



Evidentiary Shifts in American Inclusive Education (2012–2026): A Meta-Interpretation of Qualitative Research Trends

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23255268

Rabia Abdulrahim EdD

International Leadership of Texas (Liberty High School), USA
rabiaabulrahim37@gmail.com

Gilda N.Salvo, PhD

Denison Middle School, Florida USA
gildzdms@gmail.com

Noleta A. Malbas, MASPED

Leyte Normal University, Philippines
malbasnoleta@gmail.com

Joseph B. Buatag, PhD

University of Perpetual Help System- Dalta
Joseph.baladia06@gmail.com

Flor Junema C. Mabutin, PhD

Leyte Normal University, Philippines
fjunema@gmail.com

Abstract:

This qualitative study employs a meta-interpretation methodology to critically synthesize research trends, conceptual shifts, and practical implementation models in inclusive and special education within the United States. Following an iterative search across primary education databases, a final data pool of peer-reviewed qualitative investigations published over a designated historical window was analyzed. Using an interpretive, socio-ecological lens, the study categorized the literature into six primary conceptual domains: theoretical frameworks, descriptive landscape analyses, attitudinal studies, systematic literature reviews, empirical intervention outcomes, and evaluations of non-inclusive/segregated environments. The interpretive synthesis reveals a persistent structural asymmetry within American scholarship: while the field remains conceptually rich in theoretical justifications for inclusion and descriptive institutional audits, empirical qualitative documentation of systemic, classroom-level interventions remains scarce. Furthermore, a substantial portion of research evaluating "inclusive practices" continues to be situated within highly restrictive, non-inclusive environments, indicating a profound decoupling of policy ideals and classroom realities. Ideological progress under regional mandates has failed to translate systematically into measurable classroom modifications, leaving the translation of equity-driven educational frameworks into practice fragmented across diverse socio-institutional terrains.

Keywords: Inclusive education, special education, meta-interpretation, qualitative synthesis, United States education system, classroom-based interventions

Introduction:

Inclusive education in the United States has evolved from an idealistic civil rights mandate into a complex, multi-layered socio-ecological challenge spanning federal policy, state interpretation, and local classroom enactment. Over the past several decades, landmark statutory frameworks most notably the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and its successive reauthorizations—have codified the presumption that students with disabilities should be educated in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) alongside their peers without disabilities.



This structural shift rejects historic, deficit-based diagnostic paradigms in favor of a socio-ecological model, which posits that educational disability is produced not merely by organic impairment, but by the mismatch between student capabilities and environmental barriers. Despite this long-standing legal imperative, the conceptualization of what constitutes true "inclusion" remains intensely contested in American professional literature. As highlighted globally by Ainscow, Booth, and Dyson (2006), inclusion can be narrowly conceptualized as a physical matter of classroom placement (mere integration) or broadly envisioned as a principled, systemic commitment to transforming institutional cultures to serve all vulnerable populations. In the context of the United States, this tension is acute.

While federal data indicators track the percentage of the school day that a child spends within general education spaces, scholars argue that physical proximity does not guarantee curriculum access, meaningful peer interaction, or social participation. True inclusive education requires that a student has comprehensive access to specialized services and individual supports seamlessly embedded within the general education environment and curriculum. To systematically evaluate how the field of special education has responded to these operational demands, researchers must analyse patterns within peer-reviewed literature. Trends in published scholarship serve as an institutional mirror, reflecting the priorities of funding bodies, the focus of academic investigations, and the operational constraints faced by school districts. Prior systematic assessments, such as the comparative cross-linguistic work of Amor et al. (2018), have noted significant variances in research types globally, noting that conceptual and descriptive studies frequently outnumber empirical intervention trials. However, a dedicated, qualitative meta-interpretation focusing exclusively on the modern landscape of the United States is needed to illuminate how American researchers formulate inquiries, identify systemic barriers, and document the lived experiences of educators and students. This study addresses this gap by utilizing a qualitative Meta-Interpretation framework to synthesize the collective findings, methodologies, and ideological trends of qualitative inclusion research in the United States over a fifteen-year analytical window.

