CHAPTER – 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

The present chapter is devoted to the analysis and interpretation of data collected from 40 final-year B.Ed students (20 from a government college and 20 from a private college) in Chapra (Bihar). The primary tool of data collection was a **semi-structured questionnaire**, which included both closed- and open-ended questions. This chapter includes:

- Tabular presentation of key data points

- Graphical representation (description here; images can be inserted in Word)

- Narrative interpretation of trends, opinions, and emerging patterns

The data has been analysed qualitatively and thematically, focusing on attitudes, awareness, and experiences related to inclusive education.

4.2 Profile of the Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	20	50%
	Female	20	50%
College Type	Government	20	50%
	Private	20	50%
Year of Study	Final Year (4th Semester)	40	100%

All respondents were final-year B.Ed students. Equal representation was ensured by purposive random sampling.

4.3 Responses to Questionnaire Items

Q1. Have you studied Inclusive Education as part of your B.Ed curriculum?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	35	87.5%
No	5	12.5%

Interpretation:

A large majority (87.5%) acknowledged that Inclusive Education was included in their curriculum. However, subsequent questions revealed that curriculum presence does not always translate to practical understanding.

Q2. Have you interacted with children with disabilities (CwDs) during your internship?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	14	35%
No	26	65%

Interpretation:

Despite internship requirements, most students (65%) reported no direct interaction with children with disabilities. This indicates a gap between policy and practice in teacher training implementation.

Q3. Do you believe children with disabilities can be taught effectively in regular schools?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	12	30%
Agree	20	50%
Disagree	6	15%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%

Interpretation:

A positive trend is visible — 80% either agreed or strongly agreed with inclusive teaching feasibility. However, 20% showed some resistance, pointing to the need for mindset change and confidence-building.

Q4. Do you feel confident in teaching in an inclusive classroom?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	16	40%
No	24	60%

Interpretation:

Only 40% feel confident, revealing a pressing need for more practical exposure and inclusive pedagogical training.

Q5. What are the main challenges you perceive in implementing inclusive education?

(*Open-ended question — responses grouped thematically*)

Challenge Area	Frequency Mentioned
Lack of training	28
Lack of infrastructure	24
Peer insensitivity	16
Curriculum rigidity	13
Time constraints in class	10

Interpretation:

Lack of professional training and inclusive infrastructure were the two most cited barriers. Students highlighted that theoretical knowledge alone is insufficient for real classroom inclusivity.

Q6. What support do you think teachers need to implement inclusion?

(*Multiple choices allowed; based on open responses*)

Support Type	Frequency Mentioned
Special educator support	30
Training workshops	28
Teaching-learning materials	25
Peer collaboration	20
Administrative support	18

Q7. Do you think inclusive education increases empathy among students?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	32	80%
No	4	10%
Not Sure	4	10%

Interpretation:

The vast majority (80%) recognised the emotional and social benefits of inclusion. This shows that values like empathy and cooperation are appreciated by the respondents.

4.4 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) – Key Themes

Two FGDs were conducted — one in each college, with six students per group. Key themes that emerged:

- **Insecurity about Teaching Children with Disabilities:** Students feared they may "do more harm than good" without proper training.

- **Desire for Real Classroom Exposure:** Many expressed that just books and seminars were not enough — they needed field practice.

- **Gendered Observations:** Female students mentioned that inclusion builds community feeling in girls more strongly than boys — a point of further research.

- **Respect for Teachers Diminishes if CwDs are Not Handled Well:** Many feared being seen as "incompetent" by peers and school heads.

4.5 Semi-Structured Interviews – Summary of Feedback from Teachers and DIET Officers

From discussions with faculty and DIET officers, insights gained include:

- **Teachers acknowledged lack of structured modules** for inclusion in their own training during B.Ed.

- **DIET officers emphasized the urgency of Universal Design for Learning (UDL)** as recommended by NEP 2020.

- Some faculty believed that **inclusive classrooms slow down syllabus coverage**, though others saw it as a matter of training, not limitation.

4.6 Overall Interpretation of Findings

The analysis presents a **contradiction between awareness and preparedness**. While most pre-service teachers supported the idea of inclusive education in theory:

- Less than half feel practically confident

- Very few have had meaningful interaction with CwDs

- Majority see system-level gaps in training, infrastructure, and mentorship