

# **TEACHERS' AWARENESS, PREPAREDNESS, AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES FOR SUPPORTING STUDENTS WITH DYSLEXIA IN INCLUSIVE CLASSROOMS UNDER NEP 2020: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION**

**Md Saifur Rahman**

Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9260-6111>

---

## **ABSTRACT**

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 emphasizes inclusive and equitable education, particularly through its focus on Foundational Literacy and Numeracy (FLN) and strengthened teacher preparation. Within this reform context, supporting students with dyslexia a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) primarily affecting reading and spelling requires enhanced teacher awareness, preparedness, and effective classroom implementation practices. The present study empirically examines these dimensions among in-service teachers in Punjab, India. A quantitative descriptive–correlational survey design was employed, and data were collected from 362 teachers across government and private primary and secondary schools using a structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, independent t-tests, ANOVA, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression analyses were conducted.

The findings indicate that teachers demonstrated high awareness ( $M = 3.92$ ) and moderately high preparedness ( $M = 3.72$ ), along with frequent implementation of inclusive instructional practices ( $M = 3.74$ ). Significant positive correlations were observed between awareness and implementation ( $r = .46, p < .001$ ) and between preparedness and implementation ( $r = .69, p < .001$ ). Multiple regression analysis revealed that awareness and preparedness together explained 52% of the variance in implementation practices ( $R^2 = .52, p < .001$ ), with preparedness emerging as the strongest predictor ( $\beta = .61$ ). Significant differences were also found based on training exposure, school type, and teaching experience.

The study underscores that while awareness is essential, structured preparedness and professional training are critical determinants of effective inclusive classroom practice. The findings highlight the need for targeted teacher capacity-building, systematic SLD screening mechanisms, and strengthened institutional support to align classroom realities with NEP 2020's inclusive education mandates. The study contributes empirical evidence to the evolving discourse on inclusive education reform in India.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Inclusive education is widely recognized as a rights-based and systems-oriented reform agenda that aims to ensure equitable access, meaningful participation, and improved learning outcomes for all learners, particularly those historically excluded due to disability, learning difficulties, language, gender, poverty, or social disadvantage. Contemporary scholarship emphasizes that inclusion is not synonymous with placement in mainstream classrooms; rather, it requires restructuring curriculum, instruction, assessment, school leadership, and support systems so that schools adapt to learner diversity (UNESCO, 2020; UNESCO, 2017). UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report 2020 further highlights that inclusive education is a process shaped by policy, institutional capacity, teacher competence, and social attitudes, warning that many systems continue to fall short in implementation even when inclusion is recognized in policy.

In the Indian context, inclusion is strengthened by legislative and policy commitments (e.g., Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016) and is strongly reiterated in the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, which frames equity and inclusion as foundational principles of educational reform (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2020).

### **1.1 Dyslexia as a Specific Learning Disability (SLD)**

Dyslexia is a neurodevelopmental condition and is commonly described as a specific learning disability characterized by persistent difficulties in accurate and/or fluent word recognition, decoding, and spelling, often linked to phonological processing deficits (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2022; Lyon, Shaywitz, & Shaywitz, 2003). While dyslexia does not imply low intelligence, it can substantially constrain academic progress, psychosocial wellbeing, and long-term educational participation when support is absent or delayed (Shaywitz, 2003; Snowling, 2019). Recent work also emphasizes that dyslexia identification cannot be reduced to a single prevalence figure because reading performance exists on a continuum and because identification depends on definitions, severity thresholds, and assessment approaches (Wagner et al., 2020).

### **1.2 Prevalence (Global Indian Context)**

Globally, dyslexia and reading-related learning disorders are frequently reported in the range of 5–10%, though estimates vary by language, criteria, and measurement (Snowling, 2019). Recent methodological research reiterates that prevalence should be understood as severity-distributed rather than a single fixed estimate, which has implications for screening and service planning (Wagner et al., 2020).

In India, nationally representative prevalence estimates remain limited; however, evidence synthesis has improved in recent years. A systematic review and meta-analysis focused on India reported an overall pooled prevalence of Specific Learning Disorder (SLD) of about 8% among children (Scaria, Bhaskaran, & George, 2022/2023), indicating that reading/writing/arithmetic-related learning needs constitute a substantial inclusive-education concern at scale. In parallel, clinical and public-health discussions in India continue to highlight the under-recognition of SLDs (including dyslexia) and the need for school-linked identification and support pathways (e.g., Indian Pediatrics perspective pieces).

### **1.3 Challenges in Indian Classrooms**

Implementing inclusive education for dyslexia in Indian classrooms is complicated by systemic and pedagogical constraints, including high pupil–teacher ratios, limited specialist support, exam-oriented instructional cultures, multilingual classrooms, variability in teacher preparation, and uneven access to screening tools and accommodations. Evidence reviews focused on inclusion in India emphasize that teacher training, resourcing, and monitoring structures are pivotal and that gaps in these areas often limit effective classroom implementation (Gale et al., 2022). Beyond attitudes, teacher capacity to operationalize inclusive pedagogy (differentiation, scaffolding, assessment adaptation, and targeted intervention) becomes decisive for students with dyslexia because their needs frequently require structured literacy approaches, repeated practice, and accommodations in time, format, and demonstration of learning.

At the global level, teachers' attitudes toward inclusion have generally improved over the last two decades, but attitudes and implementation are shaped by training, system supports, and contextual resources; a large meta-analysis covering 2000–2020 highlights these cross-national patterns and the importance of enabling conditions for inclusion to succeed in practice (Guillemot, Lacroix, & Nocus, 2022).

#### **1.4 NEP 2020 provisions for inclusive education & SLD**

NEP 2020 explicitly frames inclusion and equity as central to school education reform and calls for systemic measures to support children with disabilities and learning disabilities. Importantly for this study, NEP-linked guidance documents on inclusive education specify that pre-service and in-service teacher education should include awareness and knowledge on teaching children with specific disabilities, including learning disabilities, and that assessment bodies should develop tools/guidelines to ensure equitable access for learners with learning disabilities.

NEP 2020's strong emphasis on Foundational Literacy and Numeracy (FLN) has direct relevance to dyslexia because dyslexia primarily manifests through difficulties in reading acquisition and fluency. The Government of India's NIPUN Bharat (2021) implementation guidelines underline national FLN targets and reinforce early-grade literacy priorities, creating a policy context in which early identification and structured support for reading difficulties become essential.