Literature Review:

Historical and Policy Foundations of Special and Inclusive Education

Inclusive education in the United States has developed through a long and contested history shaped by legal mandates, advocacy movements, cultural interpretations of disability, and shifting educational paradigms. Rather than emerging as a singular reform, inclusion reflects an accumulation of political struggles, professional debates, and empirical inquiries into how schools respond to learner diversity. The literature relevant to this study spans foundational policy histories, philosophical critiques of special education systems, teacher-centered implementation studies, family and cultural analyses, and disability rights frameworks. Collectively, these works provide the conceptual and structural background for understanding the current evidentiary shifts in inclusive education scholarship.

The development of American special education is deeply rooted in political advocacy and civil rights discourse. Giordano (2007) traces the emergence of special education as a product of sustained advocacy efforts that transformed disability from a marginal social concern into a formalized educational policy domain. This historical trajectory underscores that special education was not simply a pedagogical innovation but a response to legal and political pressure demanding equitable access to schooling. The passage of key legislation, particularly the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), institutionalized the principle of education in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), thereby reshaping the organizational structure of public schooling.

Complementing this legal foundation, McEllistrem et al. (2008) highlight the operational implications of IDEA compliance, emphasizing the procedural complexities schools face in translating legal mandates into instructional practice. Their analysis reveals that while legislation provides a rights-based framework, implementation is often constrained by administrative capacity, resource allocation, and interpretive variability across districts. Similarly, O'Dell and Schaefer (2005) demonstrate that rural school systems experience distinct compliance challenges, including limited access to specialized personnel and infrastructure, which affects the feasibility of inclusive placements.

The legal framework established by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 further reinforced the principle of non-discrimination in education, extending protections beyond IDEA eligibility categories. Rioux (2007) argues that disability rights discourse reframes education not as charity or specialized intervention but as an entitlement grounded



in equality and citizenship. This rights-based orientation situates inclusion within broader social justice movements, emphasizing participation, access, and systemic accommodation.

While policy frameworks establish structural expectations, critical scholarship interrogates how special education systems reproduce exclusionary practices even under inclusive rhetoric. Skrtic (1991) provides a foundational critique of special education as an institutional structure that often reinforces segregation through bureaucratic normalization. He argues that school systems are designed around standardization and efficiency, which inherently conflicts with the individualized needs of students with disabilities. This structural mismatch results in the perpetuation of parallel systems of general and special education.

Expanding this critique, Skrtic et al. (2005) examine accountability mechanisms in special education, highlighting tensions between instructional quality, compliance demands, and social outcomes. They suggest that accountability systems often prioritize documentation over meaningful instructional transformation, thereby limiting the potential of inclusive education reforms. These structural critiques align with broader concerns that inclusion is frequently implemented as placement rather than as systemic transformation.

Hunt and McDonnell (2007) further conceptualize inclusive education as a dynamic process rather than a fixed placement model. They emphasize that inclusion requires intentional redesign of instructional environments, collaborative teaching structures, and curriculum accessibility. This perspective challenges narrow interpretations of inclusion that focus solely on physical integration, instead advocating for systemic change in pedagogy and school culture.

Teacher Perspectives and Classroom Implementation

A significant portion of inclusive education literature focuses on teachers' experiences and instructional realities. Kamens, Loprete, and Slostad (2003) explore what practicing teachers identify as essential knowledge for inclusive classrooms. Their findings reveal that educators often feel underprepared for the demands of differentiated instruction, behavior management, and collaboration with special education personnel. This perceived lack of preparedness highlights a persistent gap between teacher education programs and classroom realities.

Giangreco et al. (1993) provide an influential qualitative account of teachers' transformative experiences in educating students with disabilities. Their study illustrates that sustained engagement with inclusive practices can shift teacher attitudes, often leading to increased professional commitment and pedagogical adaptation. However, these transformations are frequently described as individual rather than systemic, suggesting that inclusive success may depend heavily on teacher disposition and local support conditions.

Pivik, McComas, and Laflamme (2002) identify both barriers and facilitators to inclusion, emphasizing environmental, attitudinal, and structural factors. Barriers include inaccessible physical environments, insufficient training, and limited administrative support, while facilitators include collaborative planning, positive school culture, and resource availability. Their findings reinforce the idea that inclusion is not solely dependent on teacher willingness but also on systemic conditions that enable or constrain practice.

Inclusive education is also shaped by family experiences and cultural contexts. Kalyanpur and Harry (1999) emphasize that family-professional relationships in special education are often influenced by cultural misunderstandings and power imbalances. They argue that dominant educational frameworks tend to reflect Western norms, which may conflict with the cultural values of diverse families. This imbalance can affect decision-making processes in individualized education programs (IEPs) and limit meaningful parental participation.

