DOI: https://doi.org/10.63056/jllsa.2.11.2026.427

Journal of Language, Literature & Social Affairs

journal homepage: https://scholarclub.org/index.php/jllsa

Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusive Leadership Practices in Elementary Schools: Community Inclusion and Public–Private Sector Differences

Munwar Bagum*[a], Naseem Bibi[b], Najma Ashiq[c], Muhammad Akram Malik[d], Muhammad Jawad Tahseen[e]

a. Assistant Professor, University of Southern Punjab, Multan
b. M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, University of Southern Punjab, Multan
c. Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, University of Southern Punjab, Multan
d. Professor, Department of Education, University of Southern Punjab, Multan.
e. Ph.D. Scholar, University of Southern Punjab, Multan

ARTICLE INFO

Received:
September 15, 2026
Revision Received:
October 08, 2026
Accepted:
October 19, 2026
Available Online:
November 01, 2026

Keywords:
inclusive leadership, elementary schools, teachers' perceptions, community inclusion, school sector, gender, Khanewal

ABSTRACT

This article examines elementary teachers' perceptions of inclusive leadership in Khanewal District, Punjab, Pakistan. It selects one descriptive construct—"the school as an inclusive community"—and two inferential grouping variables, school sector (public/private) and gender (male/female), from the thesis. The source thesis reports a quantitative questionnaire survey of 824 teachers and a 12-item, five-point Likert scale for the selected construct. The reported overall mean perception was 4.17 (SD = 0.90), indicating generally favourable responses. The thesis reports no statistically significant sector comparison, $t(822) = -0.12$, $p = .54$; reported summed-scale means were 50.05 for public-school teachers and 50.10 for private-school teachers. It reports a gender difference, $t = 2.86$, p written as .00, with male teachers scoring 50.63 (SD = 5.07) and female teachers 49.52 (SD = 6.05). The findings require caution because the thesis contains inconsistent labels, apparent transcription errors, and incomplete statistical output. This article reproduces the thesis-reported values rather than independently analysing participant-level data. Expanded descriptive tables clarify what the reported means can and cannot show. Interpretations are limited to the sample, and no causal conclusions are drawn. Recommendations focus on strengthening community engagement, improving reporting transparency, and verifying the reported group comparisons before policy use.

1. Introduction

Inclusive leadership in schools concerns the way leaders create participation, belonging, fairness, and meaningful involvement for students, staff, families, and community members. Inclusion is not simply the placement of diverse learners in one setting. It also involves the conditions that enable people to participate and be valued without losing their distinctive experiences. Shore et al. (2011) frame inclusion through the dual ideas of belongingness and uniqueness, both of which are useful for understanding school communities.

* Correspondence to: Assistant Professor, University of Southern Punjab, Multan
E-*mail address:* munwarbagum@usp.edu.pk (M. Bagum)

3105-4919 & 3105-4927/© 2026 The Authors. Published by Scholar Club. This is an open access article.

At school level, leadership is expressed through day-to-day practices: who is invited to participate, whose concerns are heard, how decisions are made, and how barriers to learning are identified. Leaders influence whether staff members feel safe to raise concerns and whether improvement efforts can draw on the knowledge of people closest to the classroom. Nembhard and Edmondson (2006) describe leader inclusiveness as behaviours that invite and appreciate contributions, with implications for psychological safety and improvement work.

Inclusive leadership is also relational. Randel et al. (2018) argue that leaders can foster both group belonging and recognition of individual contributions. In schools, these practices may include equitable participation in decisions, professional collaboration, active family engagement, and respectful treatment of difference. Such practices matter because a school's formal policy may endorse inclusion while everyday routines still leave some groups unheard.

Research on inclusive education systems highlights the importance of leadership and organisational culture. Ainscow and Sandill (2010) describe these as important levers for system change. Schools do not operate in isolation: they engage with families, local organisations, other schools, and education authorities. A school's community-facing practices therefore provide one practical way to examine whether the idea of inclusion is reflected in the organisation's everyday relationships.

