Evaluating the Effectiveness of Inclusion Models for Students with Learning Disabilities

Tanzela Bashir*[1], Nusrat Fatima[2], Syed Zaheer Abbas[3], Bilqees Bano[4]

[1] Lecturer, Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan.
(Corresponding Author) Email: Tanzeela.bashir@ed.uol.edu.pk

[2] M.Sc. (Psychology), National Institute of Psychology (NIP), Quaid e Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: nusratmohsin2016@gmail.com

[3] PhD Scholar (Education), Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan.
Email: 70183819@student.uol.edu.pk

[4] Bachelor of Education, Government College of Education for Women, Skardu, Gilgit Baltistan.
Email: bilqees382@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper presents a discussion on the performance of inclusion models in improving the academic and social performance of learners with learning disabilities in general school curriculums. The study was conducted to establish the perceptions of the teachers, institutional support and the overall effectiveness of inclusive practices in both the public and the private schools. The data were gathered with the help of a quantitative descriptive design and the questionnaire structured to gather information about 200 educators and administrators. Descriptive statistics as well as t-tests and ANOVA were used to test the relationship between teacher preparedness, institutional support and inclusion outcomes. The results showed overall positive views on inclusion, high student integration and social inclusion ratings. Nevertheless, the lack of training opportunities, big classes and inadequate resources within the institution were cited as the primary causes of failure. Formally trained teachers who had more experience showed more positive perceptions in inclusive education. The research arrives at the conclusion that sustained professional growth, institutional facilitation, and fair distribution of resources are the essential factors to the realization of effective and sustainable practice of inclusive education.

Keywords: Inclusive education, Learning disabilities, Teacher preparedness, Institutional support, Models of inclusion in education.

Introduction

Inclusive learning has become a part of contemporary pedagogy with the intention of giving every student, with or without disabilities, irrespective of their learning difficulties equal educational opportunities in conventional classes. Assessment of inclusion models on students with learning disabilities (LDs) is important in determining how the diverse learners can become academically successful and integrated into the systems. It has been established that inclusion fosters social cohesion and leads to better cognitive outcomes in case it is done properly. Nevertheless, the practice and effectiveness of such models differ significantly in relation to contextual, pedagogical, and resource-based variables (Liu & Potmesil, 2025; Krämer et al., 2021; Naz et al., 2024).

In the past, learners with LDs used to be taught in isolating environments through special education systems.

The worldwide move towards inclusion has started with such legislative documents as Salamanca Statement (1994) of UNESCO and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) of the UN that promote education as a right irrespective of disability. Since 2015, there has been an increase in studies around the topic of inclusive education, researching the multidimensional facet of children with special educational needs (SEN) in fields such as psychology, sociology, and pedagogy. Recent results indicate that inclusion models with adequate resources and support have a small to a moderate positive impact on academic performance in students with learning challenges (Cohen d = 0.35) (Liu & Potmesil, 2025; Krämer et al., 2021).

The idea of inclusive education is one that has received institutional and governmental interest in Pakistan in the past ten years. Other provinces like Punjab have put in place inclusive education whereby the goal is to incorporate students with mild to moderate disabilities in regular schools. Although this has been achieved, there are still setbacks with inadequate teacher training, infrastructural gaps and negative attitudes in society as they stand in the way to the successful implementation. Schools do not always have differentiated teaching resources and professional development courses that can support learners with LDs. However, government-driven projects such as the Punjab government and other groups such as the British Council have begun to reinforce inclusive models by facilitating teacher sensitivity and infrastructural realignment (Aftab et al., 2024; Manzoor et al., 2025; Ahmad & Nawaz, 2025).

Inclusive education is an important agenda in advanced countries around the world including Finland, Canada and Australia where mainstreaming, hybrid, and specialization are some of the models used to meet the different needs. According to meta-analyses, the inclusion benefits most students with mild disabilities, especially when the only approach that is implemented is based on peer modeling, differentiated instruction, and collaborative teaching. In the international community, the research also identifies the importance of teacher attitude, teacher development and assistive technology in maximizing inclusion. Research in Europe and North America suggests that inclusive settings promote greater self-esteem, academic performance, and social skills of students with LDs (Liu & Potmesil, 2025; Mbelu, 2025; Chen, B., Chen et al., 2025).