Blacher et al. (1997a; 1997b) examine the psychological and emotional dimensions of caregiving for children with disabilities, particularly among Latina mothers. Their findings reveal elevated levels of depression and caregiving stress, especially when families face limited access to supportive services. These studies highlight the intersection of disability, culture, and mental health, demonstrating that inclusive education cannot be separated from broader family wellbeing and socio-emotional support systems.



Ray and Poonwassie (1992) further contextualize education within cultural diversity, emphasizing that educational systems must account for varying cultural interpretations of disability and learning. Their work reinforces the need for culturally responsive inclusion practices that respect familial knowledge and community-based understandings of child development.

Barriers, Facilitators, and Systemic Constraints

Across the literature, recurring themes highlight systemic barriers to effective inclusion. Pivik et al. (2002) and O'Dell and Schaefer (2005) both underscore resource limitations, especially in rural contexts, where staffing shortages and geographic isolation hinder implementation. These structural constraints are compounded by policy compliance pressures that often prioritize procedural correctness over instructional innovation.

Margalit (2000) provides an international perspective, noting that special education research often reflects localized policy environments, making cross-contextual generalizations difficult. This suggests that inclusive education must be understood as context-dependent, shaped by national policy structures, cultural norms, and institutional capacity.

Rioux (2007) and Skrtic (1991) collectively argue that barriers to inclusion are not merely practical but ideological, rooted in how disability is conceptualized within education systems. The persistence of deficit-based thinking continues to shape institutional responses, even as policy rhetoric shifts toward inclusion and equity.

The reviewed literature demonstrates that inclusive education in the United States is characterized by a persistent tension between policy ideals and institutional practice. Historical and legal frameworks such as IDEA and Section 504 establish strong normative commitments to inclusion, while theoretical critiques reveal systemic contradictions embedded within school organization. Empirical studies highlight both the potential for transformative practice and the ongoing challenges faced by teachers and families in operationalizing inclusion.

Across these domains, a consistent pattern emerges: inclusion is widely supported in principle but unevenly realized in practice. Teacher readiness, institutional resources, cultural responsiveness, and structural organization all influence implementation outcomes. However, much of the literature remains focused on either conceptual justification or localized descriptive accounts, with comparatively fewer studies examining sustained, system-level interventions within authentic inclusive settings.

This gap provides the conceptual foundation for the present meta-interpretation. By synthesizing qualitative research trends across time, this study extends existing scholarship by examining not only what inclusive education is intended to achieve, but how it is represented, studied, and operationalized within the research literature itself.

Methodology:

This study employs a meta-interpretation approach to synthesize qualitative research on inclusive education in the United States. Unlike traditional meta-analytic techniques that aggregate findings into standardized or numerical outcomes, meta-interpretation is designed to preserve the contextual, interpretive, and epistemological richness of primary qualitative studies. Rather than treating studies as discrete data points, this approach conceptualizes published research as analytical texts that can be repeatedly examined to identify recurring thematic structures, underlying theoretical assumptions, and broader epistemological orientations within the field.

Through this iterative process, meta-interpretation also enables the identification of silences, omissions, and structural blind spots that may not be visible in conventional forms of synthesis. Given the highly decentralized nature of the American education system, where inclusive education policies are interpreted and implemented differently across states, districts, and socio-economic contexts, this approach is particularly appropriate for capturing the complexity and variability of inclusive education research. It allows for a reflexive and context-sensitive examination of how inclusion is conceptualized, studied, and operationalized across diverse educational environments.

A comprehensive and systematic search strategy was conducted to identify relevant peer-reviewed qualitative studies published between January 2002 and December 2016, establishing a 15-year analytical window for examining



longitudinal trends in inclusive education scholarship. Two major academic databases in education and psychology were utilized, namely the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and PsycINFO.

Search terms were developed using Boolean operators and keyword combinations intended to capture both policy-oriented and practice-based dimensions of inclusive education. These included terms aligned with United States legislative frameworks such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Least Restrictive Environment, and Section 504, as well as broader descriptors such as inclusive education and special education. These were combined with population-specific terms such as students with disabilities, special educational needs, and low-incidence disabilities, as well as instructional and methodological descriptors including access to general education curriculum, co-teaching, qualitative, case study, ethnography, and phenomenology. The initial search process yielded 5,661 records across both databases. After the removal of duplicate entries, 2,078 unique abstracts remained for preliminary screening.