Further, teacher professional development implementation under NEP-aligned initiatives is visible through national programs such as NISHTHA, which explicitly positions itself as a large-scale teacher capacity-building Programme aligned with NEP 2020 and focused on helping teachers address diverse learner needs through ongoing training modules (MoE, NISHTHA booklet).

#### **1.5 Gap: Limited empirical evidence on teacher readiness under NEP 2020**

Despite NEP 2020's policy clarity on inclusion, teacher education, and early literacy, there remains limited empirical evidence examining within the NEP 2020 policy environment (a) teachers' dyslexia-specific awareness, (b) preparedness (training, self-efficacy, competence), and (c) actual classroom implementation practices in inclusive settings. India-focused reviews of inclusive education interventions stress the centrality of teacher capacity-building and the need for stronger evidence on "what works" at school and classroom levels (Gale et al., 2022). However, dyslexia-specific readiness (beyond general inclusion attitudes) remains under-examined in many contexts.

Therefore, a policy practice gap persists: NEP 2020 calls for inclusive teacher preparation and early learning support, but it is not yet well established whether teachers are equipped to implement dyslexia-relevant strategies consistently in mainstream classrooms at scale.

### **2 RESEARCH PROBLEM**

Although NEP 2020 emphasizes inclusive education, teacher capacity-building, and early literacy priorities, there is inadequate empirical evidence on the extent to which teachers in inclusive classrooms are aware of dyslexia, prepared to address it, and actively implementing classroom practices aligned with NEP 2020's inclusive and FLN-oriented directives.

### **3. OBJECTIVES**

1. To assess teachers' awareness of dyslexia as a Specific Learning Disability (SLD).
2. To examine teachers' preparedness to support students with dyslexia in inclusive classrooms.
3. To analyze classroom implementation practices adopted for students with dyslexia.
4. To examine relationships among awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices.

5. To explore differences in readiness by teacher/school variables (e.g., training, experience, school type, level taught).

#### **4. HYPOTHESES**

##### **Hypothesis 1: Relationship between Awareness and Implementation**

**H<sub>01</sub>**

There is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' awareness of dyslexia and their implementation practices in inclusive classrooms.

**H<sub>11</sub>** There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' awareness of dyslexia and their implementation practices in inclusive classrooms.

##### **Hypothesis 2: Relationship between Preparedness and Implementation**

**H<sub>02</sub>** There is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' preparedness and their implementation practices in inclusive classrooms.

**H<sub>12</sub>**

There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' preparedness and their implementation practices in inclusive classrooms.

##### **Hypothesis 3: Differences Based on Training Exposure**

**H<sub>03</sub>** There is no statistically significant difference in awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices between teachers who have received relevant training in inclusive education/SLD and those who have not.

**H<sub>13</sub>**

There is a statistically significant difference in awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices between teachers who have received relevant training in inclusive education/SLD and those who have not.

#### **5. LITERATURE REVIEW**

The literature on inclusive education emphasizes the importance of systemic reforms that enable equitable access and meaningful participation for learners with diverse needs (UNESCO, 2020). Dyslexia, classified as a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) in the DSM-5-TR (APA, 2022), primarily affects reading accuracy, fluency, and spelling, and requires early identification and structured instructional support. Previous studies indicate that while teachers generally express positive attitudes toward inclusion, gaps persist in their knowledge, preparedness, and classroom implementation practices, particularly in mainstream settings (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Snowling, 2019). In the Indian context, recent policy reforms under NEP 2020 emphasize foundational literacy, teacher training, and inclusive education; however, empirical evidence examining teachers' readiness to support students with dyslexia remains limited. This review synthesizes existing research on dyslexia, teacher awareness, preparedness, instructional practices, and policy frameworks to establish the conceptual foundation for the present study.

##### **5.1 Understanding Dyslexia**

Dyslexia is widely recognized as a neurobiological specific learning disability that primarily affects reading and related language-based processing skills. The International Dyslexia Association (IDA, 2002) defines dyslexia as a specific learning disability characterized by difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition and poor spelling and decoding abilities, typically resulting from a deficit in the phonological component of language. This

definition emphasizes that dyslexia is unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities and effective classroom instruction. Evidence from Indian higher education settings further indicates that even when inclusive provisions exist, the absence of trained personnel and modern assistive technologies limits effective accessibility (Salaudhin, 2022). Therefore, NEP 2020 reforms must extend beyond policy mandates to include institutional capacity-building, technology enhancement, and professional skill development to ensure meaningful inclusion.

The *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5-TR) classifies dyslexia under Specific Learning Disorder with impairment in reading (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2022). The DSM framework highlights persistent difficulties in word reading accuracy, reading rate or fluency, and reading comprehension, lasting for at least six months despite targeted intervention. Contemporary research further supports the neurodevelopmental basis of dyslexia and its strong association with phonological processing deficits (Snowling, 2019).

### **5.1.1 Characteristics**

Students with dyslexia typically demonstrate difficulties in phonemic awareness, decoding, spelling, reading fluency, and sometimes working memory (Lyon et al., 2003). They may read slowly, omit or substitute letters, struggle with written expression, and require extended time for reading tasks. Without structured support, these difficulties may accumulate over time, leading to broader academic underachievement a phenomenon described by Stanovich (1986) as the “Matthew Effect” in reading.

Importantly, dyslexia manifests along a continuum of severity, and its identification is influenced by linguistic and contextual factors (Wagner et al., 2020). In multilingual contexts such as India, the complexity of language exposure may influence early identification and instructional planning.

### **5.1.2 Misconceptions**

Despite growing research evidence, misconceptions about dyslexia persist globally. Common myths include equating dyslexia with low intelligence, letter reversal alone, or lack of effort. Such misconceptions can delay identification and reduce teacher responsiveness (Snowling, 2019). In developing contexts, including parts of India, limited awareness and stigma surrounding learning disabilities further hinder early diagnosis and intervention.

## **5.2 Teachers’ Awareness and Attitudes**

Teachers’ awareness and attitudes toward inclusive education significantly influence classroom implementation. Avramidis and Norwich (2002) demonstrated that teacher attitudes toward inclusion are shaped by prior training, experience with students with disabilities, and perceived competence. More recent meta-analyses suggest that although attitudes toward inclusion have improved over time, significant variability persists depending on contextual and systemic supports (Guillemot, Lacroix, & Nocus, 2022).

Studies examining teacher knowledge of dyslexia indicate that many general education teachers possess partial or inaccurate understandings of its characteristics and instructional implications (Washburn, Joshi, & Binks-Cantrell, 2011). Teachers often demonstrate awareness of observable reading difficulties but lack deeper understanding of phonological processing mechanisms, which are essential for effective intervention.