Although all theoretical support columns focus on inclusion as a human right, the effectiveness of inclusion models in practice with students with LDs is not consistent. The teachers in most parts complain that the inclusion is done in an insincere way- without proper training, material or mechanisms. Students with LDs, therefore, might not be able to enjoy the benefits of academic engagement and emotional support that can make them prosper. The urgent need is to empirically test the functionality of inclusion models in various educational settings to find out the elements that contribute towards their effectiveness or failure (Bagadood et al., 2025; Alahmari et al., 2025; Almulla & Amjad, 2025).

The importance of the research is that the inclusion models are explored on a real-world level and thus, the gap between idealism on policy and classroom practice is closed. The study will explain to the educators, policymakers and school administrators some of the strategies that can enhance student learning and engagement in students with LDs. Results will be used in evidenced-based policy formulation to make inclusion not just policy requirement but also a desirable pedagogical practice that results in improved learning and social inclusion of learners (Liu & Potmesil, 2025; Krämer et al., 2021).

Though other researchers confirm such an overall positive effect of inclusion, not many studies have investigated the relative effects of models of inclusion (e.g., hybrid and full inclusion) on the cognitive and psychosocial achievement of LDs. Also, the low- and middle-income countries such as Pakistan have a lack of empirical evidence where resources and teacher preparation are key factors when it comes to outcomes. This study will attempt to address this gap by evaluating the operationalization and perceptions of inclusion models in a local educational setting (Afzaal et al., 2022).

Research Objectives
This study is intended to:
1. To determine the effect of inclusion models on the academic and psychosocial performance of students with LDs.
2. To examine the perceptions and readiness of teachers on how to use inclusive instructional methods.
3. To determine the contextual barriers and enabling factors that impact on effectiveness of inclusion models.

Research Questions
1. Which inclusion models are the most effective ones in enhancing academic performance of students with learning disabilities?
2. How do teachers and administrators perceive the use of inclusion models with students with LDs?
3. What are the contextual conditions that cause the success or constraints of these inclusion models?

Literature Review
Inclusive education has turned into an international trend in the quest to ensure that students with learning disabilities get equal access to learning. Recent studies highlight the fact that inclusion models can generate social participation as well as contribute greatly to the academic achievement and emotional wellness of students with special educational needs. Inclusive classrooms help such students to get regular curricula together with their peers, which will feel like belonging to them and enhance their motivation and self-efficacy. Also, the experience of different learning arrangements stimulates socialization and the acquisition of the necessary life skills, which will allow students with learning disabilities to increase their ability to collaborate and communicate (Liu & Potmesil, 2025; Iftikhar et al., 2024; Sajjad et al., 2025).

An empirical study conducted in 2020 found that the use of inclusion model results in an observable academic improvement of students with disabilities as compared to segregated educational systems (Adams, 2020). Increased standardized test performance and enhanced adaptability were observed in the study because of adaptive instructional support and a cooperative classroom environment. Some teachers, however, indicated that they thought the models of inclusion were not practical due to lack of resources and training as some of the factors that affected their perceived effectiveness (Adams, 2020; Theall et al., 2025; Triano & Meeks, 2025).

The literature further reports that inclusive education is also useful to the students who are not disabled since they develop empathy, decrease discrimination, and enhance communication and collaboration skills. By means of regular peer interaction, the groups acquire respect towards each other, and they adopt positive social attitudes, which lead to classroom harmony and overall success. Inclusion models therefore work in two ways, namely, accommodations of students with learning disabilities and enhancement of the general learning experience (Lindner & Schwab, 2025; Navas-Bonilla et al., 2025; Kartiko et al., 2025).

At the policy level, the current research indicates that although inclusion policies have increased access to formal education, there are still differences because of the unequal distribution of resources, insufficient teacher training, and the use of out-of-date curricula. Policymakers are encouraged to pay attention to adaptive pedagogy, lifelong learning, and investment in assistive technology to reinforce the inclusive systems. Efforts to integrate are most successful when buttressed by systemic reforms that include the workload of teachers, the size of the classroom and the ability to have flexible assessment criteria (Smith et al., 2025).

