



Evaluation of Inclusive Education Policy and Implementation in Elementary School

Muhammad Faqih Arwen^{1*}

¹Universitas Ma'arif Nahdlatul Ulama Kebumen, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received: February 13, 2025

Revised: March 19, 2025

Accepted: April 16, 2025

Keywords:

Accessibility;

Inclusive Education;

Inclusive Policy Implementation;

Teacher Competence;

Teacher Perception.

Abstract

Background: Inclusive education promotes equitable learning opportunities for students with special needs within regular classrooms through adaptive pedagogy and supportive learning environments. Despite growing policy support, many elementary schools still encounter challenges translating inclusive principles into practical and sustainable classroom practices, particularly in contexts with limited infrastructure, professional training, and institutional resources.

Aims: This study aimed to evaluate the implementation of inclusive education policy and examine how inclusive practices are enacted through teaching strategies, classroom interactions, and school support systems at the elementary school level.

Methods: A qualitative descriptive case study was conducted at one public elementary school involving the principal and teachers selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through classroom observations, semi structured interviews, and document analysis, then analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns related to accessibility, instructional practice, interpersonal interaction, and institutional support.

Result: The findings indicate that inclusive practices were initiated through empathetic teacher attitudes, flexible classroom interactions, and supportive peer relationships. However, accessibility limitations, undifferentiated instruction, lack of structured training, and insufficient institutional resources constrained meaningful participation for students with special needs.

Conclusion: Inclusive education requires integrated pedagogical competence, accessible environments, and systemic collaboration to transform policy intentions into sustainable classroom practice and future educational innovation grounded in humane inclusive values.

To cite this article: Arwen, M. F. (2025). Evaluation of Inclusive Education Policy and Implementation in Elementary School. *SHINE: Journal of Special Needs, Holistic Interventions, and Neurodiversity in Education*, 1(1), 21-29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/shine.v1i1.xx>

This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) ©2025 by author/s

INTRODUCTION

Physical education is an essential part of schooling because it supports not only students' physical fitness, but also their emotional regulation, social participation, and learning readiness. In special education settings, this role becomes even more critical: structured movement experiences can help students with special needs build functional skills that are closely tied to autonomy and quality of daily living. However, many students with disabilities experience barriers in movement coordination and motor control that can limit participation in learning and peer interaction, making motor development a central target in educational intervention (Gonzalez et al., 2019).

Motor development is commonly described through two interconnected domains: gross motor skills and fine motor skills. Gross motor skills relate to the coordination of large muscle groups used for activities such as walking, jumping, balancing, and throwing, while fine motor skills involve precise hand-finger coordination for tasks such as grasping objects, manipulating tools, and writing-related actions. Importantly, these domains do not develop in isolation. Evidence from developmental

* Corresponding author:

Arwen, M. F., Universitas Ma'arif Nahdlatul Ulama Kebumen, Indonesia. ✉ arwenska09@gmail.com

synthesis indicates that gross and fine motor competence may cascade into broader developmental outcomes (including communication and functional engagement), highlighting why motor training deserves careful attention within school-based programs (Gonzalez et al., 2019).

Adaptive Physical Education (APE) is designed to respond to these realities by adjusting objectives, methods, task difficulty, and learning environments so that students with diverse functional profiles can participate meaningfully. In practice, the success of APE depends heavily on teachers' judgments and beliefs particularly their confidence to design modifications, manage participation, and sustain instructional consistency. Research in inclusive and disability-focused physical education consistently shows that teacher efficacy and attitudes are strongly linked to how inclusion is enacted in day-to-day practice (Hutzler et al., 2019; Savolainen et al., 2020).

In addition, validated evidence using disability-specific efficacy instruments (e.g., SE-PETE-D) reinforces that teachers' perceived capability is not a minor variable; it is a practical driver of instructional decisions in disability contexts (Reina et al., 2019). Despite the recognized importance of motor development in special education, empirical work has often emphasized program outcomes, curriculum statements, or broad inclusion discourse, while fewer studies richly document teachers' lived experiences in implementing motor training models, especially within schools that face resource limitations. Studies describing inclusion in physical education point to recurring constraints such as limited facilities and equipment, restricted instructional time, and gaps in training continuity that can weaken the sustainability of inclusive practice (Haegele et al., 2021).