Dialogue and social justice are also central. Ryan (2006) argues that inclusive school leadership involves more than managerial efficiency; leaders must attend to participation and fairness. A culture of dialogue can help reveal barriers that remain invisible to decision-makers who hear only the most powerful voices. In the present article, the selected descriptive variable is "the school as an inclusive community," measured through teacher ratings of community participation, school–community relationships, family inclusion, and related practices.

The source thesis investigated teachers' perceptions of inclusive leadership practices in public and private elementary schools in Khanewal District. To develop a focused article from that thesis, this paper retains one descriptive construct and examines two inferential grouping variables: school sector and gender. This restricted focus makes the results more readable and avoids presenting every analysis in the thesis, which contains inconsistent descriptions of the study and some potentially conflicting statistics.

The article addresses three questions: (1) What was the reported descriptive level of teachers' perceptions of the school as an inclusive community? (2) Did the thesis report a difference between public and private school teachers? (3) Did the thesis report a difference between male and female teachers? The purpose is to summaries these data and interpret them cautiously, not to confirm the original calculations or make causal claims.

The distinction between a descriptive result and an inferential comparison is important. A mean score describes the responses in the sample; a significance test assesses whether an observed group difference is compatible with a specified statistical model. Neither alone establishes the quality of leadership in a school or explains why teachers may respond differently. Statistical significance does not indicate practical importance, and a non-significant result does not demonstrate that two groups are equivalent.

The contribution of this focused article is therefore twofold. First, it organizes the relevant thesis findings around one construct and two comparisons. Second, it makes the limitations visible, including mixed scale metrics and incomplete reporting. These cautions are necessary for an accurate article and may guide a cleaner analysis if the original dataset and statistical output become available.

2. Methodology

The thesis describes the research as quantitative and survey-based, with a descriptive design. The current article is a secondary, thesis-derived report. It is not a new field study and does not reanalyze the raw dataset. The source reports that SPSS was used to compute descriptive statistics, independent-samples t tests, and ANOVA. For the present scope, only the descriptive summary of the inclusive-community construct and the comparisons by sector and gender are reproduced.

The source thesis's account of its study varies across sections. It refers to different school levels and populations in places, and the sampling method is not consistently described. The sample size is also described differently in some passages, whereas the results chapter reports N = 824 for the selected demographic and scale results. This article uses table-level N = 824 and does not attempt to reconcile the inconsistencies by inference.

No participant-level data was available for reanalysis. Therefore, new test statistics, confidence intervals, effect sizes, reliability estimates, or corrected p-values cannot be calculated. All numeric outcomes in this article are attributed to the thesis as reported. Where source entries appear inconsistent, the discrepancy is explicitly noted and the interpretation remains provisional.

For the descriptive variable, the thesis reports a mean of 4.17 and standard deviation of 0.90 for the 12-item inclusive-community subscale. It also reports item-level means and standard deviations. For school sector and gender, it reports independent-samples comparisons of total scores. These subgroups values appear to be summed scale scores, whereas the full-scale descriptive mean is an item-level average. The thesis does not clearly document that distinction; this article flags it rather than treating unlike metrics as directly comparable.

The significance threshold is treated as $\alpha = .05$, consistent with the source thesis. The sector comparison is considered non-significant based on the reported $p = .54$. The gender comparison is described as significant as reported by the thesis, although its ".00" notation is imprecise and exact output should be checked. A p value cannot literally be zero; the source's software output should be retrieved before reporting a precise value.

2.1. Sample

The thesis reports 824 teachers in the analysis: 476 from public schools and 348 from private schools. It reports 410 male teachers and 414 female teachers. The sample includes both urban and rural settings. The nearly balanced gender counts and the representation of both sectors allow the source thesis to present two group comparisons, subject to the limitations of the reported sampling procedure.

The source also describes a population of 4,667 teachers across four Khanewal District tehsils and provides separate population and sample tables. Yet the thesis alternates among elementary and secondary terminology and makes claims about the population that do not align consistently with those tables. Consequently, the precise population frame and the basis for selection cannot be confidently stated from the thesis text alone.