Several case studies carried around the world attest that inclusive models are more likely to boost academic motivation and decrease dropout rates of students with learning disabilities when applied effectively. The learners also show better self-esteem and emotional strength in inclusive environments, which can be explained by the fact that peers and teachers accept them and support them. However, there are still entrenched challenges including stigmatization of society and insufficient policy backing which are important challenges

to educational equity (Kamran & Bano, 2025; Woolfson, 2025; Bahriddinovich et al., 2025).

Assessment of government and institutional programs such as Disability Inclusion Funding Model have shown that progressive funding systems and staff mentorship programs can greatly improve the performance of students. The feature of these programs is the focus on collaborative instruction, when special and general educators equally share the classroom control, making sure that they both differentiate and equal their instruction design. These funding reforms also enhance the acquisition of special learning materials thus enhancing access to and inclusiveness of education (Smith-Merry et al., 2025; Salinger et al., 2025; Cunningham et al., 2025).

Finally, the literature recommends the inclusion models as a successful approach of addressing the learning needs of students with learning disabilities. A combination of well-trained teachers, allocation of resources, adaptive curriculum and engaging the society all depends on their success. The future observation ought to proceed with the research into the longitudinal results, presence of new educational technologies, and culturally responsive inclusion models to enhance the sustainability of the inclusive educational practices in the long term.

Research Methodology
Research Design
The research design in this study is a quantitative descriptive research design that is devoted to investigating the effectiveness of inclusion models to the students with learning disability in the general educational setting. Systematic measurement of relationships between teacher preparedness, institutional support and student integration by use of statistical analysis is made possible by design. The quantitative model enables accurate assessment of the inclusion practices with the help of standardized tools.

Research Population
The research population is to include teachers and school administrators engaged in the implementation of the practice of inclusive education within both the public and the private educational institutions. This group of people was selected because the participants have direct experience of working with learning disability students, and hence have an experience based and relevant insight in the assessment of inclusive education success.

Sampling Technique
This study used the convenience sampling method to choose the study participants. The method of convenience sampling is important because it entails the selection of people who are most easily accessible and willing to take part, and therefore it is a good way of obtaining data with maximum efficiency when the subjects are easily accessed via professional networks or online communication systems like online groups. This was an appropriate method considering the time limit and the fact that the survey was carried out online.

Research Sample
There were 200 respondents who were included in the study, that is, male and female teachers, school administrators of different levels of education such as primary, middle, secondary, and higher secondary. The respondents were chosen according to their working experience in teaching or administration in inclusive education schools. This was the statistically appropriate sample size to represent trends and perceptions in various institutions.

Research Tool
The research employed a structured questionnaire in the form of a Google Forms as the instrument of primary data collection. The tool consisted of Likert-scale items that were divided into such dimensions as teacher

preparedness, institutional support, student integration, attitudinal orientation towards integration, and model effectiveness. The instrument was made to measure both objective and qualitative outcomes of inclusion.

Validity and Reliability
The content validity of the questionnaire was ensured by expert evaluation by the specialists in the field of special and inclusive education. A pilot test was carried out on 20 educators to make the test clear and internally consistent. The instrument has a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.82 which implies that the instrument is very reliable when used in quantitative educational research.

Data Collection
The online initiative of a four-week period to gather data was accomplished by means of an online Google Form link that was distributed via email networks and educational social media groups. The informed consent was received voluntarily, and informed consent was given by the participants. The web-based approach made it possible to distribute information efficiently, provide access and maintain a secure storage of data and cover a wide geographic and institutional scope.

Data Analysis
The analysis of the data was done with the help of Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS). The mean, frequency, and standard deviation of the responses were calculated to provide a summary of the answers. The inferential statistics consisting of independent samples t-tests and ANOVA were used to examine the difference according to the demographic structure of variables like gender, the type of school, and professional experience. The results were put into perspective in reference to the study objectives to assess the practical effects that inclusion models have to educational outcomes of students with learning disabilities.