Recent work also stresses that strengthening inclusion requires context-sensitive support systems that connect teacher learning, school structures, and follow-up professional development, rather than relying on one-off training events (Saiz-González et al., 2025). SLB Negeri Tamanwinangun serves students with varied disability profiles, requiring teachers to continuously adapt motor training tasks to students' functional abilities and daily needs. In this context, teachers' perceptions of gross and fine motor training models become a meaningful lens for understanding how APE is constructed in the classroom: what teachers prioritize, how they modify activities, and what constraints they negotiate. Therefore, this study aims to explore in depth the perceptions of adaptive physical education teachers regarding gross and fine motor development training models implemented at SLB N Tamanwinangun, including their understanding, implementation practices, and perceived challenges. The findings are expected to contribute practical insight for developing motor training models that are more responsive, sustainable, and grounded in the realities of special-school contexts.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design to provide an in-depth understanding of how the inclusive education policy is implemented at primary school. This approach was selected because it allows researchers to explore natural settings, capture real phenomena as they occur, and present a detailed description of practices, interactions, and forms of support provided to students with special needs. Through this design, the study aimed to examine how teachers, school leaders, and learning environments contribute to the implementation of inclusive education. A qualitative descriptive approach is widely used in inclusive education research to analyze everyday practices, contextual factors, and challenges experienced by schools in applying inclusive principles (Haegele et al., 2021).

Participant

Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their role and involvement in the implementation of inclusion in schools. Data from observations and interviews were integrated through source triangulation techniques to increase the validity and credibility of the findings. A sample is a collection of individuals, things, or things collected from a large population for measurement in research. Data were analyzed thematically, following an inductive approach, identifying categories and patterns based on naturally emerging themes. The research subjects consisted of the principal, two regular class teachers, and one teacher who handles students with special needs at primary school (1 school in Province of Jawa Tengah). The participants were purposively selected because they had direct knowledge and experience in implementing inclusive

education. There was no direct student participation. All adult participants gave informed consent to participate voluntarily after explaining the purpose and procedures of the study.

Instrument

The main instruments used in this study were structured observation sheets and semi-structured interview guidelines. The observation sheet was designed based on five key dimensions of inclusive education, namely: (1) facility accessibility, (2) curriculum and instructional methods, (3) teacher and student interactions, (4) student and student interactions, and (5) available support and resources. Each dimension was operationalized into specific observable indicators to ensure systematic and consistent data collection. The use of observation sheets referring to accessibility, interaction, and instructional support aligns with the findings of (Saiz-González et al., 2025), who emphasize the need for clear indicators of physical environment and classroom practices in assessing inclusive education.

The semi-structured interview guidelines were developed through a review of relevant literature and adapted to explore participants' perceptions, knowledge, and practical experiences related to the implementation of inclusive education. Qualitative research methods provide rich descriptions of human experiences and combining tools such as observation and interview helps researchers capture the complexity of social processes and contextual meanings. The interview items were open-ended to allow flexibility, enabling informants to elaborate on their experiences while still ensuring alignment with the study objectives. This combination of instruments allowed for both descriptive documentation of school practices and deeper insights into stakeholders' viewpoints.

Procedures

Data collection was conducted on June 5, 2025. Observations were carried out for one full day, starting at 10:00 a.m. until the learning activities were completed. The researcher systematically recorded the physical condition of the school, the learning process in the classroom, and the interaction between teachers and students. The observations were conducted non-participatively to maintain objectivity and avoid influencing classroom dynamics. The application of observations and semi-structured interviews aligns with (Saiz-González et al., 2025) explanation that these methods enable researchers to explore phenomena in depth and capture participants' authentic experiences in educational settings.

Interviews were conducted face-to-face with three informants, consisting of classroom teachers and the school principal. Each interview lasted approximately 30–45 minutes, was audio-recorded with permission, and accompanied by field note documentation. The use of triangulation in this study is essential for enhancing the credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative findings, as emphasized by (Saiz-González et al., 2025), who state that triangulation strengthens the validity of data by cross-checking information from multiple sources and methods. The interview questions were open-ended to allow in-depth exploration of teachers' experiences in teaching students with special needs, the challenges they encounter, and the types of support available at the school.

