EXPLORING PROSPECTS OF COLLABORATION WITHIN SEGREGATED SYSTEM OF GENERAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS TO SCAFFOLD INCLUSION

Syeda Mahnaz Hassan[1], M. Uzair-ul-Hassan[2], M. Iqbal Basit[3], Shah Bano Maken[4] & Iram Parveen[5]
[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, University of the Punjab
[2,3,4,5]University of Sargodha
Corresponding Author: drsyedamahnazhassan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *The research was conducted to explore the prospects of collaboration within segregated system of general and special education schools to scaffold inclusion. The study examines views and voices of special and general education teachers, heads and administrators. For the purpose, questionnaires were administered to 160 teachers, heads and administrators of general and special schools. The sample was selected using multistage sampling. While for qualitative data; convenient-cum-purposive sampling was used. Interviews were conducted from25 teachers, heads and administrators in total. The quantitative analysis shows that there is significant statistical mean score difference between general and special school teachers to develop collaboration of institutions. Further, special school teachers are more inclined towards developing collaboration between general and special schools to scaffold inclusion as compared to general school teachers. The qualitative analysis unfolds and reveals insightful channels to trace prospects of collaboration within existing segregated education system. Interconnected multifaceted menaces and stumbling blocks need to be minimized in both general and special schools to develop collaboration. Although teachers, heads and administrators of both schools are aspirant to develop collaborative settings to scaffold inclusion to achieve Education for All, paradoxically have qualms. Collaborative programme may prove to be significant through effective management, proper planning, appropriate curriculum and essential training.*

Keywords: *Segregated system, collaboration, inclusion, special education*

1. INTRODUCTION

Institutions deal with attitudes, traditions and performance of a community on issues. On the basis of physical abilities and conditions of students, academic institutions have been divided into general and special. General educational institutions are meant for students who are without disabilities while special education institutions are for students with disabilities/less-abilities. The former ones deal with major part of population, so these are significantly higher in number as compared to later; which are least focused due to hosting lower proportion of population. The major drawback of these institutions is that students of both institutions have mutually lack of coordination. This lack of coordination doesn't only exist in childhood rather it prevails till career age and in practical life. Seriousness of this problem prompted educationists, social scientists and researchers to search for some alternate strategies. After number of hypothesis, observations and experimentation, they reached to a new educational approach "inclusion" half century ago. Inclusion can, perhaps, not be clearly defined but it is meant to fabricate a social policy, which is equally and happily acceptable by all segments of society. Ambiguity about concept of inclusion encompasses many questions, for example, what is superiority of inclusive education system over previously existing ones? How is it going to be equally successful? Who are the affectees? Which will be compensated by this system? For the purpose of introducing these policies towards the education arrangements in various countries of global world, a complex and contested process of social change is reinforced. While social policy is dominated by the rhetoric of inclusion, the reality for many remains one of exclusion and the panacea of 'inclusion' masks many sins. As Armstrong et al. have stated that early calls for inclusion in the middle 1980s and early 1990s had four quite disparate origins [1]. Firstly, parents, teachers and advocates of

students with disabilities favoured inclusive education as a way of challenging the barriers and restrictions to access and participation. These are *imposed* by existing models of 'mainstreaming' or 'integration'. This critique disputed two main assumptions of existing policy and practice: first that for general education, there is a threshold of classroom and school that is difficult or sometimes impossible for some students depending upon type of their disability besides severity of problem; second that in order to properly cope with the needs of students having special education needs (SEN), a non-traditional system of communication, evaluation and distribution of resources would be mandatory that may give opportunity to learn major part of their studies outside the classroom. Secondly, perception of activists and researchers towards concept of disability significantly affected the contribution of special education in imitating the segregation and domination of incapacitated people [2]. As described in the Social Model of Disability, disability is not caused due to damaging of certain organ; rather it is depriving and inferior response of society towards individuals with impairments. Findings of this model are considered valuable for inclusive education. Thirdly, with the introduction of ideas of commercialization and focus on knowledge-based economical education in schools by highlighting concepts of culpability, choice, control, and assortment, the idea of inclusive education was launched through extensive vision of educational reform platforms around the globe. Theme of the discussion is the art of distinguishing systems through identifying individuals or groups through inclusion, exclusion and interrelated processes. Fourthly, inclusive education has been interrelated to expansion and in particular the delivery of instructive prospects to all children within instructive structures. International organizations have been trying to made

inclusion as an international objective [3]. It built upon Tomlinson's [16] analysis of special education as a subsystem of the mainstream working to made possible the easy working system of the inclusion. Skrtic had told us that special education couldn't develop a rationale for school organizations to develop a required culture and assistance for utilizing resources for its development to fulfil demands of working [4].