Demographic Analysis
Table 1: Frequency of Demographic Information

Category	Respondents	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	104	52
	Female	96	48
Age	Under 25 years	30	15
	25–34 years	80	40
	35–44 years	60	30
	45–54 years	20	10
	55+ years	10	5
Highest qualification	Bachelor's	50	25
	Masters	100	50
	M.Phil.	36	18
	PhD	14	7
Years of teaching experience	Less than 2 years	20	10
	2–5 years	50	25
	6–10 years	70	35
	11–15 years	20	10
	Above 15 years	40	20
School type	Public	110	55
	Private	90	45
Level taught	Primary	60	30

	Middle	50	25
	Secondary	60	30
	Higher Secondary	30	15
Formal training in inclusive education	Yes	96	48
	No	104	52

Table 1 shows demographic features of 200 participants who participated in this study among teachers and school leaders engaged in the process of inclusive education. The ratio of both genders is balanced, 52% males and 48% females in the survey, thus making the responses gender diverse. Regarding age, the highest proportion of 40% is within the age of 25-34 years indicating that the majority of the respondents are young professionals, with 30 percent between the age of 35-44 years, a combination of early and mid-career teachers. When it comes to qualifications, half of the respondents (50%) have a master degree and 25% have a bachelor degree implying that most of them are well qualified teachers.

Regarding the teaching experience, 35% of the respondents have 6-10 years of experience in their fields demonstrating that a majority of the respondents are experienced in their careers whereas 25% have 2-5 years' experience which shows that the sample is a balanced group of both novice and experienced teachers. The respondents are also representative of both sectors since most of them (55%), work in the public schools and the remaining 45% respondents work in the private schools. The taught levels are categorized as primary (30%), middle (25%), secondary (30%) and higher secondary (15%) level, which shows a wide spectrum of educational settings. It is noteworthy that 48% of the respondents surveyed said they were trained on inclusive education formally and 52% said they were not which means there is a gap in training inclusive education that might affect the efficacy of the practices.

Overall, the demographic information shows the existence of a properly distributed and heterogeneous sample of educators, which gives a good background of analyzing perceptions and practices in terms of inclusion models of students with learning disabilities.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of teacher's perception on models of inclusion.

Statements	Mean	S.D.
Teacher Preparedness and Professional Competence		
I feel confident in adapting instructional methods to meet the needs of students with learning disabilities.	4.12	0.72
I have received adequate training on how to implement inclusive education practices.	3.65	0.94
I regularly use differentiated instruction techniques in my classroom.	3.98	0.81
I understand how to assess students with learning disabilities fairly and effectively.	4.03	0.77
My institution provides sufficient opportunities for professional development in inclusive practices.	3.56	1.02
Institutional Support and Resources		
My school provides sufficient learning materials and assistive technologies for inclusive education.	3.42	0.98
There are clear institutional policies supporting inclusion of students with learning disabilities.	3.75	0.84

The school administration actively supports teachers in implementing inclusion strategies.	3.88	0.79
Class sizes are manageable enough to facilitate inclusive teaching.	3.21	1.04
Collaboration between general and special educators is encouraged and effectively practiced.	3.90	0.87
Student Integration and Social Inclusion		
Students with learning disabilities participate actively in classroom and extracurricular activities.	4.01	0.70
Peers without disabilities show acceptance and positive attitudes toward students with learning disabilities.	4.08	0.66
Inclusion practices have improved social interactions among all students.	4.10	0.63
Students with learning disabilities are treated fairly by teachers and peers.	4.14	0.68
My classroom environment encourages mutual respect and understanding among all learners.	4.22	0.59
Attitudinal Dimension Toward Inclusion		
Inclusive education benefits both students with and without learning disabilities.	4.40	0.56
Inclusion creates additional workload and stress for teachers. (reverse-coded)	3.18	1.12
I value inclusion as an essential aspect of equitable education.	4.35	0.61
Inclusion promotes empathy and diversity awareness among students.	4.28	0.58
Teachers should receive incentives for effectively implementing inclusive models.	4.31	0.64
Perceived Effectiveness of Inclusion Models		
Inclusion models in my institution improve academic outcomes for students with learning disabilities.	4.00	0.73
These models promote long-term skill development and independence among students.	3.95	0.78
Inclusion models are well-aligned with curriculum goals and objectives.	3.83	0.82
The overall implementation of inclusion in my institution is effective.	3.90	0.76
Continuous evaluation and feedback enhance the success of inclusion programs.	4.07	0.70