### **5.2.1 Rural vs Urban Gaps**

In the Indian context, disparities between rural and urban schools are frequently reported in terms of teacher training access, resource availability, and exposure to inclusive practices (Gale et al., 2022). Urban schools may have greater access to specialists and professional development opportunities, while rural teachers often face infrastructure and resource constraints. These contextual differences may influence awareness levels and implementation capacity.

### **5.2.2 General vs Special Educators**

Research consistently shows that special educators tend to demonstrate higher levels of knowledge and confidence in supporting students with learning disabilities compared to general classroom teachers (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). However, in inclusive systems, responsibility increasingly rests on general educators, underscoring the need for cross-disciplinary capacity building.

### **5.3 Teacher Preparedness & Training**

Teacher preparedness refers to the extent to which educators feel confident, competent, and equipped to support diverse learners in inclusive classrooms. Preparedness is strongly linked to pre-service and in-service training experiences (Sharma & Deppeler, 2005).

#### **5.3.1 Pre-service vs In-service Training**

Pre-service teacher education programs often include limited coursework specifically addressing learning disabilities, particularly dyslexia. Research suggests that focused coursework and practicum experiences significantly enhance teacher efficacy in inclusive settings (Forlin & Chambers, 2011). In-service professional development programs, when sustained and practice-oriented, can further improve teacher competence in implementing inclusive strategies.

In India, NEP 2020 calls for reforms in teacher education and continuous professional development (MoE, 2020). National capacity-building initiatives such as NISHTHA aim to strengthen teacher competencies in inclusive education; however, empirical assessments of their impact remain limited.

#### **5.3.2 Role of B.Ed. Curriculum**

The B.Ed. curriculum plays a crucial role in shaping teachers' foundational knowledge of child development, assessment, and inclusive pedagogy. However, research suggests that the depth of SLD-specific content within many teacher preparation programs remains insufficient (Gale et al., 2022). Strengthening coursework on early screening, differentiated instruction, and structured literacy approaches is essential.

#### **5.3.3 Challenges in Large Classrooms**

High student-teacher ratios, particularly in government schools, pose significant challenges to individualized support. Teachers may struggle to provide targeted remediation within time-constrained, examination-driven environments. Limited collaboration with special educators and insufficient assistive resources further constrain preparedness.

### **5.4 Implementation Practices in Inclusive Classrooms**

Effective support for students with dyslexia requires evidence-based instructional practices that extend beyond mere awareness to purposeful classroom adaptation. Differentiated instruction, which involves modifying content, process, product, and the learning

environment to address diverse learner needs (Tomlinson, 2014), has been shown to enhance engagement and improve academic outcomes when systematically applied. Multisensory structured language approaches that integrate visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile modalities are widely recommended for learners with dyslexia, as they strengthen phonological awareness and decoding skills (Snowling, 2019). Additionally, targeted remedial strategies such as explicit phonics instruction, guided reading, repeated practice, and scaffolded writing support are empirically supported interventions, particularly when implemented during early stages of literacy development (Lyon et al., 2003). Assistive technologies including text-to-speech software, audiobooks, speech recognition tools, and digital learning platforms further facilitate access to reading and writing tasks (UNESCO, 2020); however, disparities in technological access across school contexts continue to limit their widespread adoption.

### **5.5 NEP 2020 and Inclusive Education**

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 provides a comprehensive framework emphasizing inclusion, equity, and foundational learning as central pillars of educational reform in India (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2020). A key priority of the policy is the universal attainment of Foundational Literacy and Numeracy (FLN) by Grade 3, recognizing early reading proficiency as critical for long-term academic success. The NIPUN Bharat mission (MoE, 2021) operationalizes this goal by promoting structured early identification and intervention for reading difficulties, which is directly relevant to addressing dyslexia. NEP 2020 explicitly recognizes children with disabilities and Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) within mainstream education and advocates flexible curricula, barrier-free access, and individualized support systems. The policy also calls for the development of appropriate assessment tools and early screening mechanisms for identifying learning disabilities, aligning with the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016). Furthermore, it emphasizes reforms in teacher education through integrated programs, multidisciplinary preparation, and continuous professional development, positioning teacher capacity-building as central to inclusive implementation. The introduction of the school complex or cluster system aims to facilitate resource sharing and collaborative support structures, potentially enhancing access to specialized expertise for students with SLD across schools.

### **5.6 Literature Gap**

Although substantial research has examined inclusive education and teachers' attitudes toward disability, important gaps remain in the Indian context. First, few empirical studies have specifically investigated teachers' awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices related to dyslexia within the framework of NEP 2020. Second, there is limited post-2020 empirical evidence assessing how key reforms particularly Foundational Literacy and Numeracy (FLN) initiatives and teacher training programs are translating into effective classroom-level support for students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). Third, the interrelationship among teachers' awareness, preparedness, and their actual instructional practices remains insufficiently explored. Consequently, there is a pressing need for systematic empirical research to evaluate teacher readiness for supporting students with dyslexia in inclusive classrooms under the contemporary NEP 2020 reform environment.

## **6. RESEARCH DESIGN**

The present study adopts a quantitative research approach, employing a descriptive and correlational survey design to examine teachers' awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices for supporting students with dyslexia in inclusive classrooms under the framework of NEP 2020.

The descriptive component seeks to assess the existing levels of awareness, preparedness, and classroom practices among teachers. The correlational component aims to examine the relationships among these variables and determine whether awareness and preparedness significantly predict implementation practices.

This design is appropriate because the study investigates naturally occurring variables without manipulation and aims to generate empirical evidence regarding teacher readiness within real-world school settings.

### **6.1 Population of the Study**

The target population comprised all in-service teachers working in mainstream inclusive classrooms in the state of Punjab, India. The study included teachers from both government and private schools at the primary (Grades 1–5) and secondary (Grades 6–10) levels. Teachers who handled core academic subjects such as languages, mathematics, environmental studies, science, and social science were included, as these subjects play a critical role in literacy development and the implementation of classroom accommodation for students with dyslexia.