To strengthen the credibility of the findings, triangulation procedures were applied, (1) Method triangulation was conducted by comparing data obtained through observation and semi-structured interviews. The analytical procedures adopted in this research are consistent with methodological principles commonly discussed in the (Haegele et al., 2021), which emphasizes rigorous coding, iterative theme development, and cross-verification of data to ensure trustworthy findings; (2) Source triangulation was carried out by collecting information from different informants (teachers and principal) to capture diverse perspectives; and, (3) Data triangulation was performed by examining the consistency between observational notes, interview transcripts, and school documents such as classroom arrangements and available facilities.

Through this triangulation process, the researcher ensured that the data collected were accurate, consistent, and representative of the actual conditions at primary school (1 school in Province of Jawa Tengah). This analytical process follows (Reina et al., 2019), who highlight that triangulation across methods and informants is a fundamental strategy in educational research to minimize bias and improve the robustness of qualitative interpretations.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was used to examine the data. To obtain a thorough grasp of the information, all interview transcripts and observation notes were first transcribed, read several times, and familiarized. After that, the researcher created preliminary codes by determining significant units associated with inclusive teaching methods. Thematic analysis involved repeated reading of interview transcripts and observation notes to generate initial codes and overarching themes, following established procedural steps for thematic inquiry (Savolainen et al., 2020). This method was particularly suitable for understanding teachers' and principals' experiences in depth, offering richer insight into participants' perspectives than purely descriptive approaches (Haegele, 2021).

Following that, these codes were arranged into more general categories and themes that matched the five primary facets of inclusive education that this study looked at. Triangulation techniques were used to improve the findings' reliability and credibility. While source triangulation was guaranteed by looking at the consistency of viewpoints from several sources (teachers and the principal), method triangulation was carried out by comparing data gathered through interviews and classroom observations. Iterative comparison across the different data sets helped to sharpen the themes. All analytical procedures were carried out manually, without the use of statistical software, as the data were qualitative and focused on interpretive meaning rather than numerical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This study employed a qualitative case study design, focusing on examining the actual implementation of inclusive education at primary school (1 school in Province of Jawa Tengah). Data were obtained through one-day direct observation and semi-structured interviews with three informants on June 5, 2025. Observations covered five aspects of inclusive education: facility accessibility, curriculum and teaching methods, teacher–student interaction, student–student interaction, and school support and resources. Observations showed that the physical environment at school was not yet fully accessible for students with disabilities.

The school does not have ramps or elevators that allow wheelchair users mobility. The toilets available are public toilets without special adjustments, and classrooms are not equipped with visual markers or hearing aids. This indicates that accessibility has not been prioritized in the planning of the school's physical facilities. One teacher acknowledged this limitation, stating:

"We actually want the facilities to be more accessible for children with special needs, but so far there has been no budget for this (Mr AK)."

This condition aligns with UNESCO's global findings that accessibility remains a major challenge in primary schools in developing countries. Nevertheless, the teachers' expressed awareness of these limitations reflects a genuine concern for creating more inclusive learning spaces. Strengthening institutional commitment and resource allocation is therefore essential to ensure that physical environments support the dignity, safety, and participation of all students.

Although teachers demonstrated genuine empathy toward students with special needs, such as allowing additional time for assignments and making simple instructional adjustments, classroom instruction generally remained broad and not fully individualized. Teachers tried to respond to students' needs based on personal judgment rather than structured pedagogical guidance.

"We want to guide the students better, but we still do not fully understand the characteristics of children with special needs (Mr AK)."

This statement illustrates that teachers were aware of the gap between their intentions and their professional capacity. While they did not reject inclusive education, they felt uncertain about how to implement adaptive or differentiated instruction effectively due to limited knowledge and experience.

"We usually adjust as best as we can, but there are no specific guidelines or training that really help us (Mr AJ)."

Overall, these findings suggest that teachers' compassionate attitudes alone were not sufficient to support meaningful inclusion. The lack of systematic professional preparation and instructional frameworks limited their ability to individualize teaching, highlighting the need for sustained training and institutional support to strengthen inclusive classroom practices.