Collaboration is an activity where all team members feel equal responsibility for the solution of a shared problem. Collaboration requires some attributes that must be possessed by all the members. Individual differences take place everywhere and these should be for the harmony of the process. It is a way that professionals select to fulfil a project. It is verified only where all followers feel their contribution esteemed and where they sense they are treasured. In Pakistan, collaboration can scaffold inclusion where segregated system of general and special education schools exist. The foundation of collaboration discusses voluntariness and parity. The study needs to develop a collaborative system to foster inclusive process in general schools. The purpose of the study is to seek out prospects of collaboration within segregated system. The study iterated that inclusion cannot be successful without collaboration within segregated system of education. It seems that collaboration is the key to success for inclusive system, either collaboration among teachers and head teachers or institutions. Students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) are required to participate mentally as well as physically in discussions on inclusion phenomenon [5]. It needs much attention, patience and ability of teachers as well as heads of the institutions. For this purpose proper planning and strategy is needed. To fulfil this goal collaboration is a key concept. In the process of collaboration everyone in the program has equal share, responsibility and work. They are equally responsible for every act which has been taken in the process of collaboration. Collaboration as a corner stone of current seminary inclusion is an idea that has tall notional coinage between many intellectuals in the area of special instruction. Successful inclusion can be practiced by doing true collaboration among heads, teachers and students of general and special education institutions. Hines views that school head as the instructional leaders with trial of supervisory actual collaborative dealings amid the tutors and the officers can enable the operative use of collaboration abilities [6]. Fallon stated that in the communal sciences, collaboration amongst squads is relaxing an obligation [7]. Though, mixing collaboration with the values of inclusion appears to be limited to the arena of education. Collaboration founded on inclusive applies advances the varied excellence of team message, problem solving, and decision making. In the ground of education, teachers have the main responsibility for appealing all scholars in the knowledge practice and vigorously including them in the classroom scenery and with the course content. Inclusive traitors comprehend that their views, standards, approaches, and actions set the tendency for every resolution. Armstrong et al. elaborated that collaboration is grounded on equality [1]. Sheridan & Welch have told us very beneficial strategy for collaboration [8]: 1. shared problem solving: may be the foundation for collaborative actions in numerous

environments of school situations. This is a stimulating task since it includes a collection of specialists whose necessities, prospects, and thoughts should be combined into shared understanding and mutually-agreed upon results. 2. Co-teaching: whenever two or more than two teachers take part in lesson for a solo group of scholars, naturally in a single classroom setting, one way of meeting the requirements of learners in inclusive schools but not a solution for every inclusive situation.

Collaboration is flair of interconnecting for expert's use for starting shared responsibilities. Most of the time it has been assumed that collaboration is a style for decision making. Term inclusion may frequently be connected with collaboration. Inclusion is a philosophy or set of beliefs grounded on the notion that "everybody belongs, is acknowledged, provisions, and is reinforced by his or her peers and other fellows of the school civic in the passage of consuming their instructive necessities met. Following features are important for collaboration: equality, Voluntariness, mutual goals, common accountability and resources. The following styles of collaborative interactions in educational settings seem to be eminent: co-teaching, team, station, parallel, re-teaching, additional learning actions, one-observe one-teach and one-monitor one-teach. It is significant that the classroom teacher, special education teacher, related services staff, and families assume shared ownership for educating all students. Collaboration has been labelled as a method for straight communication between two equal groups. Sharpe & Hawes though well intentioned, handling everyone "the same" could truly dismiss rather than embrace many students [9]. Student oriented educational culture can be got only if the school has no pressure on them about their policies from outside [10]. Inaugurating similar potentials can mean a distribution of a top-down, exterior approach, with slight contribution from parents or learners. Skrtic argues that this form, which stresses collaboration and active problem solving, would provide all students with schooling that is both excellent and equitable, and thus prepare today's youth for the challenges and requirements of the post-industrial era of the coming twenty-first century [4].