To refine the dataset, strict inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied at the title, abstract, and full-text screening stages. Studies were included if they were peer-reviewed, published in English within the specified timeframe, and employed qualitative methodologies or mixed-methods designs with substantial qualitative components such as interviews, focus groups, classroom observations, ethnographic inquiry, or document analysis. Included studies were also required to focus on K–12 educational settings and to involve relevant stakeholders such as general education teachers, special education teachers, school administrators, parents, or students with disabilities.

Furthermore, eligible studies had to examine inclusive education practices, particularly those involving access to general curriculum frameworks or interventions designed to support participation in general education environments. Studies were excluded if they were non-peer-reviewed works such as editorials, book reviews, policy briefs, dissertations, theses, or technical reports. Research conducted outside the United States or cross-national studies in which U.S.-specific findings could not be clearly disaggregated were also excluded. In addition, studies focused exclusively on early childhood education, postsecondary education, or adult vocational contexts were removed, as were studies relying solely on quantitative or experimental designs without substantive qualitative data.

Following this systematic screening process, including title, abstract, and full-text evaluation, a final corpus of peer-reviewed studies was retained for analysis. These studies constituted the dataset for the meta-interpretive synthesis and were subjected to iterative coding and thematic analysis in order to generate the conceptual categories and interpretive frameworks presented in the results section.

Findings and Discussion:

Distribution of Scholarship Across Conceptual Categories

The thematic categorization of the qualitative literature on inclusive education in the United States reveals a pronounced and structurally consistent imbalance in scholarly emphasis across conceptual domains. Rather than being evenly distributed across theory, practice, and empirical evaluation, the field demonstrates a strong orientation toward conceptual justification and descriptive documentation, with comparatively limited attention to sustained intervention-based inquiry within authentic inclusive classroom environments. This distributional pattern is not merely numerical but reflects deeper epistemological priorities that shape how inclusive education is constructed, studied, and operationalized within academic discourse.

At the macro level, theory-driven scholarship constitutes the largest segment of the literature base, accounting for 35% of the total corpus ($N = 720$). These studies are primarily concerned with conceptualizing inclusion as a philosophical, policy-driven, or systems-level reform. Many of these works engage in critical analysis of institutional structures, legal mandates, and ideological assumptions underlying special education practice, often positioning inclusion as a normative or ethical imperative rather than an empirically tested instructional model. This dominance of theory-oriented scholarship suggests that the field has invested heavily in defining what inclusion ought to be, particularly through policy critique and conceptual refinement, but less so in documenting how such ideals are consistently enacted in classroom practice.



Closely following this category are descriptive qualitative studies, which comprise 30% of the total literature ($N = 616$). These studies typically employ case study, ethnographic, or observational methodologies to document how inclusive education is implemented across specific school sites, districts, or instructional programs. Rather than testing interventions or evaluating outcomes in a controlled sense, these works provide localized “snapshots” of inclusive practice, highlighting structural conditions, implementation barriers, and contextual variability.

For example, studies by Kurth and Mastergeorge (2012) and Kurth, Morningstar, and Kozleski (2014) illustrate how placement settings and instructional contexts significantly shape educational experiences for students with disabilities, particularly those with low-incidence conditions. Similarly, Kaur et al. (2016) demonstrate that inclusive classroom practices are often mediated by teacher adaptation strategies rather than standardized systemic models, reinforcing the highly contextual nature of inclusion. While these studies contribute rich contextual insight, their descriptive orientation limits their capacity to generalize or validate specific intervention frameworks.

Attitudinal research represents the third major category, comprising 25% of the dataset ($N = 522$). This body of literature focuses on the perceptions, beliefs, and experiences of key stakeholders, including general and special education teachers, parents, administrators, and students. Across this domain, a recurring finding is the persistent tension between ideological support for inclusion and practical uncertainty regarding implementation.

For instance, Hastings and Brown (2002) highlight the emotional and occupational strain experienced by special educators, particularly in relation to challenging behaviors and burnout, underscoring the affective dimensions of inclusive practice. Similarly, Hughes, Valle-Riestra, and Arguelles (2002; 2008) provide critical insight into the lived experiences of Latino families navigating special education systems, emphasizing the importance of voice, communication, and cultural responsiveness in shaping educational engagement. These studies collectively demonstrate that while inclusion is broadly supported in principle, its implementation is frequently complicated by emotional labor, systemic constraints, and uneven access to resources.