The table below recasts the reported counts in a compact form. These counts should be checked against the original dataset before any secondary statistical analysis or policy inference. The article does not claim that the sample is representative of all teachers in Khanewal or elsewhere.

Table 1: Participant counts reported for the two selected grouping variables

Variable	Category	n	Percent
School sector	Public	476	57.8
School sector	Private	348	42.2
Gender	Male	410	49.8
Gender	Female	414	50.2
Total	All reported participants	824	100.0

Note. Percentages are calculated from the thesis-reported counts, which sum to N = 824. The sampling frame and selection method should be confirmed from the original records.

Interpretation. Public-school teachers make up a larger share of this sample than private-school teachers, while the gender groups are almost evenly represented. These are sample characteristics, not evidence that the district's teacher population has the same proportions. The difference in group sizes is relevant when assessing the precision of each comparison, and the unexplained sampling inconsistencies limit generalize ability.

2.2. Tool

The thesis used a self-developed questionnaire for teachers. The questionnaire included demographic questions and statements about inclusive leadership practices. The instrument's first section collected background information such as school location, school sector, designation, gender, teaching experience, age group, academic qualification, and professional qualification. The second section asked respondents to rate leadership practices on a Likert-type scale.

The selected 12-item subscale was titled "The School as an Inclusive Community." Items address whether the school administration promotes community participation, develops school–community relationships, collaborates with other schools, opens discussion about exclusion, engages families, represents diversity in school governance, supports family-school interaction, and gathers information about the needs of members of the school community.

The thesis describes five response options, from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The response coding is not described consistently in every section, and a few table headings appear to compress or omit response categories. The article therefore uses the overall published mean as stated, without reconstructing the response coding or recalculating the composite score.

Instrument validity is described through expert review and pilot testing. Expert reviewers were asked to consider clarity, relevance, and coverage. The thesis reports that items were revised and some redundant wording removed. It also describes piloting with teachers to identify unclear wording and assess whether the instrument could be completed successfully. The

identities of all reviewers and detailed item-level validity procedures are not presented consistently in the accessible thesis narrative.

The thesis says Cronbach's alpha was used to assess scale reliability. A reliability coefficient is not clearly available for the selected 12-item subscale in the reported material used for this article. The article therefore does not provide an alpha value or claim that the selected scale's internal consistency has been independently verified. A future report should provide the number of items, alpha, confidence interval if available, and the sample used for that calculation.

2.3. Development

The instrument was intended to measure teachers' perceptions of inclusive leadership in their schools. The questionnaire's two domains covered the school as an inclusive community and management of teaching and learning processes. For this paper, only the community domain is used as the descriptive variable. The sector and gender responses are treated as grouping variables rather than outcomes.

The thesis describes a development sequence involving drafting, review, and pilot testing. First, statements were written to reflect school leadership practices connected with inclusion. Second, experts examined the items for relevance and clarity. Third, feedback was used to revise wording and remove repetition. Finally, the instrument was piloted with a small group of teachers before the larger survey.

For a stronger instrument-development record, the article would ideally include a table mapping each item to its intended dimension, the source or rationale for item construction, the number and expertise of reviewers, the specific changes made after review, pilot sample characteristics, completion time, and the reliability of each scale. These details cannot be added as established facts because the thesis does not report them in a sufficiently consistent and complete manner.

The selected construct has practical relevance because its items focus on visible organizational practices. However, teachers' perceptions are not direct observations of all leadership behavior, and a high mean does not prove that every family or student group experiences equal inclusion. Perception data should therefore be interpreted alongside school-level evidence, such as participation records, structured feedback, and qualitative accounts.

2.4. Administration

The thesis reports that administrative permission was obtained from relevant education authorities and school heads before questionnaires were distributed. Participants were informed that their responses would be confidential and used for research purposes. The thesis describes participation as voluntary and reports that questionnaires were completed by teachers and returned for analysis.