The study developed its rationale on the assumption that collaboration between general and special schools can enhance learning of all students including students with disabilities. For example, teacher from general and special education by working together in the same class can be more effective. It is argued that this could be practiced only with the sustenance and support of administrators, heads and teachers who would be willing to work in such setting. These are the main actors in practicing inclusive classes through collaboration. To explore the perceptions of heads, administrators and teachers of general and special schools towards collaboration the study has been developed. The researchers were interested to explore the prospects of collaboration of general and special education teachers and heads to scaffold inclusion. The aim of the study was to investigate views and voices of special and general education teachers, heads and administrators to develop collaboration.

The study was designed to:

1. explore views and voices of teachers, heads and administrators for collaboration between institutions;

2. examine opportunities that will enhance the collaborations of institutions.
3. identify barriers in developing collaboration;
4. investigate the difference between perceptions of teachers and heads of special & general education institutions about developing collaboration.

The study formulated following research questions in accordance with the objectives:

1. What understanding can be deduced from views and voices of teachers, heads and administrators regarding possibility of collaboration?
2. What are opportunities to develop collaboration of institutions?
3. What are the barriers in developing collaboration of both educational institutions?
4. Is there any significant difference in perceptions of teachers, heads and administrators to develop collaboration of general and special education on the basis of various demographics used for the study?

2. METHODOLOGY

This is mixed method research. Mackenzie and Knipe explicate that gathering both numeric information [11] (e.g., on instruments) as well as text information (e.g., on interviews) so that the final database represents both quantitative and qualitative information [12]. According to Gorard combined or mixed-methods research has been identified as a "key element in the improvement of social science, including education research" [13] with research strengthened by the use of a variety of methods. All teachers of secondary level of special and general schools of Sargodha division were the population of the research. Researchers selected Sargodha division for research purpose because of convenience. Also in Punjab teachers have some information about the concept of inclusive education and there are some special education institutions where inclusive education is being practiced.

2.1 Sample and Sampling

Data were collected from teachers of Mianwali, Khushab, Noor-Pur-Thal, Silanwali, Kotmomin, Shah-Pur and Sargodha. The sample was selected conveniently and purposively. Researcher went to schools and asked the heads for the list of teachers in their institutions. So that researcher could be able to select the teachers from the list. Researcher selected teachers from the list who were available at that particular time so that researcher could be able to fill the questionnaire and conduct interviews. Sample was consisted of 160 teachers. Seventy teachers were from special schools and 90were from general schools of these cities. Researcher had selected teachers from general school greater in number as compared to special teachers. Reason behind this was that general school teachers represent the wide number of students as compared to special school teachers. Among the sample selected 86 were male and 74 were female. Researcher has chosen the female teachers too as they are also playing an important role in teaching the children either the children belong to general schools or special schools. One more reason of selecting the female teachers was that the researcher wanted to examine the difference between their perceptions to develop collaboration between general and special school to scaffold inclusion as compared to the male teachers.

2.2 Instruments

A questionnaire and interviews' questions were developed and formulated for the study. The researchers collected data from heads and teachers of special and general institutions about collaboration through questionnaires. Researchers developed the questionnaire themselves and made reliable and valid through pilot testing and experts' opinions respectively. Also questions for interview were finalized by incorporating experts' opinions. The purpose of the questionnaire was to get teachers and heads' perceptions and the purpose of interviews was to get teachers' views and voices about collaboration between general and special schools to scaffold inclusion. The teachers were asked to respond on a five point likert scale 1(strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3(not decided), 4(agree) and 5(strongly agree). Demographic information was also asked regarding their educational qualification, total students in school, number of students in class, professional qualification, educational background, training, posting area of teachers, educational background, present experience and experience as head. The statements in the questionnaire address the following dimensions of collaboration: teachers, heads and administrators' perceptions about collaboration, opportunities and possibilities, barriers, training and initiatives to develop collaborative inclusive settings. For reliability of the instrument pilot testing was conducted in Sargodha and Khushab districts only. The value of Cronbach alpha was found 7.6.

