclusion as a multi-layered process shaped simultaneously by teacher competence, institutional structure, and community participation. Viewed through Bronfenbrenner's ecological framework, the results depict inclusion as an outcome of interaction between micro-level (teacher–student), meso-level (school–parent), and exo-level (policy–infrastructure) systems. Success occurs when these levels align, producing coherence between individual intent and institutional facilitation. Similarly, the Social Model of Disability is affirmed here: barriers to learning are not inherent to students but are products of environmental neglect and organizational inefficiency. Teachers' empathy and students' cooperation show that attitudinal readiness exists; what remains lacking is systemic reinforcement.

In summary, the discussion affirms that inclusion in Nainital's rural government schools is developing yet delicate fuelled by human motivation but hindered by structural rigidity. Teacher capacity, leadership engagement, and peer cooperation together create a promising foundation, but sustainability will depend on the alignment of all actors within the educational ecosystem. Inclusive education here is not a fixed state but a continuous process of negotiation between aspiration and reality, driven by effort, empathy, and evolving institutional commitment.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study examined the barriers and facilitators to implementing inclusive education in rural government primary schools of Nainital, Uttarakhand, by drawing insights from teachers, parents, and students. The findings revealed that while the idea of inclusion is widely accepted, its practical realization remains inconsistent and dependent on multiple interrelated factors. The study concluded that teacher preparedness is the most decisive element influencing the success of inclusion. Teachers who had received formal training in inclusive education demonstrated higher confidence, adaptability, and empathy toward diverse learners, whereas untrained teachers relied mainly on experience and intuition. Nevertheless, professional commitment among all teachers was evident, suggesting a strong foundation for further capacity development. Experience also contributed meaningfully to inclusive practice, with seasoned teachers displaying flexibility and better management of multi-grade classrooms. These findings highlight that inclusion is not only a function of policy mandates but also a reflection of pedagogic confidence nurtured through both structured training and long-term classroom engagement. Another key conclusion is that institutional support and leadership significantly affect how inclusive education is practiced. Schools led by proactive head teachers, who encouraged cooperation among staff and organized internal discussions on inclusive practices, recorded higher inclusion index scores and better classroom engagement. Leadership in such schools acted as a multiplier of teacher motivation, compensating for resource scarcity through moral and collaborative support. However, systemic barriers remain prominent. Many schools continue to face challenges such as large class sizes, limited teaching aids, and poor physical accessibility issues that directly reduce the feasibility of individualized attention. These obstacles are further amplified by geographical constraints in hill areas, which make resource delivery and regular monitoring difficult. Despite these limitations, the study found encouraging signs of local innovation: teachers' improvisation, peer learning among students, and growing community support in certain blocks indicate that inclusion, though fragile, is taking root.

The study also revealed that parental awareness and engagement remain partial but promising. Parents generally support schooling for all children but lack understanding of inclusive pedagogy or disability-specific needs. In regions where awareness drives were conducted, such as Bhimtal and Kotabag, parental participation improved noticeably, showing that exposure and communication can transform passive acceptance into active involvement. Student responses further strengthened the evidence of emerging inclusivity most children demonstrated empathy and willingness to assist peers, reflecting the organic development of inclusive values when guided by caring teachers. In conclusion, inclusive education in rural Nainital stands at a transitional stage conceptually strong but institutionally weak. Teachers, parents, and students together exhibit the motivation necessary for inclusion, but the education system must enhance its structural and contextual support to sustain these efforts. Future improvements must focus on continuous, practice-based teacher development, leadership strengthening, and community engagement to convert inclusive ideals into consistent classroom reality. Only through the collective alignment of teacher competence, administrative commitment, and community participation can rurally schools in Uttarakhand truly achieve the vision of inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all learners.

REFERENCES
1. Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14(4), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903
2. Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. A. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. Race Ethnicity and Education, 16(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.730511
3. Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 17(2), 129–147. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056
4. Bhatnagar, N., & Das, A. (2014). Attitudes of secondary school teachers toward inclusive education in New Delhi, India. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 14(4), 255–263. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12016

5. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Harvard University Press.
6. Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. British Educational Research Journal, 37(5), 813–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096
7. Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Education. https://www.education.gov.in/nep2020
8. Jha, M. M. (2017). Inclusive education in India: From theory to practice (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
9. Kumar, P., & Raj, U. (2021). Inclusive education in Indian schools: Issues and challenges. Educational Quest: An International Journal of Education and Applied Social Sciences, 12(2), 89–95. https://doi.org/10.30954/2230-7311.02.2021.3
10. Lindsay, G. (2011). The effectiveness of inclusive education: Making sense of the evidence. Educational Review, 63(1), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2010.483081
11. Majoko, T. (2019). Teacher preparedness for inclusive education in developing countries: Challenges and opportunities for professional development. Teaching and Teacher Education, 86, 102919. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102919
12. Miles, S., & Singal, N. (2010). The Education for All and inclusive education debate: Conflict, contradiction or opportunity? International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802265125
13. Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2008). Impact of training on pre-service teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education and sentiments about persons with disabilities. Disability & Society, 23(7), 773–785. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687590802469271
14. Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2016). Can teachers' self-reported efficacy, concerns, and attitudes predict their actual inclusive classroom practices? Australasian Journal of Special Education, 40(1), 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1017/jse.2016.6
15. UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427