The original thesis includes a questionnaire cover letter and an instrument appendix. It also refers to cooperation from the education authorities in Khanewal. The present article does not reproduce private identifying information or appendices. It summaries the described administration process and notes that the exact dates, response rate, number of questionnaires distributed, number returned, and missing-data procedures are not stated consistently in the available narrative.

For reproducible reporting, future versions should state the recruitment and consent procedures, how confidentiality was protected, whether questionnaires were self-administered, how incomplete responses were handled, and how the data were checked before SPSS analysis. Reporting these procedural details would help readers judge possible nonresponse and measurement bias.

3. Analysis of data

The thesis reports use of descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, and inferential tests including independent-samples t tests and ANOVA. The selected descriptive variable is the inclusive-community subscale. The two inferential variables are school sector and gender. The article reproduces only those results that are identifiable in the thesis tables and related narrative.

For the descriptive outcome, the thesis reports an overall scale mean of 4.17 (SD = 0.90) and item-level values. For the sector comparison, the thesis reports means of 50.05 and 50.10, standard deviations of 5.59 and 5.64, $t = -0.12$, and $p = .54$. For the gender comparison, it reports means of 50.63 and 49.52, standard deviations of 5.07 and 6.05, $t = 2.86$, and $p = .00$. These means appear to be total scores, not item averages.

There are important reporting concerns. First, a t statistic of approximately −0.12 with the stated sample sizes would not ordinarily correspond to $p = .54$; this pair should be checked against the original output. Second, the gender p value is shown as .00, which is a rounded software display and not a valid exact probability. Third, the thesis's prose sometimes refers to

different constructs or school levels when explaining the same tables. Fourth, the full descriptive average and subgroup means may use different metrics. These issues require verification before interpreting the exact differences.

The article does not attempt to infer equivalence from a non-significant sector test, nor does it infer causality from the gender comparison. Statistical significance depends on model assumptions and data quality, and practical importance requires effect-size information and contextual interpretation. Because the underlying observations were unavailable, no assumption checks or corrections for multiple testing could be performed here.

3.1. Analysis of data

Table 2 presents the reported descriptive result for the overall construct and the item values that are identifiable in the thesis. The source's summary gives an overall mean of 4.17 (SD = 0.90). The strongest listed item concerns initiatives that foster community participation in school life. The lowest listed item mean concerns educational activities outside the school. These item results offer a more specific picture than the composite mean, although they do not establish which practice is most important or most effective.

Table 2: Descriptive summary of the school-as-inclusive-community construct

Measure	Reported mean	Reported SD	Interpretation
Overall 12-item subscale	4.17	0.90	Generally favourable sample rating
Community participation in educational life	4.55	0.67	Highest listed item; strong perceived practice
Educational activities outside school	3.97	0.99	Lowest listed item; possible improvement area
Scale response format	1–5	—	Five-point Likert-type response scale

Note. The thesis reports an average for the 12-item construct and item means. The 3.97 SD is drawn from the available table entry; confirm against the original formatted table because extraction may have affected decimal presentation.

Interpretation. The construct's mean of 4.17 suggests that respondents generally rated inclusive-community practices positively. The comparatively high participation item may reflect perceived effort to involve community members in educational life. The lower outside-school activity mean suggests a practical topic for discussion, but it should not be overread as evidence that schools do not provide such activities. A high group average can also coexist with varied experiences among families, students, or schools.

The standard deviation of 0.90 indicates variation in responses around the overall mean. A standard deviation does not identify which respondents disagreed or why. Without distributions for all response categories, item-level missingness, and school-level clustering, the article cannot establish whether the variation is concentrated in particular schools or participant subgroups.

The item-level results also show why a composite score can conceal operational differences. Community participation may be perceived as relatively established, while out-of-school engagement may be less consistently visible. School leaders can use this contrast to ask what opportunities are available, whether they are accessible to all families, and whether teachers have sufficient time and resources to support them.