To get teachers' insight about tracing prospects of collaboration between general and special institutions, the researchers conducted interviews. Following questions were asked from the teachers, heads and administrators of the institutions: What do you think about collaboration of general and special institution so that these can work together for both students with and without disabilities? Do you think there are barriers in developing collaborative process? If you have an opportunity to be a part of collaboration, would you like work in collaborative inclusive institutions? If yes, then why? If no, then why?

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

After finalizing the instrument, researchers distributed questionnaire to the heads and teachers. For this purpose researchers went personally to the selected schools for data collection. Researcher has got data not only from the heads but also from the teachers and administrators. Researchers visited Shah Pur, KotMomin, Mianwali, Khushab, Noor Pur Thal, Silanwali and Sargodha for collecting data. Return rate of the questionnaire was 97%. Researchers also went to District Education Officer and Assistant Education Officer Secondary for interviews. Then researchers also visited different general and special schools for the interviews of heads and teachers to get their voices.

Researchers faced many problems during the process of data collection. The temperament of our teachers as well as administrators was not so cooperative. Some teachers during data collection reflected "you are wasting your time to conduct research. You should change the topic, it has no worth and value at all. The people were not mad who have

established the present segregated system for normal and special students. We are busy enough and have no time for filling the questionnaire". Some of the female teachers were hesitant and deny the request to record their voice and asked the researchers to just get information in a written form. Researchers have hardly convinced them that they have no any other purpose of getting information in spite of getting data for research. The teachers whose qualification was high were also very co-operative. The whole process of data collection was very difficult also due to hard summer season in the region.

3. QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

All interviews were recorded in Urdu. Recorded interviews were transcribed and translated into English. According to Creswell, qualitative researchers build their patterns, categories, and themes from the "bottom-up," by organizing the data into increasingly more abstract units of information. According to Drzewiecka, interviews provide texts of identity and in these texts, social relations and distinctions become visible as interviewees locate themselves in relationship to cultures, communities, and others. Data collected through interviews were analysed using the content analysis techniques. According to Patton, researchers looked at what was in the text and gave it a name, reading interviews over several times made researchers to code, retrieve, assemble and viewed the data in different themes and categories [14]. This process made researchers to identify the themes and under each emerged theme, different categories were also identified. In the last step researchers reviewed the categories again to remove the chances of overlapping among them and made them final. It is important to note that sometimes one teacher/head/administrator responded multiple times under the same category or under different categories. If a teacher / head / administrator is responding under the same category then during analysis, his/her response was calculated but mentioning his/her expression within the context s/he explained which is different from the earlier one under similar category. Each teacher/head/administrator was assigned with a specific identity code. During analysis of the interviews categories and themes are emerged. As the questions were open-ended and as the interviewees were given the opportunity to respond freely to the questions, the responses were analysed according to the codes assigned to interviewees. The code assigned to text along with digit basically represents the major category of the text in which teachers have talked about. The digit represents teachers / heads / administrators' frequency response on the issue. For example, the code PCT4 represents prospects of collaboration issue on which four teachers talked about. Similarly, code MCA6 represents the issue relevant to model collaboration upon which two administrators stressed. In this ways all the interviews' text was coded. Consistency in elaborative responses of teachers/heads/administrators on similar issue also indicates the reliability of analysis.