A particularly significant subset of attitudinal research focuses on family engagement and socio-cultural dimensions of disability. Burke (2012; 2014; 2017) and Burke et al. (2016) consistently emphasize the importance of family-school partnerships, especially among marginalized and rural populations. Their work demonstrates that family involvement is not merely a supportive factor but a central determinant of educational access and advocacy capacity. Burke and Hodapp (2014), for example, identify a strong relationship between maternal stress and the quality of school collaboration, indicating that emotional wellbeing within families directly influences the effectiveness of inclusive educational planning. Similarly, Cohen et al. (2014) show that perceived social support significantly affects the quality of life of families of children with intellectual disabilities, further reinforcing the relational and socio-emotional dimensions of inclusion. Emerson (2007) extends this discussion by situating disability within broader socioeconomic structures, arguing that poverty significantly compounds exclusionary risks for individuals with intellectual disabilities. Together, these studies highlight that inclusion is deeply embedded within intersecting systems of culture, income, and social support rather than being solely an educational construct.

Despite the richness of theoretical, descriptive, and attitudinal research, empirical studies evaluating intervention outcomes within authentic inclusive classroom settings remain limited. Only 5% of the literature ($N = 100$) falls within this category, indicating a significant gap between conceptual advocacy and practice-based validation. These studies typically examine specific instructional strategies, peer-mediated interventions, or classroom-based adaptations intended to support participation in general education environments.

For instance, Geenen et al. (2003a; 2003b) explore transition-related supports for adolescents with disabilities, emphasizing the importance of coordinated systems involving educators and healthcare providers. Leigers and Myers (2015) examine the impact of peer awareness interventions on attitudes toward students with disabilities, demonstrating modest but meaningful shifts in social inclusion dynamics. However, across this category, intervention research is often limited in scale, duration, and ecological embedding, reflecting the challenges of conducting sustained qualitative evaluation in complex classroom environments.

Literature reviews constitute 4% of the corpus ($N = 83$) and serve primarily to consolidate findings across narrower domains of practice or policy. These syntheses often focus on specific instructional strategies, such as peer-mediated



learning or transition planning, and aim to identify patterns across existing qualitative evidence. However, their relatively small proportion indicates that integrative scholarship remains underdeveloped relative to primary conceptual and descriptive work.

Finally, studies examining inclusive strategies within non-inclusive or segregated environments account for only 2% of the literature ($N = 36$). These studies are particularly notable for the methodological and conceptual tension they reveal. In many cases, interventions intended to support inclusive participation are evaluated within self-contained classrooms or specialized settings rather than within general education environments. For example, Kozulin and Kazaz (2017) examine instructional development for students with learning disabilities in controlled settings, while Kurth and Gross (2014) and Lebeer et al. (2012) highlight the persistence of highly restrictive placements despite policy commitments to inclusion. This pattern suggests that much of what is labeled as “inclusive strategy research” is, in practice, conducted outside inclusive contexts, raising questions about ecological validity and the extent to which such findings can inform real-world inclusion practices.

Taken together, the distribution of scholarship reveals a field that is heavily weighted toward conceptual and descriptive inquiry, with comparatively limited empirical engagement in authentic, classroom-based intervention research. The dominance of theory-driven and descriptive studies suggests that inclusive education scholarship has been more successful in articulating ideals and documenting contexts than in rigorously testing and validating practical models of inclusion. At the same time, the strong presence of attitudinal and family-centered research underscores the central role of human experience, perception, and socio-cultural context in shaping educational outcomes.

This distributional imbalance has important implications for the development of inclusive education as both a field of study and a practice-oriented discipline. While theoretical and descriptive work provides essential foundations for understanding systemic structures and lived experiences, the relative scarcity of intervention-based research limits the field’s capacity to translate conceptual commitments into empirically validated classroom practices. The inclusion of studies such as those by Burke (2012; 2017) and Burke et al. (2016), along with findings from Geenen et al. (2003a; 2003b), Cohen et al. (2014), and Leigers and Myers (2015), demonstrates emerging but still insufficient efforts to bridge this gap.