Table 3: Selected item-level interpretation for the descriptive variable

Item area	Mean	SD	What the result can support	What it cannot establish
Community participation	4.55	0.67	Teachers in this sample gave this practice the highest listed rating.	It does not prove every community group participates equally.
Educational activities outside school	3.97	0.99	This was the lowest listed item mean and can guide inquiry.	It does not show that such activities are absent or ineffective.
Overall inclusive community	4.17	0.90	Average perception was generally favourable.	It does not establish observed inclusion or student outcomes.

Note. Item means are reproduced from the thesis. Interpretations distinguish perceptions from direct evidence of implementation.

Interpretation. The table separates a descriptive result from a practice recommendation. The lower item is best treated as a prompt for local review. Schools could ask teachers, families, and students which forms of engagement are accessible and valued, then compare perceptions with records of participation. This approach avoids assuming that one item score gives a complete picture of school inclusion.

3.2. Analysis of data

The sector comparison is summarised in Table 4. The reported public and private group means differ by only 0.05 points on the summed 12-item score. The thesis reports p = .54, which exceeds the conventional .05 threshold. On that reported basis, it did not establish a statistically significant sector difference. However, the test statistic and reported p value appear inconsistent and should be verified using the original analysis output.

Table 4: Reported sector comparison on inclusive-community total score

Sector	n	Mean	SD	Reported t	Reported p	Decision at .05
Public	476	50.05	5.59	−0.12	.54	Not significant as reported
Private	348	50.10	5.64			
Mean difference (public – private)	—	−0.05	—	—	—	Very small observed gap

Note. The thesis presents the group means and standard deviations as total scores. The reported test statistic and p value should be checked against the original SPSS output before publication.

Interpretation. The observed means are nearly identical in this sample. The reported p value does not support rejecting the null hypothesis of no sector difference at α = .05. This does not prove public and private schools are equivalent; an equivalence claim requires a defined equivalence margin and an appropriate test. A confidence interval would help show the plausible range of the population difference, but none is reported in the source.

The sector result may be useful as a descriptive comparison, but school sector alone cannot explain variation in inclusive practices. Schools within the same sector may differ in leadership preparation, resources, community relationships, staff collaboration, and student needs. Future analysis could account for school-level clustering and relevant covariates, provided the original sampling design and data structure are documented.

Table 5: Interpretive guide for the public–private comparison

Reported finding	Statistical reading	Practical interpretation	Reporting caution
Public M = 50.05; private M = 50.10	Difference is small in the sample.	No meaningful direction is evident from the means alone.	Scores appear to be sums; confirm metric and scoring.
p = .54 as printed	Not statistically significant at .05.	No sector difference was established by the reported test.	t = −0.12 and p = .54 should be cross-checked.
No confidence interval or effect size	Precision and magnitude remain unclear.	Do not infer equivalence or policy impact.	Request full output and raw-data reanalysis.

Note. This table interprets the thesis's reported figures; it is not a recalculation of the t test.

Interpretation. The responsible conclusion is narrower than "the sectors are the same." The data as reported show very similar sample averages, and the thesis's p value is non-significant. Yet absent verified output and a confidence interval, the precision of the difference is unknown. Decision-makers should not use the result to assume that sector-specific support is unnecessary.

3.3. Analysis of data

The gender comparison is shown in Table 6. The thesis reports a higher mean total score for male teachers (50.63) than female teachers (49.52), a difference of 1.11 points. The source gives t = 2.86 and p = .00. If the p value is below .05, the comparison is statistically significant as reported. The exact p value, confidence interval, effect size, and test assumptions are not provided, so the magnitude and precision cannot be fully evaluated.

Table 6: Reported gender comparison on inclusive-community total score

Gender	n	Mean	SD	Reported t	Reported p	Direction
Male	410	50.63	5.07	2.86	reported .00	Male mean higher
Female	414	49.52	6.05			
Mean difference (male – female)	—	1.11	—	—	—	Reported difference

Note. ".00" is reproduced from the thesis and is not an exact p value. It should be replaced with the exact result or a justified threshold notation after checking original output.

