INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND PEDAGOGY (IJEP)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: 3108-1800 ISSN Print: 3139-454X

Inclusive Education Practices for Diverse Learners: Examining Teacher Competencies, Classroom Strategies, and Academic Outcomes

Geenamol P G

Assistant Professor, Marian College Kuttikkanam (Autonomous), Idukki, India.

Article information

Received:13th October 2025
Received in revised form:15th November 2025
Accepted:17th December 2025
Available online:9th January 2026

Volume:2
Issue:1
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63090/IJEP/3108.1800.0026

Abstract

This mixed methods study investigates inclusive education practices across diverse educational settings, examining teacher competencies, classroom strategies, and academic outcomes for students with varying learning needs. The research was conducted across 42 schools encompassing elementary, middle, and secondary levels, involving 312 teachers and 4,850 students including those with identified disabilities, English language learners, and students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Quantitative data from classroom observations, teacher self-efficacy surveys, and student achievement measures were complemented by qualitative data from teacher interviews and focus groups. Findings reveal that successful inclusive practices depend upon teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, knowledge of differentiated instruction, and collaborative support systems. Schools demonstrating high-quality inclusive practices showed significantly better outcomes for students with disabilities and no negative effects on peers without identified needs. The study identifies critical barriers to inclusion including inadequate preparation, insufficient support personnel, and restrictive curriculum mandates. Implications for teacher preparation, school organization, and policy development are discussed.

Keywords: - Inclusive Education, Diverse Learners, Differentiated Instruction, Special Education, Teacher Preparation, Universal Design For Learning

I. INTRODUCTION

The movement toward inclusive education represents one of the most significant transformations in educational practice and policy over recent decades (Artiles et al., 2006). Grounded in principles of social justice and human rights, inclusive education advocates for the meaningful participation of all learners in general education settings regardless of disability status, cultural background, language proficiency, or other characteristics (Ainscow et al., 2006). International frameworks including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (United Nations, 2006) and the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) have established inclusion as a global educational priority, prompting nations worldwide to reconsider segregated educational models and develop more inclusive approaches.

Despite broad policy endorsement of inclusive principles, implementation remains challenging and inconsistent across educational contexts (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). Teachers report feeling inadequately prepared to address diverse learning needs (Forlin et al., 2014), and schools often lack the resources and support structures necessary for effective inclusion (McLeskey et al., 2017). Questions persist regarding whether inclusive placements produce academic and social benefits for students with disabilities without compromising outcomes for their peers (Kalambouka et al., 2007). These implementation challenges and outcome concerns underscore the need for research examining what constitutes effective inclusive practice and how such practice can be supported and sustained.

This study addresses critical questions regarding inclusive education implementation and effectiveness through comprehensive examination of practices across diverse school settings. The research investigates: What teacher competencies and beliefs are associated with effective inclusive practice? What instructional strategies do teachers employ to address diverse learning needs, and how effective are these strategies? What organizational and support factors enable successful inclusion? How do inclusive practices relate to academic outcomes for students with and without identified special needs? By addressing

these questions through rigorous mixed methods inquiry, the study aims to advance understanding of inclusive education and inform efforts to strengthen inclusive practice.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Conceptualizing Inclusive Education

Inclusive education has been conceptualized in multiple ways, ranging from narrow definitions focused on physical placement of students with disabilities in general education classrooms to broader conceptualizations encompassing transformation of educational systems to welcome and effectively serve all learners (Florian, 2014). (Ainscow et al., 2006) distinguish between narrow interpretations that view inclusion primarily as a special education issue and broader framings that address inclusion across multiple dimensions including disability, ethnicity, language, socioeconomic status, and gender. This broader conceptualization recognizes that barriers to participation affect diverse groups of learners and calls for systemic approaches addressing structural and attitudinal barriers within educational institutions (Slee, 2011).