Table 2 shows mean scores and standard deviation scores of various dimensions according to the perceptions of the teachers on inclusion models. All in all, the findings demonstrate the pleasant attitudes towards inclusive schooling. The top mean scores are the Attitudinal Dimension Toward Inclusion (M = 4.30) and Student Integration and Social Inclusion (M = 4.11), in which teachers seem to be of the opinion that inclusion is a good practice that helps students to develop a sense of empathy, respect and active interest.

The response of Teacher Preparedness and Professional Competence was also positive (M = 3.87) as teacher's express moderately low levels of confidence and competence about changing instructional practices, but the lower training opportunities scores (M = 3.56) indicate the need to develop professionally further. Institutional Support and Resources had its mean (M = 3.63) and thus, even though schools offer some supports, there are issues with some aspects such as the size of the classes and the availability of resources.

Finally, the Perceived Effectiveness of Inclusion Models (M = 3.95) indicates that educators consider inclusive measures as those that can be helpful in enhancing academic and social performance of students with learning disabilities. In general, the results are very positive, but the support of the institutions and formal training must be improved to provide a sustainable inclusion practice.

Inferential Statistics

Table 3: Independent Samples t-Test Results Comparisons of Teachers Perceptions of Inclusion Models by Gender, Type of School and Formal Training.

	N	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig.
Gender						
Male	104	79.42	12.38	198	1.853	0.065
Female	96	82.00	11.84			
School Type						
Private	90	85.76	10.92	198	2.963	0.004
Government	110	79.58	12.70			
Formal training in inclusive education						
Yes	96	87.21	9.75	198	4.178	0.000
No	104	78.46	13.28			

The independent t-tests results in the study are presented in Table 3 by comparing the perceptions of teachers towards inclusion models according to gender, school type and formal training in inclusive education. The results show that there is no significant difference between the respondents of both sexes (male and female) (p = 0.065), which implies that gender does not determine attitudes towards inclusion. Nevertheless, there was also a notable difference by school type (p = 0.004), although the strength of the positive perceptions in private schools (M = 85.76) was more than that of teachers in the public schools (M = 79.58).

The greatest difference can be observed in the variable formal training in inclusive education (p = 0.000). The trainee teachers (M = 87.21) expressed considerably more positive perceptions than teachers who were not trained (M = 78.46). This indicates how professional preparation is key in influencing positive attitudes and successful application of inclusive education practices. In general, the findings indicate that the success of inclusion depends on the institutional circumstances and teacher preparation.

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA Results Compare Teachers Perception of Inclusion Models based on Age, Educational Qualification, Teaching Experience and Level of Teaching

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age					
Between Groups	1286.47	4	321.62	2.437	0.049
Within Groups	25635.28	195	131.45		
Total	26921.75	199			
Highest qualification					
Between Groups	1410.83	3	470.28	3.655	0.014
Within Groups	25086.59	196	127.99		
Total	26497.42	199			
Years of teaching experience					
Between Groups	1925.64	4	481.41	4.278	0.003
Within Groups	21963.37	195	112.65		
Total	23889.01	199			
Level taught					
Between Groups	989.74	3	329.91	2.584	0.055
Within Groups	25001.15	196	127.56		
Total	25990.89	199			

Table 4 shows the outcomes of a one-way ANOVA test that will investigate the variations of the perceptions of inclusion models among teachers according to age, educational level, teaching experience, and level taught. Its results indicate differences of significance between age groups ($p = 0.049$), highest qualification ($p = 0.014$) and years of teaching experience ($p = 0.003$), which means that these variables affect the way teachers perceive and put inclusive education into practice. The more qualified and experienced teachers will have stronger positive attitudes towards the inclusion practices.