Interpretation. The thesis reports a statistically significant difference, with male teachers' average total score higher than female teachers' average. This establishes only a difference in reported perceptions in the analysed sample, if the original test output

is accurate. It does not show that gender caused the difference, that one group is more inclusive, or that actual leadership behaviour differed by gender.

Several explanations could be considered in a future study, including differences in role, school assignment, access to leadership communication, career experience, or interpretation of the survey items. These are hypotheses, not findings of this dataset. Qualitative interviews and carefully reported subgroup data could help clarify whether the result reflects different exposure to leadership practices or different response patterns.

Table 7: What the reported gender result does and does not mean

Aspect	Supported by thesis report	Not supported without further evidence
Direction	Male group mean exceeds female group mean by 1.11 reported score points.	That male teachers experience objectively better school inclusion.
Significance	Thesis reports t = 2.86 and p = .00.	An exact p value of zero or a verified test result.
Cause	A group difference is reported.	Gender causes the difference.
Practical importance	Cannot be assessed from p alone.	That the difference is large or policy-relevant.
Generalisation	The result pertains to the analysed sample.	That the pattern holds across all schools or districts.

Note. The second column restates the source report; the third specifies claims that need additional data or verification.

Interpretation. This distinction protects against turning a group comparison into a stereotype. If confirmed, the finding is a reason to examine how school information and participation are experienced by different teachers, not a basis for assigning competence or responsibility by gender. Reporting an effect size and confidence interval would clarify whether the observed gap is trivial, moderate, or potentially important.

3.4. Analysis of data

The source thesis contains internal reporting issues that affect confidence in the results. Table 8 records the principal limitations relevant to this article. These are not minor style issues: inconsistent sample descriptions and statistical values can change how readers interpret a result. The article therefore retains transparent attribution and recommends verification rather than silently correcting values.

Table 8: Source reporting issues and implications

Issue identified	Potential consequence	Recommended check
Population and school level described inconsistently	Unclear target population and limits to generalisation.	Confirm target population, school level, and sampling frame.
Sampling method varies across chapters	Risk of overstating representativeness.	Document actual selection method and response rate.
Sector t and p may not align	Uncertain significance conclusion.	Retrieve SPSS independent-samples output and verify group coding.
Gender p printed as .00	Exact probability is obscured.	Report exact p or threshold notation after verification.
Overall average and subgroup values use unclear scales	Comparisons may mix item means and summed scores.	Publish scoring rules, score ranges, and item count.
Some narrative labels refer to other constructs	Readers may confuse the outcome being tested.	Edit table captions and results prose against the codebook.

Note. These checks are based on inconsistencies visible in the thesis text and tables available for this article.

Interpretation. The study's broad descriptive pattern can be discussed, but the inferential details require source verification. The most important step is to obtain the original SPSS output and confirm that the grouping variables, dependent variable, sample sizes, and test assumptions match the reported tables. If the raw dataset is accessible, a clean reanalysis should document data screening and scoring decisions.

The source's use of both a five-point item average and a total score needs particular attention. A 12-item sum would normally have a different numerical range from a single-item average. Both are legitimate summaries if defined, but readers should not mistake them for the same metric. Future tables should state the possible range and report the unit of measurement in the column heading.

The sample counts sum correctly to 824 for sector and gender in the reported tables. That agreement is useful but does not resolve the sample-frame problem. Counts alone cannot establish whether nonresponse or selection bias affected the survey.

Future studies should report how many teachers were invited, how many responded, and whether response rates differed by sector or gender.

A further limitation is the absence of confidence intervals and effect sizes. A p value alone does not show the likely size or precision of a difference. The sector finding should not be read as proof of equivalence, and the gender finding should not be described as substantively important without considering its magnitude. This article's interpretations are accordingly limited to the reported direction and significance language.

3.5. Analysis of data

Figure 1 provides a simple visual reference for the subgroup means as reported. Because the overall mean is an item-average score and subgroup means appear to be sums, the figure deliberately displays only the four subgroup means. The plotted values are close to one another; the visual does not represent statistical uncertainty, and it should not be used as evidence of significance or equivalence.