4. THEMES EMERGENCE

During qualitative analysis following themes were emerged.
1. Space for inclusion
2. Model collaboration
3. Barriers for collaboration
4. Background impact
5. Functioning in collaborative institutions
6. Policy formulation

4.1 Space for inclusion

Eleven out of 18 teachers are agreed that inclusion is possible. A teacher from deaf and dumb school told a way which would be more useful to scaffold inclusion. "It is possible with appropriate curriculum and training of teachers…." (PCT11). Also a teacher from slow learner school reflected as "it is possible with training…." (PCT7). But still it was the question that we can teach a disabled student with how much disability? A teacher from slow learner school has explained that a student having mild disability can be taught in an inclusive program. For example, a teacher reflected as "yes but after training, moreover it is not possible with a child having severe problem" (PCT9). The administrator is the person who is super visioning, making policies and decisions and taking steps to implement them. It was very important for researchers to ask administrators involved in general and special education schools system concerning acceptance of students with disabilities within general education. The analysis shows that the administrators oscillate on the continuum of segregation to inclusion. They actually have shown 50-50 response. One out of 2 administrators opined that it is possible but not easy. For example, one of them explained "it is hardly possible in 2 to 3 institutions out of 50 institutions…" (PCA2). But still he had mentioned the limit up to which it may be practiced and organized. Running an educational institution more effectively is the need of the head's job. They have to administer all the programs in their institutions either they are willing to administer such institution which is inclusive or not. Most of the heads are agreed that it is possible. Three out of 4 heads have agreed that inclusion is possible. Heads of slow learners school has described "yes, but difficult because it is very time taking… main problem is adjustment of disabled children,,, hearing and seeing disability is possible but equipment is necessary… strategy is essential, proper meetings of general and special teachers should be arranged" (PCH1).

4.2 Model collaboration

In the process of collaboration every member has the equal right to participate in the whole process; inclusion is also about sharing practices. The researchers explore teachers' acceptance for collaboration among the general and special teachers and most of the teachers from both sides are willing and agreed for having collaboration. Twelve out of 18 teachers reflected that model collaboration of general and special teachers can be fruitful and possible. A teacher from deaf and dumb school suggested as "… possible but there are some things which are very necessary, for example, understanding of sign language…" (MCT4). A teacher from slow learner's school has described this issue in her interview as "…yes, collaboration is possible but before doing, do train teachers…." (MCT9). When teachers accept students with disabilities and are trained then developing collaboration would be significant. A teacher reflects as "…collaboration is very necessary for inclusion…" (MCT10). Better collaboration may lead towards successful inclusion. Still collaboration process needs much resources which is not easy

to provide in an under developing country. One out of 2 administrators explained that collaboration of general and special institutions can be a reality. He reflected as "…yes, it is possible…" (MCA1). Collaboration can lead the process of inclusion towards success. It is very essential for inclusion. Most of the heads are agreed and are ready for having collaboration but they stressed in the fulfillment of some needs for making collaborative process more successful. Three out of four heads were agreed in developing collaboration. A head of public elementary school explained, "yes, but need is to develop the interest of teachers so that they can willingly do this…" (MCH3).

4.3 Barriers in collaboration
There exist many stumbling blocks in developing collaboration. All teachers have reflected upon barriers of collaboration for inclusion. For example it needs much funding which is not easy for an under developing country. A teacher from deaf and dumb school has explained "unavailability of resources is the main hurdle in the process…" (BCT18). Funding and resources is not only a barrier but perception of teachers too is hurdle in this process. A teacher from deaf and dumb school has reflected as "thinking of teachers is the barrier…" (BCT2). To develop collaboration teachers in particular and community at large must be fully aware of the usefulness of inclusion process. The thinking and willingness of teachers and community is important because most people are not willing for collaborative process where their students without disability may learn with students with disability. A teacher has pointed out "I think community dislike to collaborate such institutions…." (BCT4). General school teachers feel problematic to teach a special child in general school as such children have different attributes. According to teachers, this problem may be coped with better training and providing the required number of staff "lack of staff and untrained staff is the main hurdle in collaborative process" (BCT10).According to administrators who are involved in special school management and administration reflected as "attitude of teachers is main barrier" (BCA2).Four heads have explained as "behavior of general teachers and parents is the main barrier" (BCH2). She further elaborated "lack of willingness of parents to develop collaboration is also a hurdle" (BCH2).

4.4 Background impact
Some of the most important issues which may affect collaboration to scaffold inclusion are the gender and background of teachers. Thirteen out of 18 teachers replied that yes background affects collaborative process. One teacher from slow learners' schools has reflected "yes, but gender also affects…" (BIT11).One administrator gave response "yes, off course background affects…" (BIA2).All heads have responded "yes,… that affects the whole collaborative process but it is not a hurdle at all" (BIH4), effective to influence this process fully.