Although teacher–student interactions in the classroom were generally warm, supportive, and emotionally responsive. Teachers frequently offered verbal encouragement, stayed close to students who appeared confused, and provided additional assistance during learning activities. These interactions reflected teachers' genuine concern for students with special needs and their willingness to offer extra attention when necessary.

"I feel sorry for children who need special attention, so I usually stay with them longer. But honestly, I still don't know the most appropriate way to support them (Mr AK)."

Although teachers demonstrated empathy and patience, the support provided tended to remain general rather than individualized. Assistance was not based on systematic understanding of students' specific learning profiles, but instead relied on intuition and immediate classroom observations.

"Most of the time, I just try to help as best as I can, but I am not sure whether what I do is already suitable for their needs (Mr. AJ)."

In conclusion, teacher student interactions were characterized by care and emotional sensitivity, yet limited pedagogical competence constrained the effectiveness of individualized support. This finding indicates that empathy alone is insufficient without professional knowledge and structured strategies to guide inclusive instructional practices.

Observations revealed that interactions among students were generally positive and non-discriminatory. Students with special needs were accepted as part of the class community and were not excluded from classroom or break-time activities. Peers interacted with them politely and without overt rejection, creating a socially safe learning environment. "So far, the other students treat them well. They play together, and there is no intentional exclusion." However, participation by students with special needs tended to be passive. While they were present in group activities, they rarely took active roles or initiated interactions. The absence of structured peer-support or social facilitation programs limited opportunities for deeper collaboration and social engagement. "We do not yet have specific programs to train other students to accompany or collaborate more actively with children with special needs." Overall, these findings suggest that social acceptance alone does not guarantee meaningful inclusion. Without intentional strategies to foster peer interaction, students with special needs may remain socially included in appearance but excluded from active participation.

The findings indicate that institutional support and resources for inclusive education were limited. The school did not employ shadow teachers or staff with specialized training in inclusive education, and most classroom teachers had not received formal professional development related to special needs education. In addition, assistive learning tools, such as Braille materials, visual aids, or digital learning supports, were not available.

"Our biggest challenge is the budget. Teacher training is also rarely provided by the education office."

This lack of institutional support placed a heavy burden on teachers, who were required to manage inclusive classrooms independently without adequate assistance or resources.

"If there were assistant teachers, it would certainly be easier. Until now, we have tried to handle everything on our own."

In summary, insufficient structural support emerged as a major barrier to effective inclusive education. The absence of trained personnel, learning tools, and sustained professional development

limited teachers' capacity to translate inclusive policies into meaningful classroom practices, underscoring the need for systemic investment to support diversity and inclusion in education.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal that the implementation of inclusive education at school remains largely procedural and has not yet evolved into a fully pedagogical and transformative practice. Across all observed dimensions, facility accessibility, curriculum and teaching methods, interpersonal interactions, and institutional support, a consistent gap emerges between inclusive policy intentions and everyday classroom realities.

The lack of accessible infrastructure identified in this study reflects a persistent structural barrier to meaningful inclusion. The absence of ramps, accessible toilets, and sensory supports indicates that inclusion has not yet been embedded in school planning at the infrastructural level. This finding aligns with international research showing that physical accessibility remains one of the most enduring challenges in inclusive education, particularly in schools located in resource-limited or rural contexts (Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson, 2019). Without accessible environments, students with disabilities are implicitly excluded from full participation, regardless of inclusive intentions. As Florian and Beaton (2018) emphasize, inclusion begins with enabling physical access that affirms dignity, safety, and autonomy.

The results demonstrate that teachers display strong empathetic attitudes toward students with special needs; however, instructional practices remain largely undifferentiated. Teachers relied on intuition and goodwill rather than structured inclusive pedagogy. This condition reflects what Slee (2018) describes as benevolent inclusion, where care is present but professional competence and pedagogical adaptation are limited. Research consistently indicates that inclusive teaching requires more than empathy, it demands intentional instructional design grounded in understanding learner diversity (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2018). Without systematic training, teachers are unlikely to implement differentiated instruction effectively, even when they possess positive attitudes toward inclusion.