Contemporary frameworks emphasize that inclusive education involves more than placement; it requires meaningful participation and achievement for all learners (Booth & Ainscow, 2011). The Index for Inclusion developed by (Booth & Ainscow, 2011) identifies three interconnected dimensions: inclusive cultures characterized by welcoming communities and inclusive values, inclusive policies that organize support for diversity, and inclusive practices that orchestrate learning to respond to learner diversity. This multidimensional framework highlights that effective inclusion requires attention to school culture, organizational structures, and classroom teaching practices (Ainscow, 2020).

2.2. Teacher Competencies for Inclusive Practice

Research has identified multiple teacher competencies associated with effective inclusive practice. Teacher self-efficacy, defined as beliefs about capability to bring about desired educational outcomes, has consistently emerged as a significant predictor of inclusive behaviors and student outcomes (Sharma et al., 2012). Teachers with higher self-efficacy for inclusive education demonstrate greater willingness to include students with diverse needs, employ more diverse instructional strategies, and persist in the face of challenges (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). (Bandura, 1997) social cognitive theory suggests that self-efficacy develops through mastery experiences, vicarious learning, social persuasion, and physiological states, providing direction for professional development design.

Knowledge and skills for differentiated instruction represent another critical competency domain. (Tomlinson, 2014) framework for differentiation identifies modification of content, process, product, and learning environment based on student readiness, interest, and learning profile as key strategies for addressing diverse needs. Universal Design for Learning (CAST, 2018) provides a complementary framework emphasizing proactive design of flexible curriculum and instruction that accommodates variability from the outset rather than requiring retrofitted modifications. Teachers skilled in these approaches can design instruction that provides multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression to reach diverse learners (Meyer et al., 2014).

2.3. Outcomes of Inclusive Education

Research examining outcomes of inclusive education has produced generally positive findings, though effects vary across contexts and populations. Meta-analyses by (Ruijs & Peetsma, 2009) and by (Oh-Young & Filler, 2015) found small to moderate positive effects of inclusive placement on academic outcomes for students with disabilities, with no negative effects on peers without disabilities. Social outcomes research indicates that inclusive settings can promote positive peer relationships and social skill development, though quality of implementation significantly moderates these effects (Koster et al., 2009). Students in well-implemented inclusive classrooms demonstrate greater acceptance of diversity and more positive attitudes toward peers with disabilities (de Boer et al., 2013).

However, research also indicates that poorly implemented inclusion can have neutral or negative effects, highlighting the importance of distinguishing between inclusive placement and inclusive practice (Lindsay, 2007). (Lindsay, 2007) comprehensive review concluded that while evidence generally supports inclusive education, variability in implementation quality and research methodology makes strong generalizations difficult. These findings underscore the need for research examining not merely whether inclusion works but how and under what conditions inclusive practices produce positive outcomes (Farrell, 2000).

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a concurrent mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018) integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to develop comprehensive understanding of inclusive education practices and outcomes. The quantitative strand examined relationships among teacher characteristics, inclusive practices, and student outcomes using survey, observation, and achievement data. The qualitative strand explored teacher experiences, perceptions, and practices through interviews and focus groups (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Integration occurred through connecting quantitative findings with qualitative insights to explain patterns and identify mechanisms underlying observed relationships (Fetters et al., 2013).

3.2. Participants and Settings

The study was conducted across 42 schools in three school districts representing urban, suburban, and rural contexts. Participating schools included 24 elementary schools, 10 middle schools, and 8 high schools. Teacher participants included 312 general and special education teachers across grade levels and subject areas. Student outcome data were analyzed for 4,850 students including 892 students with identified disabilities receiving services through individualized education programs, 1,247 English language learners, and 2,711 students without identified special needs. School selection ensured variation in demographic characteristics, inclusive practices, and organizational structures using purposive sampling strategies (Patton, 2015).