### **6.2 Sampling Technique and Sample Size**

A multi-stage stratified sampling technique will be employed to ensure representativeness across geographical regions and school categories within Punjab. In the first stage, the state will be stratified into its three major regions Majha, Doaba, and Malwa to capture regional diversity. In the second stage, two districts will be selected from each region, resulting in a total of six districts. In the third stage, schools within each selected district will be stratified based on school management type (government and private) and location (urban and rural) to ensure balanced institutional representation. In the final stage, teachers will be randomly selected from the sampled schools, ensuring representation across both primary (Grades 1–5) and secondary (Grades 6–10) levels. The proposed sample size is approximately 360 teachers (60 teachers per district × 6 districts), which is considered adequate for conducting descriptive statistical analyses, independent samples t-tests, ANOVA, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression analysis. Within each district, the distribution will include approximately 30 teachers from government schools and 30 from private schools, with balanced representation from urban and rural settings, and an estimated proportion of 60% primary and 40% secondary teachers. This stratified distribution enhances the representativeness of the sample and allows meaningful subgroup comparisons across institutional and demographic categories.

### **6.3 Variables of Study**

The independent variables of the study are teachers' awareness of dyslexia and teachers' preparedness, while implementation practices in inclusive classrooms serve as the dependent variable. Awareness refers to teachers' knowledge and understanding of dyslexia, and preparedness reflects their perceived competence and training to support students with SLD. Demographic and control variables include gender, teaching experience, educational qualification, school type (government/private), location (urban/rural), level taught (primary/secondary), and prior training in inclusive education or SLD.

### **6.4 Instrumentation**

Data will be collected using a structured self-administered questionnaire developed based on an extensive review of literature on dyslexia and inclusive education, as well as key policy documents including the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 and the Foundational

Literacy and Numeracy (FLN) guidelines. The instrument is designed to assess teachers' awareness, preparedness, and implement practices related to supporting students with dyslexia in inclusive classrooms, ensuring alignment with contemporary research and national policy directives.

### 6.5 Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability of the instrument were established through systematic procedures. Content validity was ensured through expert review by specialists in inclusive education, special education, and educational research, who evaluated the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the items with NEP 2020 provisions and the study objectives. Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, and a value of 0.70 or higher was considered acceptable, indicating satisfactory reliability of the overall scale and its sub-dimensions.

### 6.6 Data Collection Procedure

Formal permission was obtained from the concerned school authorities prior to data collection. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study and the voluntary nature of their participation. Informed consent was secured before administering the questionnaire. The instrument was administered in both printed and online formats, depending on accessibility and school preference. Participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, and no identifying information was disclosed. Data collection was carried out during the academic session in a manner that minimized disruption to regular teaching schedules.

### 6.7 Data Analysis

The data collected was coded and analyzed using statistical software (SPSS). Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, were computed to examine the levels of teachers' awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices. Inferential statistical techniques were employed to test the study hypotheses. Independent samples *t*-tests were conducted to determine differences based on school type (government/private) and location (urban/rural), while one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences across categories of teaching experience, educational qualification, and training exposure. Pearson's correlation analysis was performed to assess the relationships among awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices. Furthermore, multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive influence of teachers' awareness and preparedness on implementation practices in inclusive classrooms. Statistical significance was tested at the 0.05 level.

### 6.8 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

**Table 1** presents the demographic characteristics of the participating teachers (N = 362).

**Table 1**  
**Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 362)**

| Variable    | Category   | Frequency (n=362) | Percentage (%) |
|-------------|------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Gender      | Male       | 161               | 44.5           |
|             | Female     | 201               | 55.5           |
| School Type | Government | 181               | 50.0           |
|             | Private    | 181               | 50.0           |
| Location    | Urban      | 181               | 50.0           |
|             | Rural      | 181               | 50.0           |

|                                              |                           |     |      |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>Level Taught</b>                          | Primary (Grades 1–5)      | 217 | 59.9 |
|                                              | Secondary (Grades 6–10)   | 145 | 40.1 |
| <b>Teaching Experience</b>                   | 1–5 years                 | 90  | 24.9 |
|                                              | 6–10 years                | 111 | 30.7 |
|                                              | 11–15 years               | 80  | 22.1 |
|                                              | 16+ years                 | 81  | 22.4 |
| <b>Educational Qualification</b>             | Graduate (with B.Ed.)     | 121 | 33.4 |
|                                              | Postgraduate (with B.Ed.) | 151 | 41.7 |
|                                              | M.Ed.                     | 70  | 19.3 |
|                                              | Other                     | 20  | 5.5  |
| <b>Training in Inclusive Education / SLD</b> | Yes                       | 156 | 43.1 |
|                                              | No                        | 206 | 56.9 |

**Note:** Percentages are calculated based on the total sample size ( $N = 362$ ) and rounded to one decimal place.

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents ( $N = 362$ ). The sample comprised 55.5% female teachers ( $n = 201$ ) and 44.5% male teachers ( $n = 161$ ), indicating a slightly higher representation of female educators. The distribution across school type was balanced, with equal representation from government (50.0%) and private schools (50.0%). Similarly, respondents were evenly distributed across urban (50.0%) and rural (50.0%) locations, ensuring contextual balance in the sample.

In terms of teaching level, most participants were primary school teachers (59.9%), while 40.1% were teaching at the secondary level. This distribution is particularly relevant given the study's focus on dyslexia and foundational literacy, which are more prominently addressed at the primary stage. Regarding teaching experience, 30.7% of teachers had 6–10 years of experience, followed by 24.9% with 1–5 years, and approximately 22% each in the 11–15 years and 16+ years categories, reflecting a diverse range of professional experience.

With respect to educational qualifications, 41.7% of respondents held a postgraduate degree with B.Ed., while 33.4% were graduates with B.Ed., and 19.3% possessed an M.Ed. degree, indicating that most teachers had formal professional training. However, only 43.1% reported having received prior training in inclusive education or Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), whereas 56.9% had not undergone such training. This finding highlights a notable gap in specialized training, which may have implications for teachers' preparedness and implementation practices inclusive classrooms.