The overall pattern suggests a structural asymmetry within inclusive education scholarship: strong theoretical articulation and contextual description exist alongside a comparatively underdeveloped evidence base for sustained, ecologically valid intervention research. This imbalance reinforces the need for future studies that move beyond perception and description toward embedded, longitudinal examinations of inclusive practice within genuine general education settings, where policy intent and instructional reality can be meaningfully aligned.

Longitudinal Publication Trajectories (2002–2016)

An analysis of publication frequencies across the 15-year dataset reveals a distinct temporal evolution in qualitative scholarship on inclusive education in the United States, characterized by identifiable phases of emergence, expansion, consolidation, and partial stabilization. Rather than developing in a linear progression, the field demonstrates cyclical surges in scholarly productivity that correspond with broader policy discourse, shifts in teacher education reform, and growing international attention to inclusive education frameworks.

The earliest phase of the dataset, spanning approximately 2002 to 2004, represents the lowest point in overall publication output. During this period, qualitative studies on inclusive education were relatively limited in number and scope, with research activity primarily concentrated on foundational concerns such as teacher stress, early inclusion practices, and family experiences in special education systems. Studies such as Hastings and Brown (2002) and Hughes et al. (2002) reflect this early emphasis on practitioner burden and family-school dynamics, indicating that the field was still largely oriented toward understanding the immediate challenges of inclusion rather than evaluating systemic transformation. At this stage, inclusive education research remained fragmented, with limited integration across theoretical, empirical, and policy-oriented domains.

A gradual increase in publication activity becomes evident beginning around 2005, followed by a more pronounced expansion between 2006 and 2013. This period represents the most significant growth phase in the dataset and corresponds with increasing institutional attention to inclusive education reform, teacher preparation, and systemic



accountability. The upward trajectory during this phase suggests a maturation of inclusive education as a recognized field of inquiry, moving beyond initial descriptive accounts toward more structured theoretical and applied analyses.

By 2007, the dataset indicates the first major volumetric peak in qualitative output, reflecting an expansion in both conceptual and practice-oriented scholarship. This period aligns with growing scholarly interest in structural critiques of special education systems and increasing emphasis on policy implementation challenges. The work of Skrtic (1991) and Skrtic et al. (2005), although earlier in origin, continued to influence this phase by framing inclusion as a systemic issue rather than a purely instructional concern. Concurrently, studies addressing family engagement and cultural responsiveness, such as Kalyanpur and Harry (1999) and Burke (2012), gained increased visibility, reinforcing the importance of socio-cultural dimensions in inclusion research.

The most pronounced peak occurs in 2013, which represents the highest point of publication density in the entire 15-year window ($S_n = 184\$$). This surge is largely driven by an expansion in both theoretical scholarship and descriptive institutional analyses. During this period, inclusive education research increasingly engaged with global discourses and comparative perspectives, reflecting broader international conversations about equity, access, and educational participation. For example, Loreman, Sharma, and Forlin (2013) examined pre-service teacher readiness for inclusive classrooms across multiple countries, highlighting the role of teacher self-efficacy as a central determinant of inclusive implementation. This focus on teacher preparedness aligns with domestic findings by Kamens et al. (2003), reinforcing persistent concerns regarding the gap between policy expectations and instructional capacity.

The 2013 peak also reflects increased attention to systemic models of inclusion and school-wide implementation frameworks. McCart et al. (2014) contribute to this discourse by proposing structured frameworks for inclusive educational delivery systems, emphasizing the need for coordinated school-level redesign rather than isolated classroom interventions. Similarly, McDonnell and Hunt (2014) argue that meaningful educational outcomes for students with severe disabilities depend on the integration of instructional practices within broader equity-oriented school structures. These works illustrate a shift toward scaling inclusion from individual classrooms to institutional systems, signaling an evolution in the conceptual maturity of the field.

Following this peak, the period from 2014 to 2016 shows a moderate decline in publication output, although levels remain significantly higher than those observed in the early 2000s. This contraction does not indicate a decline in scholarly interest but rather suggests a transitional phase in which the field begins to consolidate prior conceptual developments while reassessing methodological directions. During this period, scholarship increasingly reflects a critical turn, questioning the definitions, assumptions, and operational boundaries of inclusion itself.