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

Multiple instruments captured the constructs of interest. The Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices scale (Sharma et al., 2012) measured teachers' self-efficacy beliefs across three subscales: efficacy in using inclusive instruction, efficacy in collaboration, and efficacy in managing behavior. Classroom observations used a researcher-developed protocol assessing differentiation practices, student engagement, and inclusive classroom climate, drawing on frameworks by (Tomlinson, 2014). Student achievement was measured through district benchmark assessments in reading and mathematics administered three times annually. Teacher interviews and focus groups followed semi-structured protocols (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) exploring inclusive practice experiences, challenges, and support needs.

3.4. Data Analysis

Quantitative analyses employed multilevel modeling (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) to account for the nested structure of students within classrooms within schools, with random assignment at the school level. Models examined relationships between teacher characteristics, observed inclusive practices, and student achievement while controlling for student demographics and prior achievement. Qualitative data were analyzed through thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), with coding frameworks developed both deductively from the research questions and inductively from patterns emerging in the data. Mixed methods integration involved developing joint displays (Guetterman et al., 2015) connecting quantitative findings with illustrative qualitative data and using qualitative insights to explain quantitative patterns.

3.5. Findings

3.5.1. Teacher Competencies and Self-Efficacy

Survey results revealed substantial variation in teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices, with mean scores indicating moderate confidence levels overall but significant dispersion across teachers. Teachers with more extensive preparation in special education and differentiation demonstrated significantly higher self-efficacy scores ($p < .01$), consistent with research by (Forlin et al., 2014). Years of teaching experience showed a curvilinear relationship with self-efficacy, with moderate experience teachers reporting highest confidence levels. Notably, self-efficacy for managing diverse behaviors showed the lowest mean scores and greatest variability, suggesting this domain represents a particular challenge for many teachers (Klassen & Chiu, 2010).

Interview data illuminated factors contributing to self-efficacy differences. Teachers expressing high self-efficacy described foundational preparation experiences that included extensive field placements in inclusive settings and specific coursework addressing diverse learners (Blanton et al., 2011). They also described ongoing professional learning opportunities focused on differentiation and collegial support from special education colleagues. Conversely, teachers with lower self-efficacy often described feeling unprepared by initial training and isolated in their current practice, with limited opportunities to develop inclusive competencies, reflecting concerns identified by (Florian and Linklater, 2010).

3.5.2. Inclusive Instructional Practices

Classroom observations documented wide variation in implementation of inclusive instructional practices, consistent with patterns reported by (McLeskey et al., 2017). High-implementation classrooms demonstrated consistent use of flexible grouping, multiple means of content representation, varied response options, and ongoing formative assessment informing instructional adjustments, reflecting Universal Design for Learning principles (CAST, 2018). Teachers in these classrooms demonstrated sophisticated understanding of individual student needs and employed varied strategies to address those needs while maintaining high expectations for all learners. Low-implementation classrooms showed predominantly whole-group instruction with limited differentiation, reliance on single modes of content delivery, and minimal adjustment based on student response.

Teacher self-efficacy scores significantly predicted observed inclusive practice quality ($p < .001$), even after controlling for preparation background and school context, supporting theoretical predictions by (Bandura, 1997). This relationship suggests that beliefs about capability translate into actual practice differences, supporting the importance of self-efficacy as a target for professional development (Sharma et al., 2012). Additionally, collaborative planning time with special education colleagues and access to instructional coaching predicted higher practice quality, indicating the role of organizational supports in enabling effective inclusion (Waldron & McLeskey, 2010).

3.5.3. Student Outcomes

Multilevel analyses revealed significant positive relationships between inclusive practice quality and achievement for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities in classrooms demonstrating high inclusive practice quality showed significantly greater achievement growth compared to those in lower quality classrooms ($p < .001$), with effect sizes of 0.34 standard deviations in reading and 0.28 in mathematics. Importantly, achievement outcomes for students without disabilities

were not negatively affected by inclusive placements, consistent with meta-analytic findings by (Ruijs & Peetsma, 2009). Indeed, students without disabilities in high inclusion quality classrooms showed slightly higher achievement than peers in lower quality classrooms, though this difference did not reach statistical significance.