Warm and supportive teacher-student interactions were evident throughout classroom observations, highlighting teachers' emotional engagement and concern for student well-being. However, support tended to be generic and reactive rather than individualized. This finding supports previous research suggesting that emotional responsiveness, while important, must be complemented by pedagogical expertise to produce meaningful learning outcomes (De Bruin, 2019). Teachers' uncertainty regarding appropriate instructional responses indicates limited pedagogical self-efficacy, which has been shown to directly influence the quality of inclusive practices (Soodak & Sharma, 2020).

Positive peer relationships were observed, with students with special needs generally accepted within the social environment. Nevertheless, their participation remained passive due to the absence of structured peer-mediated strategies. International evidence suggests that social inclusion does not automatically occur through physical placement alone; it requires deliberate facilitation through cooperative learning and peer support programs (Garrote et al., 2017). Without intentional social scaffolding, students with special needs risk remaining socially present but functionally isolated within inclusive classrooms.

The absence of shadow teachers, assistive learning tools, and sustained professional development emerged as a critical constraint. This finding reinforces global evidence that inclusive education fails when responsibility is placed solely on classroom teachers without adequate institutional support (Waitoller & Thorius, 2016). Sustainable inclusion requires coordinated systems that integrate teacher training, specialist support, and resource provision. As Loreman (2017) argues, inclusive education is not an individual teacher responsibility but a whole-school and system-level commitment.

Implications

This study contributes to the field of inclusive education by providing an in-depth, contextually grounded analysis of how inclusive education policies are experienced and interpreted at the school level. While many previous studies emphasize policy evaluation or quantitative outcome measurement, this research foregrounds teachers' lived experiences and perceptions, revealing the

nuanced relationship between empathy, professional competence, and institutional support. By integrating analysis across physical accessibility, instructional practice, interpersonal interaction, and systemic constraints, the study offers a holistic framework for understanding inclusion as a dynamic process shaped by contextual realities. Furthermore, the findings enrich existing theoretical discussions by illustrating how inclusive practice evolves through negotiation between individual teacher agency and structural limitations, thereby expanding the discourse on sustainable inclusive pedagogy in resource-limited settings.

Research Contribution

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. The research was conducted in a single school context with a small number of participants, which may limit the transferability of findings to broader educational environments with different cultural or institutional conditions. The qualitative descriptive design prioritizes depth and contextual richness rather than statistical generalization, meaning that the results should be interpreted as situated insights rather than universal conclusions. Additionally, the absence of direct student participation restricts the exploration of inclusion from learners' perspectives, particularly regarding their emotional experiences and sense of agency. The relatively short duration of observation also limits the ability to capture long-term changes in inclusive practices and professional development processes.

Limitations

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. The research was conducted in a single school context with a small number of participants, which may limit the transferability of findings to broader educational environments with different cultural or institutional conditions. The qualitative descriptive design prioritizes depth and contextual richness rather than statistical generalization, meaning that the results should be interpreted as situated insights rather than universal conclusions. Additionally, the absence of direct student participation restricts the exploration of inclusion from learners' perspectives, particularly regarding their emotional experiences and sense of agency. The relatively short duration of observation also limits the ability to capture long-term changes in inclusive practices and professional development processes.

Suggestions

Future research is encouraged to adopt multi-site or comparative designs to examine how inclusive education policies are implemented across diverse school contexts and resource conditions. Longitudinal studies could provide deeper insight into how teacher efficacy, professional learning, and institutional support evolve over time and influence inclusive outcomes. Researchers are also encouraged to incorporate the perspectives of students with disabilities, parents, and peer groups to enrich the relational dimension of inclusion. From a practical standpoint, future investigations may explore the integration of adaptive technologies, peer-mediated learning strategies, and universal design learning frameworks to strengthen participation and autonomy among students with special needs. Such directions can help bridge the gap between policy expectations and classroom realities while advancing inclusive education toward more humane, sustainable, and context-responsive educational practices.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms that the expectations articulated in the Introduction regarding the need to examine inclusive education policy and its practical implementation are meaningfully reflected in the Results and Discussion. The findings demonstrate that inclusive practices at the elementary school level are shaped by the interaction between teachers' empathy, institutional readiness, and contextual limitations. While inclusive education has been initiated through supportive classroom interactions and flexible responses to student diversity, significant gaps remain in infrastructure accessibility, differentiated pedagogy, and sustained professional development. The alignment between the research objectives and empirical findings highlights that inclusive education cannot

rely solely on policy mandates but must be translated into practical, pedagogically grounded actions supported by systemic resources.