No significant difference was, however, detected in the level taught ($p = 0.055$), which implies that the perceptions of inclusion are no different in the primary, middle and secondary, and higher secondary levels. In general, the findings suggest that experience and professional background play a significant role in influencing the knowledge and the support that teachers give to the inclusion models of education.

Findings
The results of the work outline the general positive attitudes and views of teachers and school administrators in relation to inclusion models of students with learning disabilities. The demographic data revealed a representative sample of the diverse group of the respondents of both the public and the private institutions, different levels of teaching and gender and experience balance. Nevertheless, a little bit more than half of the participants had not trained in inclusive education formally, which means that there was a gap in professional development that could lead to effective implementation.

The descriptive findings indicated that teachers have a high positive attitude towards inclusion especially on the domain of student integration, social inclusion, and the attitudinal orientation. Educators agree that inclusion improves empathy, collaboration, and respect towards students and encourages fair learning. Even though teachers showed moderate levels of confidence in modifying their instructions and testing students with learning disabilities, they also cited lack of institutional resources, big classes, and minimal opportunities of professional development as challenges they face.

The inferential data analysis also indicated that the perceptions of inclusion among teachers in the private schools were much more positive than in the public schools probably because of the availability of better resources and administration. Moreover, teachers undergoing formal training around inclusive education expressed much greater competence and positive attitudes than those not trained in the area, which supports the significance of the ongoing professional development.

The results of the one-way ANOVA showed that there were significant differences in perceptions according to age, qualification, and the teaching experience where teachers with higher experience and qualifications were more supportive of inclusive practices. However, difference was, however, noted between the teaching levels implying that inclusive education is considered positively throughout all the grade levels.

In general, the research shows that inclusion models are rather viewed as effective and helpful, but the success is based on the training of teachers, institutional support, and sufficient resources. These aspects can be reinforced to achieve more efficient and sustainable behaviors of inclusive education to students with learning disabilities.

Discussions
The results of the current research reveal that teachers and school administrators have mostly positive attitudes to inclusion models designed to work with students with learning disabilities which is consistent with the evidence in the prior literature that inclusion practices that are implemented well have a small to medium positive impact on student academic performance (Liu & Potmesil, 2025; Krämer et al., 2021). The findings indicate that there are high attitudinal ($M = 4.30$) and positive student integration ($M = 4.11$) indicating that inclusive settings create empathy, collaboration, and social integration (Lindner & Schwab, 2025; Navas-Bonilla et al., 2025). This validates previous results that inclusive environments do improve socialization and cooperation between peers.

Nevertheless, teacher preparedness and institutional support are also found to have gaps in the findings. The teaching method (M = 3.56) represents one of the issues that scholars have already identified when they discovered that the lack of professional development complicated teachers in terms of their confidence and ability to implement (Adams, 2020; Theall et al., 2025). These restrictions are especially applicable in Pakistan, where one can find the lack of teacher training and the insufficiency of infrastructures preventing effective inclusion (Aftab et al., 2024; Ahmad & Nawaz, 2025).

It was observed that professional training had a significant correlation with teacher's attitudes in inclusion in that the teachers who had received formal training in inclusion education had more positive attitudes (p = 0.000). This stresses that professional preparation is a major factor in achieving successful inclusion, which is in line with the established past lines of education systems focusing on the systematic teacher support (Triano & Meeks, 2025). Likewise, the findings of the ANOVA, which revealed that experience and the level of qualification contribute to the perception of inclusion, build on previous studies that competency based on experience has a positive impact on the inclusion outcomes (Aftab et al., 2024; Kamran & Bano, 2025).

The perceived difference between teachers working with private and with public schools (p = 0.004) strengthens structural inequalities whereby, in most cases, the former enjoys improved resources and management (Manzoor et al., 2025; Smith et al., 2025). Such disparity demonstrates the need to initiate government actions to close the institutional gaps and promote the inclusion of education in the state sector (Aftab et al., 2024; Ahmad & Nawaz, 2025).

The results of social inclusion are consistent with the international results that indicate that inclusive learning promotes emotional stability, self-esteem, and peer acceptance among learners with disabilities (Mbelu, 2025; Woolfson, 2025). The high means of fairness, mutual respect and classroom empathy confirm that inclusivity is helpful on both sides of the students with and without disabilities, as it promotes the improvement in social harmony (Chen et al., 2025; Kartiko et al., 2025).