English language learners also showed differential benefits related to inclusive practice quality, with higher quality classrooms associated with greater language proficiency and academic achievement growth ($p < .05$). Qualitative data suggested that differentiation strategies employed to support students with disabilities often benefited English language learners as well, including visual supports, explicit vocabulary instruction, and flexible grouping for targeted support (August & Shanahan, 2006). Teachers in high-quality inclusive classrooms described approaching diversity comprehensively rather than treating different student groups as requiring entirely distinct approaches, reflecting the intersectional perspective advocated by (Artiles et al., 2006).

3.5.4. Barriers and Enabling Factors

Interview and focus group data identified multiple barriers impeding inclusive practice, consistent with challenges reported in prior research (Forlin et al., 2014). Time constraints emerged as the most frequently cited barrier, with teachers describing insufficient planning time for differentiation and limited time for collaboration with special education colleagues. Class size and composition concerns were also prominent, with teachers expressing difficulty meeting diverse needs in large classes with high proportions of students requiring additional support. Curriculum rigidity and pacing mandates were identified as barriers in some contexts (McLeskey et al., 2017), with teachers feeling constrained in their ability to adapt instruction to student needs.

Enabling factors identified through qualitative analysis included collaborative co-teaching arrangements that combined general and special education expertise (Friend & Cook, 2017), regular common planning time for collaborative lesson design, instructional coaching supporting differentiation implementation (Kraft et al., 2018), and administrative leadership prioritizing inclusion (Crockett, 2002). Schools demonstrating high inclusive practice quality typically had strong principal leadership for inclusion, established co-teaching partnerships, and embedded time for professional collaboration. These organizational features appeared to create conditions enabling teachers to develop and sustain effective inclusive practices (Waldron & McLeskey, 2010).

IV. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study contribute to understanding of effective inclusive education by identifying teacher competencies, instructional practices, and organizational conditions associated with positive outcomes. The significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy and inclusive practice quality underscores the importance of developing teacher confidence alongside knowledge and skills, as emphasized by (Sharma et al., 2012). Professional development and teacher preparation programs should attend to building self-efficacy through mastery experiences, modeling of effective practice, and supportive feedback (Bandura, 1997), rather than focusing solely on information delivery.

The finding that high-quality inclusive practices benefit students with disabilities without harming peers addresses a persistent concern raised in debates about inclusion (Kalambouka et al., 2007). When implemented well, inclusive education appears to create rising tides that lift multiple boats, benefiting diverse learners through instructional approaches designed to address varied needs (Tomlinson, 2014). The key qualifier is implementation quality; poorly implemented inclusion may fail to produce benefits or could potentially have negative effects, highlighting the importance of attention to practice quality rather than merely placement (Lindsay, 2007).

The barriers identified in this study suggest that effective inclusion requires systemic support extending beyond individual teacher capacity (McLeskey et al., 2017). Time for collaboration and planning, manageable class sizes and composition, and flexible curriculum structures represent organizational conditions that enable or constrain teacher efforts (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). School leaders and policymakers bear responsibility for creating these conditions (Crockett, 2002), and without such structural supports, even well-prepared teachers may struggle to implement effective inclusive practices sustainably.

V. CONCLUSION

This study provides evidence that inclusive education, when implemented with quality, produces positive academic outcomes for students with disabilities and does not disadvantage peers without identified needs, supporting conclusions from prior meta-analyses (Ruijs & Peetsma, 2009). Effective inclusion depends upon teacher competencies including self-efficacy (Sharma et al., 2012), differentiation skills (Tomlinson, 2014), and collaborative practices, supported by organizational conditions including time for collaboration, co-teaching arrangements (Friend & Cook, 2017), and administrative leadership (Crockett, 2002). These findings have implications for multiple stakeholders: teacher preparation programs should emphasize inclusive pedagogy and provide extensive experience in inclusive settings (Blanton et al., 2011); schools should establish collaborative structures and protect time for professional learning; and policymakers should ensure resources adequate to support effective inclusion.