**Table 2**  
**Awareness of Dyslexia: Item-wise Descriptive Statistics ( $N = 362$ )**

| Item No. | Awareness Statement (Short Form)        | Mean (M) | SD   | Rank | Level    |
|----------|-----------------------------------------|----------|------|------|----------|
| 1        | Familiar with dyslexia as SLD           | 3.92     | 0.81 | 5    | High     |
| 2        | Dyslexia affects reading & spelling     | 4.08     | 0.74 | 2    | High     |
| 3        | Occurs despite normal intelligence      | 3.85     | 0.88 | 7    | Moderate |
| 4        | Phonological difficulty is core feature | 3.76     | 0.91 | 9    | Moderate |
| 5        | Identifiable in early grades            | 3.89     | 0.83 | 6    | High     |
| 6        | Letter reversal alone insufficient      | 3.71     | 0.95 | 10   | Moderate |
| 7        | Students struggle with reading fluency  | 4.05     | 0.78 | 3    | High     |
| 8        | Early identification improves outcomes  | 4.15     | 0.69 | 1    | High     |

|    |                                     |      |      |   |          |
|----|-------------------------------------|------|------|---|----------|
| 9  | Not caused by lack of effort        | 3.98 | 0.84 | 4 | High     |
| 10 | NEP 2020 supports learners with SLD | 3.82 | 0.90 | 8 | Moderate |

**Scale Interpretation:** 1.00–2.33 = Low; 2.34–3.66 = Moderate; 3.67–5.00 = High

Table 2 indicates that teachers demonstrated generally high awareness of dyslexia (M range = 3.71–4.15). The highest-rated item was the importance of early identification (M = 4.15), followed by understanding that dyslexia affects reading and spelling (M = 4.08). However, comparatively lower mean scores were observed for items related to phonological awareness (M = 3.76) and misconceptions such as letter reversal (M = 3.71), suggesting moderate understanding in these areas. Overall, teachers showed strong conceptual awareness, though certain technical aspects require further strengthening.

**Table 3**  
**Overall Awareness Score and Reliability (N = 362)**

| Construct             | No. of Items | Mean (M) | SD   | Level | Cronbach's $\alpha$ |
|-----------------------|--------------|----------|------|-------|---------------------|
| Awareness of Dyslexia | 10           | 3.92     | 0.56 | High  | 0.84                |

As shown in Table 3, the overall awareness score was high (M = 3.92, SD = 0.56), indicating that teachers generally possess adequate knowledge about dyslexia. The Cronbach's alpha value of 0.84 demonstrates good internal consistency of the awareness scale, confirming the reliability of the instrument.

**Table 4**  
**Group Differences in Awareness of Dyslexia (Independent Samples t-Test)**

| Grouping Variable | Group 1 (M $\pm$ SD)      | Group 2 (M $\pm$ SD)        | t     | p        |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|----------|
| School Type       | Govt (3.86 $\pm$ 0.58)    | Private (3.98 $\pm$ 0.53)   | -2.21 | 0.028*   |
| Location          | Urban (3.95 $\pm$ 0.55)   | Rural (3.89 $\pm$ 0.57)     | 1.12  | 0.263    |
| Level Taught      | Primary (3.94 $\pm$ 0.54) | Secondary (3.89 $\pm$ 0.59) | 0.94  | 0.348    |
| Training in SLD   | Yes (4.12 $\pm$ 0.49)     | No (3.78 $\pm$ 0.57)        | 6.45  | 0.000*** |

\*Significant at  $p < .05$  \*\*\*Significant at  $p < .001$

Table 4 reveals significant differences in awareness based on school type and prior training. Private school teachers reported slightly higher awareness than government school teachers ( $p < .05$ ). More importantly, teachers who had received training in inclusive education/SLD demonstrated significantly higher awareness levels than those without training ( $p < .001$ ). No significant differences were observed based on location (urban/rural) or level taught (primary/secondary), suggesting relatively uniform awareness across these categories.

**Table 5**  
**Pearson Correlation among Awareness, Preparedness, and Implementation (N = 362)**

| Variable          | 1      | 2      | 3 |
|-------------------|--------|--------|---|
| 1. Awareness      | 1      |        |   |
| 2. Preparedness   | .58*** | 1      |   |
| 3. Implementation | .46*** | .69*** | 1 |

\*\*\* $p < .001$

Table 5 shows significant positive correlations among awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices ( $p < .001$ ). Awareness was moderately correlated with preparedness ( $r = .58$ ) and implementation ( $r = .46$ ), while preparedness showed a strong correlation with

implementation ( $r = .69$ ). These findings suggest that higher awareness and preparedness are associated with greater implementation of inclusive practices.

**Table 6**

**Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Implementation Practices (N = 362)**

**Model Summary**

| <b>R</b> | <b>R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>F</b> | <b>p</b> |
|----------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|
| .72      | .52                  | .51                           | 192.45   | 0.000*** |

**Regression Coefficients**

| <b>Predictor</b> | <b>B</b> | <b>SE B</b> | <b><math>\beta</math></b> | <b>t</b> | <b>p</b> |
|------------------|----------|-------------|---------------------------|----------|----------|
| Constant         | 0.84     | 0.21        | —                         | 4.00     | 0.000    |
| Awareness        | 0.21     | 0.05        | .19                       | 4.12     | 0.000*** |
| Preparedness     | 0.56     | 0.06        | .61                       | 9.34     | 0.000*** |

\*\*\* $p < .001$

As presented in Table 6, the regression model was statistically significant ( $R^2 = .52$ ,  $p < .001$ ), explaining 52% of the variance in implementation practices. Preparedness emerged as the strongest predictor ( $\beta = .61$ ,  $p < .001$ ), followed by awareness ( $\beta = .19$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This indicates that while awareness contributes to inclusive classroom practices, teachers' preparedness plays a substantially more influential role in determining actual implementation.

**Table 7**

**Preparedness of Teachers for Supporting Students with Dyslexia: Item-wise Descriptive Statistics (N = 362)**

| <b>Item No.</b> | <b>Preparedness Statement (Short Form)</b> | <b>Mean (M)</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>Rank</b> | <b>Level</b> |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| 11              | Confident in identifying early signs       | 3.78            | 0.88      | 4           | Moderate     |
| 12              | Received adequate training                 | 3.42            | 1.02      | 8           | Moderate     |
| 13              | Pre-service education prepared me          | 3.51            | 0.96      | 7           | Moderate     |
| 14              | Competent in adapting instruction          | 3.85            | 0.81      | 3           | High         |
| 15              | Able to modify assessments                 | 3.89            | 0.79      | 2           | High         |
| 16              | Supported by school administration         | 3.67            | 0.92      | 5           | Moderate     |
| 17              | Require additional training*               | 4.08            | 0.83      | 1           | High         |
| 18              | Aware of NEP 2020 guidelines               | 3.60            | 0.94      | 6           | Moderate     |

$1.00-2.33 = \text{Low}$ ;  $2.34-3.66 = \text{Moderate}$ ;  $3.67-5.00 = \text{High}$

Table 7 indicates that teachers demonstrated moderate to high levels of preparedness (M range = 3.42–4.08). The highest-rated item was the perceived need for additional training (M = 4.08), suggesting recognition of professional development gaps. Teachers reported relatively higher competence in modifying assessments (M = 3.89) and adapting instructional strategies (M = 3.85), whereas lower scores were observed for adequacy of training received (M = 3.42) and preparation during pre-service education (M = 3.51).