4.5 Functioning of collaborative institutions
Working in an inclusive set up is different from segregated institutions. Are teachers ready to work and lead in an inclusive institution? Nine out of 18 teachers are willing to run an inclusive set up. A teacher from deaf and dumb school has opined "by making an effective strategy, collaborative and inclusive set up can be made more functional…" (FCT6).

Another teacher demands "…but we need guidance and training …." (FCT7). The most important element is effective management which may lead to the actual success of collaboration between the institutions. A teacher from public elementary school stressed "by developing good policies and with good management it will be working …" (FCT14). To run an inclusive set up is interesting for administrators or not? In response to the question, the administrator agreed and explained "for this, we need essential equipment, trained teachers, A.V. aids for disabled and school have working environment for teachers..." (FCA2).A head teacher of slow learners' school has elaborated "I will try to do in a good way, but the attitude of teachers needs to be changed…and good and effective planning is also required" (FCH1).

4.6 Policy formulation
Mostly teachers have responded that they like to contribute in the procedure of policy making of their institution. Eleven out of 18 teachers emphasized on participation in policy formulation in schools. A teacher from a selected school reflected "I like to participate in the process of policy making and give suggestions although I have no authority of its implementation…." (PFT3). Policy making is a part of an administrator's job. Both of the administrators interviewed responded that they actively participated in the procedure of policy making as it is the part and requirement of their job. For example, an administrator pointed out "we should talk and initiate but we are bound by higher authority…" (PFA2).Heads may play an active role in the process of policy making to develop collaboration for the institution. All the four heads like to contribute in the procedure of policy making of their institution as far as collaboration is concerned. A head from a school opined "yes, we can but within the limits" (PFH3). All heads are of the view that they participate in policy making but they have to remain within the limits of their powers.

5.   QUANTITATIVE RESULTS
The quantitative analyses show that no significant differences were found among teachers about collaboration of institutions on the basis of their age, experience and gender. No significant difference is found about community role in building collaboration on the basis of teachers' experience and gender. No significant difference found between male and female teachers about training to develop collaboration although female teachers mean score is greater than male. No significant statistical mean score difference exists between male and female teachers about motivation of teachers to develop collaboration although male teachers mean score is greater than female. No significant statistical mean score difference exists between urban and rural teachers to develop collaboration although rural teachers mean score is greater than urban. No significant statistical mean score difference exists between urban and rural teachers about community role to develop collaboration although urban teachers mean score is greater than rural. There is no significant statistical mean score difference between urban and rural teachers to develop collaboration of institutions although urban teachers mean score is greater than rural. There is no significant statistical mean score difference between urban and rural teachers about training to develop collaboration although urban teachers

mean score is greater than rural. There is no statistical mean score difference between urban and rural teachers about motivation to develop collaboration although urban teachers mean score is greater than rural. There is no significant statistical mean score difference between general and special teachers to develop collaboration although special teachers mean score is greater than general. There is no significant statistical mean score difference between general and special teachers about community role to develop collaboration although special teachers mean score is greater than general. There is no significant statistical mean score difference between general and special teachers about training to develop collaboration although special school teachers mean score is greater than general school teachers. There is no significant statistical mean score difference between general and special teachers about motivation to develop collaboration although special school teachers mean score is greater than general school teachers.

Table 1: Independent sample t-test comparing general and special school teachers' perception to develop collaboration of general and special schools

Teachers	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig.(2-tailed)
General schools	101	18.9	3.7	-1.87	.041
Special schools	60	21.4	5.10		

The independent sample t-test (table 1) shows that there is significant difference between general and special school teachers' perception to develop collaboration. (t= -1.87 sig. = 0.41), Mean general school teachers = 18.9, Mean special school teachers= 21.4. It is evident that there is significant statistical mean score difference between general and special school teachers to develop collaboration of institutions although special school teachers mean score is greater than general school teachers. It means that special school teachers are more inclined towards developing collaboration between general and special schools to scaffold inclusion.

6. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Inclusive education calls for equal educational facilities and equipment in the process of getting education for all students irrespective of their abilities or disabilities. Equality, equity and social justice are essential parameters for a comprehensive understanding of inclusion and education for all. Collaboration founded on inclusion advances varied excellence of team message, problem solving, and decision making. In collaboration, teachers can perform well. Teachers have an equal opportunity of performing and proving their skills in their institutions and classrooms while they are in an inclusive collaborative set up. Those who have earlier practice within capacity and related specialized training clutch more optimistic approaches. As instructional leader, school head is offered with the trial of enabling and managing operative cooperative associations among teachers and educators. Some parents seem to be worried as teachers reflected that their children would not obtain enough support from their tutors and they might follow unsuitable conducts of children with infirmities. Singal argued that inclusive

education has covering for education system broadly and has made educational process more expanded and widened [15]. It has enlarged its area towards the education for all. Now it is our duty that either we are fulfilling our job for attaining the objectives of education for all or not.

Teachers, heads and administrators of general and special schools provided insightful channels to trace prospects of collaboration within existing segregated education system. Inclusion can be scaffold if collaboration develops. For example, possibilities to minimize barriers in both general and special education schools and involvement of teachers in policy formulation can expedite inclusion process significantly in both general and special schools. Further the result shows that majority of special education teachers have positive response and are ready for collaboration with general school teachers. Although most of the heads of both schools are ready for practicing inclusion in their institutions but have qualms as well. They favour to arrange collaborative settings to scaffold inclusion to achieve Education for All. Funding is issue but to foster the process local and regional setting can be created with administrative cooperation of general and special schools. Through effective management, proper planning, appropriate curriculum and essential training, collaborative programme may prove to be significant. Envisioning seminars and workshops innovatively and conducting may be helpful for both teachers of special and general schools as well as heads to enrich their teaching and management techniques that ultimately pave the way towards developing collaboration to scaffold inclusion.

REFERENCES

[1] Armstrong, A., Armstrong, D. & Spandagou, I. (2010). Inclusive education: International policy and practice. London: Sage.

[2] Oliver, M. (1996). Understanding disability: From theory to practice. London: Macmillan Press.

[3] Sebba, J. & Ainscow, M. (1996). International development in inclusive schooling: Maping the issue. Cambridge Journal of Education. 26(1), 5-18.

[4] Skrtic, T. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. Harvard educational review. 61(2), 148-207.

[5] Bossaert, G., Colpin, H., Pijl, S. J., & Petry, K. (2013). Truly included? A literature study focusing on the social dimension of inclusion in education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 37(1), 60-79. 10.1080/13603116.2011.580464.

[6] Hines, J. T. (2008). Making Collaboration Work in Inclusive High School Classrooms: Recommendations for Principals. *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 43(5), 277-282.

[7] Fallon, M. (2013). Inclusive collaboration with families of children with autism spectrum disorders (ASD): Perceptions of families, pre-service and in-service level teachers, 46(1), 45-62.

[8] Sheridan, S. M., Welch, M. & Orme, S. F. (1996). Is consultation effective? A review of outcome research. *Remedial and Special Education.* 17(6), 341–354.

[9] Sharpe, M.N. & Hawes, M.E. (2003). Examining current challenges in secondary education and transition. *International Journal of Inclusive education.* 2(1).

[10] McLeskey, J. & Waldron, N. L. (2000).Comprehensive school reform and inclusive schools. *Theory into practice*. 45(3), 269-278.

[11] Mackenzie, N. & Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research*. Vol. 16. http://www.iier.org.au/iier16/mackenzie.html.

[12] Cresswell, J. W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches. (2nd ed.). California: Sage Publication.

[13] Gorard, G. (2004). Combining methods in educational and social research. Berkshire: Open University Press.

[14] Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA, USA: Sage.

[15] Singal, N. (2005). Mapping the Field of Inclusive Education: A Review of the Indian Literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 9(4), 331-350.

[16] Tomlinson, S. (1982). The Sociology of Special Education, Beckenham: Croom Helm.