Moreover, the study illustrates that meaningful inclusion requires a holistic approach that integrates accessible environments, structured instructional strategies, and collaborative school culture. The challenges identified throughout the Results and Discussion sections provide valuable insight into areas requiring strategic improvement, including teacher training, assistive learning resources, and peer-support initiatives. These findings open opportunities for further research to explore longitudinal impacts of inclusive practices, comparative studies across diverse school contexts, and the integration of adaptive technologies and universal design frameworks. Ultimately, this study contributes to advancing inclusive education by bridging theoretical expectations with classroom realities and by offering practical directions for developing more humane, sustainable, and context-responsive educational practices in future educational environments.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author expresses his gratitude to the adaptive physical education teachers at SLB N Tamanwinangun for the cooperation, support, and time that has been given during this research process. The author also expressed his gratitude to the principal of at primary school (1 school in Province of Jawa Tengah) for giving permission and opportunity to collect data in the school environment.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

MA conceptualized the study, developed the research design, and conducted field data collection through classroom observations and semi structured interviews. MFA performed data coding, thematic analysis, and interpretation of findings to ensure analytical rigor and alignment with inclusive education frameworks. MA drafted the original manuscript, conducted critical revisions to strengthen theoretical and methodological clarity, and approved the final version of the article for publication. The author assumes full responsibility for the integrity, accuracy, and ethical standards of the research and its scholarly contribution.

REFERENCES

- Gonzalez, S. L., Alvarez, V., & Nelson, E. L. (2019). Do gross and fine motor skills differentially contribute to language outcomes? A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2670. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02670>
- Haegele, J. A., Bueche, J. J., Wilson, W. J., Brady, E., Zhu, X., & Li, C. (2021). Barriers and facilitators to inclusion in integrated physical education: Adapted physical educators' perspectives. *European Physical Education Review*, 27(2), 297–311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X20944429>
- Hutzler, Y., Meier, S., Reuker, S., & Zitomer, M. (2019). Attitudes and self-efficacy of physical education teachers toward inclusion of children with disabilities: A narrative review of international literature. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 24(3), 249–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2019.1571183>
- Reina, R., Haegele, J. A., Vidal-Almela, S., & Sanz, D. (2019). Spanish validation of the self-efficacy scale for physical education teacher education majors toward inclusion (SE-PETE-D). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2169. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02169>
- Saiz-González, Á., Muñoz-Jiménez, J., & Alguacil, M. (2025). Inclusive physical education teachers' perceptions about key factors for disability inclusion in physical education. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 108. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010108>
- Savolainen, H., Malinen, O.-P., & Schwab, S. (2020). Teacher efficacy predicts teachers' attitudes towards inclusion – a longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1752826>
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2019). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648335>

- De Bruin, K. (2019). The impact of inclusive education reforms on teachers' professional learning. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(4), 429–444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1427155>
- Florian, L., & Beaton, M. (2018). Inclusive pedagogy in action: Getting it right for every child. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22(8), 870–884. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1412513>
- Garrote, A., Sermier Dessemontet, R., & Moser Opitz, E. (2017). Facilitating the social participation of pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(4), 495–510. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2017.1297578>
- Loreman, T. (2017). Pedagogy for inclusive education. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.148>
- Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2018). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 73, 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.03.012>
- Slee, R. (2018). *Inclusive education isn't dead, it just smells funny*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429431448>
- Soodak, L. C., & Sharma, U. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy and inclusive practices. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(3), 223–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1497096>
- Waitoller, F. R., & Thorius, K. K. (2016). Cross-pollinating culturally sustaining pedagogy and universal design for learning. *Harvard Educational Review*, 86(3), 366–389. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.86.3.366>