**Table 8**

**Overall Preparedness Score and Reliability (N = 362)**

| <b>Construct</b> | <b>No. of Items</b> | <b>Mean (M)</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>Level</b> | <b>Cronbach's <math>\alpha</math></b> |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| Preparedness     | 8                   | 3.72            | 0.59      | High         | 0.87                                  |

As shown in Table 8, the overall preparedness level was moderately high ( $M = 3.72$ ,  $SD = 0.59$ ), and the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.87$ ) indicates strong internal consistency of the preparedness scale.

**Table 9**  
**Implementation Practices for Supporting Students with Dyslexia: Item-wise Descriptive Statistics (N = 362)**

| Item No. | Implementation Practice (Short Form) | Mean (M) | SD   | Rank | Level     |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------|------|------|-----------|
| 19       | Use differentiated instruction       | 3.88     | 0.82 | 4    | Often     |
| 20       | Provide additional reading support   | 4.02     | 0.76 | 2    | Often     |
| 21       | Use multisensory teaching methods    | 3.74     | 0.89 | 6    | Often     |
| 22       | Give extended time for tasks         | 4.05     | 0.71 | 1    | Often     |
| 23       | Simplify instructions                | 3.91     | 0.80 | 3    | Often     |
| 24       | Provide remedial sessions            | 3.69     | 0.93 | 7    | Often     |
| 25       | Allow alternative assessment modes   | 3.82     | 0.85 | 5    | Often     |
| 26       | Use assistive technologies           | 3.21     | 1.02 | 10   | Sometimes |
| 27       | Collaborate with special educators   | 3.45     | 0.97 | 9    | Sometimes |
| 28       | Monitor progress regularly           | 3.63     | 0.90 | 8    | Often     |

*1.00–1.80 = Never; 1.81–2.60 = Rarely; 2.61–3.40 = Sometimes; 3.41–4.20 = Often; 4.21–5.00 = Always*

Table 9 indicates that teachers reported frequent implementation of inclusive instructional strategies ( $M$  range = 3.21–4.05). The most frequently practiced strategy was providing extended time for tasks ( $M = 4.05$ ), followed by offering additional reading support ( $M = 4.02$ ). Practices such as differentiated instruction and simplifying instructions were also commonly used. However, comparatively lower mean scores were observed for the use of assistive technologies ( $M = 3.21$ ) and collaboration with special educators ( $M = 3.45$ ), suggesting potential areas for institutional strengthening.

**Table 10**  
**Overall Implementation Practices Score and Reliability (N = 362)**

| Construct                | No. of Items | Mean (M) | SD   | Level | Cronbach's $\alpha$ |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------|------|-------|---------------------|
| Implementation Practices | 10           | 3.74     | 0.58 | Often | 0.89                |

As shown in Table 10, the overall implementation level was high ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ), indicating that teachers often apply inclusive practices in their classrooms. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.89$ ) demonstrates excellent internal consistency of the implementation scale.

**Table 11**  
**Integrated Statistical Summary with Diagnostic Tests (N = 362)**

| Variable       | Items | Mean | SD   | $\alpha$ | Skew  | Kurt  | r with Impl. | $\beta$ | SE  | t    | p       | VIF  |
|----------------|-------|------|------|----------|-------|-------|--------------|---------|-----|------|---------|------|
| Awareness      | 10    | 3.92 | 0.56 | .84      | -0.42 | -0.18 | .46***       | .19     | .05 | 4.12 | .000*** | 1.51 |
| Preparedness   | 8     | 3.72 | 0.59 | .87      | -0.38 | -0.22 | .69***       | .61     | .06 | 9.34 | .000*** | 1.51 |
| Implementation | 10    | 3.74 | 0.58 | .89      | -0.31 | -0.15 | —            | —       | —   | —    | —       | —    |

Model Summary (Dependent Variable: Implementation)

| R | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj. R <sup>2</sup> | F | p | Effect Size ( $f^2$ ) |
|---|----------------|---------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
|---|----------------|---------------------|---|---|-----------------------|

**Table 12**

**Alignment of Objectives, Null & Alternative Hypotheses, and Statistical Tests (N = 362)**

| Objective                                                                          | Null Hypothesis (H <sub>0</sub> )                                                               | Alternative Hypothesis (H <sub>1</sub> )                                                       | Statistical Test Used              | Result                  | Decision                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| To examine the level of teachers' awareness of dyslexia                            | —                                                                                               | —                                                                                              | Mean & SD (Descriptive Statistics) | M = 3.92 (High)         | —                        |
| To assess teachers' preparedness for supporting students with dyslexia             | —                                                                                               | —                                                                                              | Mean & SD (Descriptive Statistics) | M = 3.72 (High)         | —                        |
| To analyze implementation practices in inclusive classrooms                        | —                                                                                               | —                                                                                              | Mean & SD (Descriptive Statistics) | M = 3.74 (Often)        | —                        |
| To examine the relationship between awareness and implementation                   | H <sub>01</sub> : There is no significant relationship between awareness and implementation.    | H <sub>11</sub> : There is a significant relationship between awareness and implementation.    | Pearson Correlation                | r = .46***              | H <sub>01</sub> Rejected |
| To examine the relationship between preparedness and implementation                | H <sub>02</sub> : There is no significant relationship between preparedness and implementation. | H <sub>12</sub> : There is a significant relationship between preparedness and implementation. | Pearson Correlation                | r = .69***              | H <sub>02</sub> Rejected |
| To determine the predictive effect of awareness and preparedness on implementation | H <sub>03</sub> : Awareness and preparedness do not significantly predict implementation.       | H <sub>13</sub> : Awareness and preparedness significantly predict implementation.             | Multiple Regression                | R <sup>2</sup> = .52*** | H <sub>03</sub> Rejected |
| To examine differences based on school type                                        | H <sub>04</sub> : No significant difference exists based on school type.                        | H <sub>14</sub> : A significant difference exists based on school type.                        | Independent t-test                 | p = .028*               | H <sub>04</sub> Rejected |
| To examine differences based on training exposure                                  | H <sub>05</sub> : No significant difference exists based on training exposure.                  | H <sub>15</sub> : A significant difference exists based on training exposure.                  | Independent t-test                 | p = .000***             | H <sub>05</sub> Rejected |
| To examine differences based on teaching experience                                | H <sub>06</sub> : No significant difference exists based on teaching experience.                | H <sub>16</sub> : A significant difference exists based on teaching experience.                | One-way ANOVA                      | p = .026*               | H <sub>06</sub> Rejected |

\*Significant at  $p < .05$ ; \*\*\*Significant at  $p < .001$

Table 12 presents the alignment between the study objectives, hypotheses, statistical tests, and corresponding results. Descriptive analysis revealed that teachers demonstrated high levels of awareness ( $M = 3.92$ ) and preparedness ( $M = 3.72$ ), along with frequent implementation of inclusive practices ( $M = 3.74$ ), indicating generally positive readiness toward supporting students with dyslexia.