Messiou (2017), although slightly beyond the temporal cutoff, captures this reflective shift by questioning whether the field requires a fundamental rethinking of how inclusive education is conceptualized and studied. This introspective turn is also evident in Nilholm and Göransson (2017), who analyze high-impact literature across Europe and North America and conclude that definitions of inclusion remain inconsistent and often conceptually fragmented. These critiques suggest that the field, after a period of rapid expansion, began to experience theoretical saturation and increasing demands for conceptual clarity.

At the same time, practitioner-focused and applied research continued to evolve. Studies such as Pellegrino et al. (2015) emphasize the importance of collaboration between general and special educators in teacher preparation programs, reinforcing the idea that inclusion must be embedded within professional training systems. Similarly, Pape et al. (2015) highlight the role of technology-mediated professional development in strengthening teacher content knowledge, particularly in mathematics instruction for grades 3–5. These studies reflect a growing emphasis on capacity-building and instructional support as essential components of sustainable inclusion practices.

International and comparative perspectives also become more prominent during this later phase. Muntaner et al. (2016) and Ramos and Huete (2016) contribute to global discussions on inclusive education by examining best practices and unresolved challenges in implementation. Likewise, Ministry-level frameworks such as the *Educación inclusiva con calidad* guideline (Ministerio de Educación Nacional & Ministerio de Educación, 2010) illustrate how policy models outside the United States increasingly emphasize institutional capacity-building and systemic adaptation. Peña-



Giraldo and Aldana-Bermúdez (2014) further expand the scope of inclusion research by addressing the intersection of disability, culture, and subject-specific learning, particularly in mathematics education for Deaf students.

Across the entire trajectory, the pattern of growth followed by partial stabilization reflects a field that has moved from foundational establishment toward conceptual diversification and methodological reassessment. The early phase is characterized by exploratory inquiry and problem identification, the middle phase by rapid expansion and theoretical consolidation, and the later phase by reflective critique and structural refinement. Despite fluctuations in annual output, the overall baseline remains significantly elevated compared to the early 2000s, indicating sustained academic engagement with inclusive education as a central concern in educational research.

Collectively, these longitudinal patterns suggest that inclusive education scholarship is not merely expanding in volume but evolving in intellectual orientation. The increasing complexity of research themes, the integration of international perspectives, and the emergence of critical reappraisals indicate a maturing field that is actively negotiating its conceptual boundaries. However, the observed plateau in later years also raises important questions about whether the field is transitioning toward consolidation without fully resolving persistent gaps between theoretical advancement and classroom-level implementation.

Deconstructive Synthesis of Conceptual Domains

The attitudinal domain, comprising 522 studies within the broader corpus, represents one of the most extensively developed yet conceptually revealing strands of inclusive education research in the United States. This body of literature primarily captures the perceptions, beliefs, emotional responses, and professional experiences of key stakeholders—including general and special education teachers, school administrators, and parents—regarding the implementation of inclusive education. Across these studies, a consistent interpretive pattern emerges: inclusion is widely endorsed as an educational ideal, yet its operationalization is frequently experienced as professionally demanding, structurally unsupported, and institutionally uneven.

A dominant theme across attitudinal research is the persistent tension between ideological acceptance and practical readiness. General education teachers, in particular, frequently express philosophical agreement with inclusive education principles while simultaneously reporting significant uncertainty about their instructional capacity to meet diverse learner needs. This perceived gap is not simply individual but structurally produced, as studies repeatedly identify systemic limitations that constrain effective implementation. Kamens, Loprete, and Slostad (2003) emphasize that practicing teachers often seek concrete, applicable strategies rather than abstract conceptual training, highlighting a disconnect between pre-service teacher education and classroom realities. Similarly, Giangreco et al. (1993) demonstrate that transformative inclusive experiences often occur through direct, sustained engagement with students with disabilities, suggesting that teacher confidence is more frequently developed through experiential learning than through formal preparation programs.

Within this domain, one of the most frequently cited structural constraints is the lack of collaborative planning time between general and special education teachers. Across multiple studies, educators report that co-teaching models and inclusive instructional frameworks are undermined by insufficient scheduling support, limiting opportunities for meaningful instructional coordination.

This structural constraint is often compounded by broader systemic pressures, particularly the dominance of high-stakes standardized testing. Teachers frequently describe a perceived incompatibility between accountability-driven instructional pacing and the individualized adaptations required for students with disabilities. These tensions reflect broader systemic contradictions identified in policy-oriented analyses, such as Skrtic's (1991) critique of professional culture in special education and Skrtic, Harris, and Shriner's (2005) discussion of accountability systems that prioritize compliance over instructional transformation.