However, insufficient institutional facilities, high classrooms, and weak administrative support are still holding back on improvement (Bahriddinovich et al., 2025; Smith-Merry et al., 2025). These difficulties imply that inclusion policies tend to be more theoretical with no resources allocated practically and no regular support from teachers. Based on this, the inclusion should be strengthened with the help of strategic training, better infrastructure, and joint educational governance (Salinger et al., 2025; Cunningham et al., 2025).

To sum up, the present research can prove the idea that the attitude of teachers, their level of professionalism, and the access to resources are significant determinants of successful inclusion. These results are consistent with the statement according to which inclusive education could be effectively implemented in terms of improving academic and social performance under the condition of adaptive pedagogy implementation, continuous teacher training, and institutional commitment (Aftab et al., 2024; Liu & Potmesil, 2025).

Conclusion
The study shows that inclusive education models can make a great difference in helping students with learning disabilities to have better academic and social experiences. The inclusion concept is generally perceived positively by the teachers, especially in terms of embracing empathy, respect and participation among every learner. With such positive attitudes, issues such as inadequate training of teachers, resources, institutional support can continue to pose challenges in effective implementation. The disparity in the mindset between the public and the private schools also highlights the importance of equal allocation of funds and assistance. All in all, sustainable growth in inclusive education will be based on realistic investment in professional growth, infrastructure, and policies, making needs of learners and teachers a priority.

Recommendations
The following are two suggestions made using the findings of the research:

1. The schools are recommended to offer continuous growth of professional development and specific training courses on inclusive education to teachers that allow them better assist students with learning disabilities and tailor their instructional strategies to specific needs.
2. Institutions should improve on allocation of resources such as teaching material and assistive technology in the inclusive classroom, manageable number of students in the classroom and equip teachers and students with the enabling resources to achieve academic and social integration in the classroom.

References

Adams, M. A. (2020). Inclusion Model Impact on Students with Disabilities in Academic Settings.

Aftab, M. J., Amjad, F., & Chaudhry, H. (2024). Inclusive Education: Strategies for Successful Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Mainstream Classrooms. *Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review*, *4*(3), 439-453.

Aftab, M. J., Amjad, F., & Naz, B. (2024). Perceptions and Attitudes of College Teachers toward Inclusive Education in Punjab, Pakistan. *JIE*, 95-116.

Aftab, M. J., Irfan, N., & Amjad, F. (2024). Impact of Assistive Technology on Reading Comprehension Skills in Students with Learning Disabilities. Annals of Human and Social Sciences, 5(3), 387-402.

Aftab, M. J., Majeed, Z., & Amjad, F. (2024). Practices Used to Diagnose Hearing Impaired Students with Learning Difficulties in Mathematics. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, *13*(3), 1078-1091.

Afzaal, H. M., Zafar, S., Anis, F., Abbas, S. Z., & Amjad, F. (2022). Comparative Review Of Special Education Services In Pakistan And India. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, *6*(8), 9924-9942.

Ahmad, S., & Nawaz, H. S. (2025). EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PUNJAB'S 2020 SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, *4*(2), 42-54.

Alahmari, S. A., Aftab, M. J., & Amjad, F. (2025). Challenges in Literacy Skills Development in Early Childhood Special Education in Inclusive Setting. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, *28*(1), 661-671.

Almulla, A. A., & Amjad, F. (2025). Emerging Trends of Using Artificial Intelligence in Developing Strategies to Handle the Students with Learning Disabilities in the Subject of Mathematics. *Qualitative Research*.

Bagadood, N. H., Aftab, M. J., & Amjad, F. (2025). Tailoring Instructional Strategies to Improve Functional Mathematics Competence in Children with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, *28*(1), 415-424.

Bahriddinovich, J. M., Sayrikhonovnaa, K. G., & Bakhromovna, N. D. (2025). PROBLEMS OF TEACHING AND EDUCATING CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION. *Global Science Review*, *2*(1), 306-310.