Figure 1: Reported subgroup means on the inclusive-community total score

Group	Mean	Visual reference
Public	50.05	
Private	50.10	
Male	50.63	
Female	49.52	

Note. The bars are illustrative placeholders, not proportional chart bars. The thesis-reported subgroup values are total scores; the 4.17 overall mean is an item-average score and is not plotted here.

Interpretation. The close public and private means reflect the small sample mean gap described in Table 4. The male and female means differ by 1.11 points as reported. Visual closeness does not determine statistical significance; uncertainty and test assumptions must be considered. A proper bar chart with a defined axis, confidence intervals, and a consistent scoring metric would be preferable once verified data are available.

4. Suggestion

The most useful practice suggestion is to build on the comparatively strong community-participation rating while examining the lower-rated outside-school activity item. School leaders can invite teachers, families, students, and community partners to identify which activities are accessible and valuable, and whether timing, transport, language, disability access, or other barriers affect participation. These are areas for local investigation, not barriers proven by the thesis.

Schools can also strengthen inclusive representation in their routine decision processes. For example, school councils and consultation meetings can document whose voices are represented, how feedback is recorded, and what actions follow. A short feedback loop—collect concerns, report decisions, and check whether changes helped—can make engagement meaningful rather than symbolic.

At district level, a professional learning programme could focus on inclusive leadership behaviours such as active listening, transparent decision-making, equitable participation, collaborative problem-solving, and responding constructively to reports of exclusion. The programme should use examples from local school contexts and include opportunities for peer discussion and reflective practice.

A follow-up research project should first verify the instrument scoring and the original dataset. It should specify the population, sampling method, response rate, school-level clustering, missing-data rules, and reliability statistics. It should report exact means, standard deviations, test statistics, degrees of freedom, exact or threshold p values, confidence intervals, and effect sizes. If feasible, interviews or focus groups can help explain the perceptions behind survey ratings.

5. Recommendations

- School leaders should maintain and extend meaningful opportunities for families, students, teachers, and local organisations to contribute to school decisions and educational activities.
- Schools should review the lower-rated practice concerning educational activities outside school and identify feasible, accessible activities with families and community partners. The review should consider participation barriers and avoid assuming that one format suits every family.
- Education authorities should provide professional learning for head teachers on inclusive communication, shared decision-making, equitable representation, and constructive responses to discrimination or exclusion.
- School improvement plans should include observable indicators of participation, such as the diversity of consultation participants, frequency of community engagement, and documentation of how feedback influenced decisions.
- Researchers should verify the reported gender difference against the original statistical output before using it in policy or practice. If confirmed, follow-up inquiry should explore contextual explanations without attributing leadership capacity or attitudes to gender alone.
- Future reports should distinguish item-average scores from summed-scale scores, state the possible scale range, and provide clear scoring and coding rules.
- Future quantitative analyses should include exact sample sizes, test statistics, degrees of freedom, p values, confidence intervals, and effect sizes, alongside checks of test assumptions and missing data.
- Future studies should include additional districts and school levels, and where possible gather perspectives from head teachers, students, and families in addition to teachers.
- Because teachers are nested within schools, future work should account for school-level clustering where the design and data permit. This will improve estimates of uncertainty and help distinguish within-school from between-school variation.
- The original thesis should be reviewed for consistency in its descriptions of population, school level, sampling, table numbering, outcome labels, and statistical conclusions before it is used as a basis for further publication.

References

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14(4), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903

Bibi, N. (2026). Teachers' perception of inclusive leadership practices: A comparative study in public and private schools at elementary level [M.Phil. thesis, University of Southern Punjab, Multan].

Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. Creativity Research Journal, 22(3), 250–260.

Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27(7), 941–966.

Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., & Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. Human Resource Management Review, 28(2), 190–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.002

Ryan, J. (2006). Inclusive leadership and social justice for schools. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500483995

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. Journal of Management, 37(4), 1262–1289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943