Future research should continue examining inclusive education across diverse contexts and investigating long-term outcomes for students in inclusive settings. Studies examining the experiences of students themselves, including their perspectives on inclusive placements and practices, would complement the teacher-focused inquiry presented here (Shogren et al., 2015). As inclusive education continues to evolve as both policy commitment and professional practice, ongoing research remains essential to guide implementation and ensure that inclusion realizes its promise of equitable educational opportunity for all learners (Ainscow, 2020).

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587

Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2006). Improving schools, developing inclusion. Routledge.

Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., Dorn, S., & Christensen, C. (2006). Learning in inclusive education research: Re-mediating theory and methods with a transformative agenda. Review of Research in Education, 30(1), 65–108. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X030001065

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

Blanton, L. P., Pugach, M. C., & Florian, L. (2011). Preparing general education teachers to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools (3rd ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

CAST. (2018). Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Crockett, J. B. (2002). Special education's role in preparing responsive leaders for inclusive schools. Remedial and Special Education, 23(3), 157–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325020230030401

de Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15(3), 331–353.

Farrell, P. (2000). The impact of research on developments in inclusive education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 4(2), 153–162.

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs: Principles and practices. Health Services Research, 48(6), 2134–2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? European Journal of Special Needs Education, 29(3), 286–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933551

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. British Educational Research Journal, 37(5), 813–828.

Florian, L., & Linklater, H. (2010). Preparing teachers for inclusive education: Using inclusive pedagogy to enhance teaching and learning for all. Cambridge Journal of Education, 40(4), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2010.526588

Forlin, C., Earle, C., Loreman, T., & Sharma, U. (2011). The Sentiments, Attitudes, and Concerns about Inclusive Education Revised (SACIE-R) scale for measuring pre-service teachers' perceptions about inclusion. Exceptionality Education International, 21(3), 50–65.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2016). Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals (8th ed.). Pearson.

Guetterman, T. C., Fetters, M. D., & Creswell, J. W. (2015). Integrating quantitative and qualitative results in health science mixed methods research through joint displays. Annals of Family Medicine, 13(6), 554–561.

Kalambouka, A., Farrell, P., Dyson, A., & Kaplan, I. (2007). The impact of placing pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools on the achievement of their peers. Educational Research, 49(4), 365–382.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(3), 741–756.

Koster, M., Nakken, H., Pijl, S. J., & van Houten, E. (2009). Being part of the peer group: A literature study focusing on the social dimension of inclusion in education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 13(2), 117–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110701284680

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. Review of Educational Research, 88(4), 547–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Lindsay, G. (2007). Educational psychology and the effectiveness of inclusive education/mainstreaming. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709906X156881

McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, B. (Eds.). (2021). Handbook of effective inclusive schools: Research and practice (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). Universal design for learning: Theory and practice. CAST Professional Publishing.

Oh-Young, C., & Filler, J. (2015). A meta-analysis of the effects of placement on academic and social skill outcome measures of students with disabilities. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 47, 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.08.014

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ruijs, N. M., & Peetsma, T. T. (2009). Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed. Educational Research Review, 4(2), 67–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2009.02.002

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 12(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x

Shogren, K. A., Gross, J. M., Forber-Pratt, A. J., Francis, G. L., Satter, A. L., Blue-Banning, M., & Hill, C. (2015). The perspectives of students with and without disabilities on inclusive schools. Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 40(4), 243–260. https://doi.org/10.1177/1540796915583492

Slee, R. (2011). The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education. Routledge.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD.

UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education. UNESCO.

United Nations. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. United Nations.

Waldron, N. L., & McLeskey, J. (2010). Establishing a collaborative school culture through comprehensive school reform. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 20(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410903535364.