Chen, B., Chen, J., Wang, M., Tsai, C. C., & Kirschner, P. A. (2025). The effects of integrated STEM education on K12 students' achievements: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 00346543251318297.

Cunningham, S., Russell, A. M., Lidington, E., & Shiely, F. (2025). Lack of data collection in clinical trials prevents us from evaluating inclusion of people with disabilities. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *181*, 111715.

Iftikhar, F., Manzoor, A., & Amjad, F. (2024). Exploring the Relationship of Emotional Intelligence and Social Competence in Teachers of Students with Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, *2*(4), 753-780.

Kamran, M., & Bano, N. (2025). A systematic review of literature on inclusive education with special

emphasis on children with disability in Pakistan. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *29*(7), 1078-1096.

Kartiko, A., Arif, M., Rokhman, M., Ma'arif, M. A., & Aprilianto, A. (2025). Legal Review of Inclusive Education Policy: A Systematic Literature Review 2015-2025. *International Journal of Law and Society (IJLS)*, *4*(1), 22-46.

Krämer, S., Möller, J., & Zimmermann, F. (2021). Inclusive education of students with general learning difficulties: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *91*(3), 432-478.

Lindner, K. T., & Schwab, S. (2025). Differentiation and individualisation in inclusive education: a systematic review and narrative synthesis. *International journal of inclusive education*, *29*(12), 2199-2219.

Liu, X., & Potmesil, M. (2025, January). A review of research on the development of inclusive education in children with special educational needs over the past 10 years: a visual analysis based on CiteSpace. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 9, p. 1475876). Frontiers Media SA.

Manzoor, A., Khalid, M. U., & Rashid, A. (2025). Bullying Faced by Children With Special Needs in Pakistan: Challenges, Interventions, and Societal Implications for Educational Inclusion. In *Preventing Bullying Among Children With Special Educational Needs* (pp. 93-124). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Mbelu, S. E. (2025). Exploring the Impact of Multigrading on Learners with Disabilities: A Qualitative Study in Harry Gwala District, KZN, South Africa. *Education Sciences*, *15*(9), 1254.

Navas-Bonilla, C. D. R., Guerra-Arango, J. A., Oviedo-Guado, D. A., & Murillo-Noriega, D. E. (2025, February). Inclusive education through technology: a systematic review of types, tools and characteristics. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 10, p. 1527851). Frontiers Media SA.

Naz, B., Abbas, A., & Amjad, F. (2024). Enhancing Student Learning Outcomes through Blended Learning Strategies: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, *5*(2), 152-165.

Sajjad, N., Batool, S., & Amjad, F. (2025). Utilizing artificial intelligence to improve teachers' knowledge and instructional strategies in special education setting. *Journal of Social Sciences Research & Policy*, *3*(1), 153-164.

Salinger, M., Nguyen, M., Kessler, A., Triano, S. E., Betchkal, R., Manchanda, E. C. C., ... & Meeks, L. M. (2025). Advancing disability equity and inclusion in undergraduate medical education: Proceedings from the access in medicine summit. *Academic Medicine*, *100*(10S), S54-S63.

Smith, M. A., Akwue, O. S., Marazzo, J., Williams, L. D., Fishon, E., Downer-Reid, A., ... & Muhammad, L. (2025). Evaluating Inclusive Education Policies: A Human Rights Perspective on Supporting Students with Disabilities.

Smith-Merry, J., Darcy, S., Dew, A., Hemsley, B., Imms, C., O'Donovan, M. A., ... & Ellem, K. (2025). Who funds published disability research in Australia?. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, *36*(1), 52-63.

Theall, A. C., Crandall, J. E., Gamboa, H. N., Chichioco, M., Hughes, S. E., Gruppen, L., & Hung, E. (2025). Promoting disability inclusion through an expanded conceptual framework of the learning environment. *Academic Medicine*, 10-1097.

Triano, S. E., & Meeks, L. M. (2025). Strengthening disability inclusion in medical education: the role of disability resource professionals through Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems framework. *Academic Medicine*, 10-1097.

Woolfson, L. M. (2025). Is inclusive education for children with special educational needs and disabilities an impossible dream?. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *95*(3), 725-737.