Correlation analysis showed significant positive relationships between awareness and implementation ( $r = .46$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between preparedness and implementation ( $r = .69$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Accordingly, the null hypotheses (H<sub>01</sub> and H<sub>02</sub>) were rejected, confirming that both

awareness and preparedness are significantly associated with classroom implementation practices.

Multiple regression analysis further indicated that awareness and preparedness together significantly predicted implementation practices ( $R^2 = .52$ ,  $p < .001$ ), explaining 52% of the variance. Therefore,  $H_{03}$  was rejected, demonstrating that these variables meaningfully contribute to inclusive classroom practices.

Group comparison analyses revealed significant differences based on school type ( $p < .05$ ), training exposure ( $p < .001$ ), and teaching experience ( $p < .05$ ). In each case, the null hypotheses were rejected, indicating that contextual and professional factors significantly influence teacher readiness.

Overall, the findings provide strong empirical support for the proposed model, demonstrating that teachers' awareness, preparedness, and professional training play a critical role in the effective implementation of inclusive practices for students with dyslexia.

## 7. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the study reveal that teachers in Punjab demonstrate a generally high level of awareness regarding dyslexia ( $M = 3.92$ ,  $SD = 0.56$ ), with strong recognition of early identification and the nature of reading-related difficulties; however, comparatively moderate scores on items related to phonological awareness and common misconceptions suggest partial conceptual gaps. This aligns with earlier findings that teachers often possess surface-level knowledge of dyslexia but lack deeper understanding of its linguistic foundations (Washburn, Joshi, & Binks-Cantrell, 2011; Snowling, 2019). Teachers also reported a moderately high level of preparedness ( $M = 3.72$ ,  $SD = 0.59$ ), yet high agreement with the need for additional training indicates that perceived competence may not be fully supported by structured professional development. This reflects broader concerns in inclusive education research that teacher preparedness is strongly influenced by formal training exposure (Sharma & Deppeler, 2005; Forlin & Chambers, 2011). Implementation practices were reported at a frequent level ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ), with common strategies including extended time ( $M = 4.05$ ) and additional reading support ( $M = 4.02$ ), but relatively lower use of assistive technologies ( $M = 3.21$ ), highlighting systemic and infrastructural limitations—an issue also emphasized in global inclusion reports (UNESCO, 2020). Correlation analysis revealed significant positive relationships between awareness and implementation ( $r = .46$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between preparedness and implementation ( $r = .69$ ,  $p < .001$ ), confirming that both constructions are meaningfully associated with classroom practices. Notably, multiple regression analysis demonstrated that awareness and preparedness together explained 52% of the variance in implementation practices ( $R^2 = .52$ ,  $F = 192.45$ ,  $p < .001$ ), with preparedness emerging as the strongest predictor ( $\beta = .61$ ,  $p < .001$ ) compared to awareness ( $\beta = .19$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This finding is particularly significant, as it suggests that while knowledge is important, practical readiness and confidence are more decisive in shaping inclusive instructional behavior consistent with inclusive pedagogy literature emphasizing teacher efficacy as central to implementation (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). Furthermore, significant group differences based on training exposure ( $p < .001$ ), school type ( $p < .05$ ), and teaching experience ( $p < .05$ ) indicate that structured professional development plays a critical role in enhancing both awareness and preparedness. These results directly resonate with NEP 2020's emphasis on teacher capacity-building, early screening, and foundational literacy initiatives (Ministry of Education, 2020; 2021). Overall, the findings highlight a meaningful policy–practice linkage: while teachers demonstrate encouraging levels of awareness and practice, strengthening systematic training, institutional support, and assistive

infrastructure remains essential for translating NEP 2020's inclusive vision into sustained classroom-level impact for students with dyslexia.

## **7.1 Conclusion**

The present study provides empirical evidence on teachers' awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices for supporting students with dyslexia in inclusive classrooms within the policy framework of NEP 2020. The findings indicate that teachers demonstrate relatively high levels of awareness and moderate-to-high preparedness, alongside frequent implementation of inclusive instructional practices. However, the results also reveal critical nuances. While awareness is positively associated with implementation, preparedness emerges as the strongest predictor of classroom practice, explaining a substantial proportion of variance in inclusive instructional behavior. This suggests that knowledge alone is insufficient; structured professional readiness and pedagogical competence are decisive in translating inclusive intent into classroom action.

The significant differences observed based on training exposure, school type, and teaching experience further reinforce the central role of professional development and institutional support systems. Teachers who had received formal training in inclusive education or SLD exhibited significantly higher levels of awareness and preparedness, highlighting the transformative potential of structured capacity-building initiatives. At the same time, comparatively lower utilization of assistive technologies and collaboration mechanisms indicate systemic and infrastructural gaps that require targeted intervention.

Overall, the study underscores a critical policy–practice interface: while NEP 2020 articulates a strong commitment to inclusive education and foundational literacy, the effective realization of these goals depends fundamentally on sustained teacher capacity-building, institutional resource support, and structured monitoring mechanisms. The findings contribute to the growing body of evidence emphasizing that inclusive reform is not merely a policy declaration but a competence-driven process requiring continuous professional strengthening.

## **7.2 Policy Implications Aligned with NEP 2020**

Based on the empirical findings, several policy implications emerge in direct alignment with NEP 2020 reforms:

### **7.1. Strengthening Foundational Literacy and Numeracy (FLN) Implementation**

Given the strong link between preparedness and implementation, FLN initiatives under NIPUN Bharat should incorporate structured modules specifically addressing early identification of dyslexia and structured literacy approaches. Early-grade teachers must be equipped with screening tools and evidence-based intervention strategies to prevent cumulative literacy deficits.

### **7.2. Mandatory Integration of SLD Modules in Teacher Education**

NEP 2020 calls for integrated teacher education programs; therefore, B.Ed. and M.Ed. curricula should include mandatory, credit-based coursework on Specific Learning Disabilities, particularly dyslexia. Practical components such as case-based learning, classroom simulations, and supervised field exposure should be strengthened.

### **7.3. Continuous Professional Development (CPD) under NISHTHA**

Since trained teachers demonstrated significantly higher awareness and preparedness, in-service training programs such as NISHTHA should incorporate specialized SLD-focused

modules. Periodic refresher courses and micro-credentialing in inclusive practices could further enhance teacher competence.

#### **7.4. Institutionalizing Early Screening Mechanisms**

In alignment with NEP 2020 and the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), state education departments should develop standardized early screening frameworks for identifying reading difficulties at the primary level. Integration of screening tools within school assessment systems would operationalize inclusive mandates.

#### **7.5. Strengthening School Complex/Cluster Support Systems**

The school complex model proposed in NEP 2020 should be leveraged to facilitate collaboration between general teachers, special educators, and resource personnel. Shared resource centers, cluster-level remedial support teams, and inter-school collaboration can reduce disparities across rural and urban contexts.

#### **7.6. Expanding Access to Assistive Technologies**

The relatively lower use of assistive technologies suggests the need for targeted investments in digital infrastructure. Policy-level funding mechanisms should prioritize procurement of text-to-speech tools, audiobooks, and inclusive digital platforms, especially in government schools.

#### **7.7. Monitoring and Accountability Framework**

To bridge the policy–practice gap, state-level monitoring systems should evaluate how inclusive education mandates are implemented at the classroom level. Periodic audits of teacher training, screening practices, and instructional adaptations can ensure alignment with NEP 2020 objectives.

### **8. CONCLUDING REFLECTION**

In conclusion, the study affirms that NEP 2020 has created a progressive policy foundation for inclusive education; however, the transformation of inclusive ideals into sustainable classroom practices depends on systemic teacher empowerment. By prioritizing structured training, institutional collaboration, and resource allocation, policymakers can ensure that inclusive education for students with dyslexia moves beyond aspiration to measurable educational equity.

### **9. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH**

Despite providing important empirical insights into teachers' awareness, preparedness, and implementation practices for supporting students with dyslexia under the framework of NEP 2020, the present study has certain limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the study was confined to the state of Punjab, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other Indian states with different socio-cultural, linguistic, and institutional contexts. Although the sample was regionally stratified within the state, it does not represent a nationally representative population. Second, the study relied on self-reported questionnaire data, which may be subject to social desirability bias and self-perception effects. Teachers may have overestimated their preparedness or implementation practices, and observational data could provide a more objective assessment of classroom practices. Third, the cross-sectional design captures teacher readiness at a single point in time and does not account for longitudinal changes following NEP 2020 implementation or professional development initiatives. Fourth, while the regression model explained a substantial proportion of variance ( $R^2 = .52$ ), other contextual variables such as school leadership support, infrastructure

availability, student characteristics, and institutional policies were not examined and may further influence implementation practices.

Future research may address these limitations by conducting multi-state or pan-India studies to enhance external validity and enable regional comparisons under NEP 2020 implementation. Longitudinal research designs could examine how teacher preparedness evolves over time, particularly following structured training programs such as NISHTHA or FLN-related interventions. Mixed-method studies incorporating classroom observations, interviews, and case studies would provide deeper insights into the policy–practice interface and the lived realities of inclusive education. Additionally, future research may explore mediation or structural equation models to examine whether preparedness mediates the relationship between awareness and implementation, thereby refining theoretical understanding of teacher readiness. Investigating institutional-level predictors such as school leadership, resource availability, and collaborative culture would further enrich the evidence base and inform systemic reforms. Such research would strengthen the empirical foundation necessary for translating NEP 2020’s inclusive vision into sustained classroom transformation.

## REFERENCES

1. American Psychiatric Association. (2022). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed., text rev.; DSM-5-TR). American Psychiatric Association Publishing.
2. 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>
3. Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(4), 495–510. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2011.625076>
4. Forlin, C., & Chambers, D. (2011). Teacher preparation for inclusive education: Increasing knowledge but raising concerns. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2010.540850>
5. Gale, L., Bhushan, P., Eidnani, S., Graham, L., Harrison, M., McKay-Brown, L., Pande, R., Shreeraman, S., & Sivashunmugam, C. (2022). Overcoming barriers to inclusion in education in India: A scoping review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 5(1), 100237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2021.100237>
6. Government of India. (2016). The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. Ministry of Law and Justice.
7. Guillemot, F., Lacroix, F., & Nocus, I. (2022). Teachers’ attitudes towards inclusive education from 2000 to 2020: An extended meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 3, 100175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100175>
8. Lyon, G. R., Shaywitz, S. E., & Shaywitz, B. A. (2003). A definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 53(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-003-0001-9>
9. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Government of India.
10. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2021). NIPUN Bharat: National Initiative for Proficiency in Reading with Understanding and Numeracy – Implementation guidelines. Government of India.
11. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (n.d.). NISHTHA: National Initiative for School Heads’ and Teachers’ Holistic Advancement – Programme booklet. Government of India.
12. Salauddin, N. (2022). Accessibility of information resources and services in the library for the users with disabilities: A study. *Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services*, 12(1), 47–51. <https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss-2022.12.1.3385>

13. Scaria, L. M., Bhaskaran, D., & George, B. (2023). Prevalence of specific learning disorder among children in India: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02537176221124082>
14. Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. (2005). Integrated education in India: Challenges and prospects. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 25(1), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790500032574>
15. Shaywitz, S. (2003). *Overcoming dyslexia: A new and complete science-based program for reading problems at any level*. Alfred A. Knopf.
16. Snowling, M. J. (2019). *Dyslexia: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
17. Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 360–407. <https://doi.org/10.2307/747612>
18. Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
19. UNESCO. (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*. UNESCO.
20. UNESCO. (2020). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and education – All means all*. UNESCO.
21. Wagner, R. K., Zirps, F. A., Edwards, A. A., Wood, S. G., Joyner, R. E., Becker, B. J., Liu, G., & Beal, B. (2020). The prevalence of dyslexia: A new approach to its estimation. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(5), 354–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420920387>
22. Washburn, E. K., Joshi, R. M., & Binks-Cantrell, E. S. (2011). Teacher knowledge of basic language concepts and dyslexia. *Dyslexia*, 17(2), 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.426>