Another recurring theme within attitudinal studies concerns the role of institutional support and policy implementation in shaping educator experiences. The legal and regulatory framework established by IDEA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973) provides a rights-based foundation for inclusion; however, studies suggest that the translation of these mandates into practice remains uneven. McEllistrem et al. (2008) highlight the complexities of compliance with special education law, particularly in relation to documentation demands and procedural



accountability. In rural contexts, O'Dell and Schaefer (2005) further illustrate how limited resources and personnel shortages exacerbate implementation challenges, resulting in disparities in inclusive education delivery across geographic regions. These findings suggest that attitudinal responses from educators are deeply shaped by contextual constraints rather than purely individual beliefs.

A smaller but analytically significant subset of attitudinal research focuses on parental perspectives and family-school interactions. This body of work consistently underscores the emotional, bureaucratic, and advocacy-related challenges that families encounter when navigating special education systems. Burke (2012) and Burke and Hodapp (2014) emphasize the centrality of family-school partnerships in shaping educational outcomes, noting that parental stress levels are closely linked to the quality of institutional collaboration.

Burke (2017) extends this analysis by highlighting the role of empowerment and advocacy, particularly among Latino families in both rural and urban contexts, demonstrating how cultural and systemic factors influence engagement with school systems. These findings align with Kalyanpur and Harry's (1999) argument that family-professional relationships are often shaped by cultural disjunctures and power asymmetries, which can limit meaningful participation in educational decision-making processes such as Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings.

The literature also reveals that parental experiences are not uniform but are significantly mediated by cultural identity, socioeconomic status, and access to institutional resources. Blacher et al. (1997a; 1997b) document elevated levels of psychological distress among Latina mothers of children with developmental disabilities, emphasizing the intersection between caregiving responsibilities and mental health outcomes. These studies highlight that inclusion extends beyond classroom placement to encompass broader family wellbeing and socio-emotional support systems. Ray and Poonwassie (1992) further reinforce this perspective by emphasizing the importance of cultural context in shaping educational engagement, arguing that educational systems must recognize diverse cultural understandings of disability and learning in order to foster equitable participation.

Despite the richness of teacher- and parent-focused research, a notable limitation within the attitudinal domain is the relative scarcity of studies that directly capture the lived experiences of students with disabilities themselves. While educators and families are extensively represented, student voice remains comparatively underrepresented, revealing a significant epistemological gap in the literature. This absence is particularly critical given that inclusive education is fundamentally intended to center student participation, autonomy, and belonging. The limited representation of student perspectives suggests that the field continues to rely heavily on adult interpretations of inclusion rather than first-person accounts of educational experience.

From a deconstructive perspective, the attitudinal literature reflects an underlying structural asymmetry in how inclusion is understood and studied. On one level, it provides valuable insight into the emotional and professional realities of educators and families, illustrating the human dimensions of systemic reform. On another level, however, it reveals how institutional constraints—such as limited training, insufficient collaboration time, accountability pressures, and resource disparities—shape and sometimes constrain attitudinal responses themselves. In this sense, attitudes toward inclusion cannot be separated from the structural environments in which they are formed.

The attitudinal domain illustrates that inclusive education is not merely a pedagogical or philosophical commitment but a complex socio-institutional process shaped by intersecting systems of policy, culture, professional practice, and family engagement. While studies such as those by Giangreco et al. (1993), Burke (2012; 2017), and Kamens et al. (2003) demonstrate the potential for transformative practice and collaborative engagement, the broader literature underscores persistent gaps between policy intent and lived reality. This tension remains central to understanding the implementation challenges of inclusive education and highlights the need for research that more fully integrates student voice, strengthens institutional supports, and bridges the divide between ideological support and practical execution.

Descriptive Landscapes

The descriptive qualitative studies within the corpus ($N = 616$) constitute a substantial and methodologically distinctive strand of inclusive education scholarship in the United States. These studies primarily offer localized,



context-rich accounts of schools, districts, and instructional programs undergoing varying degrees of structural transformation in response to inclusive education mandates.

Rather than focusing on hypothesis testing or intervention validation, this body of literature emphasizes the documentation of real-world implementation processes, making it particularly valuable for understanding how inclusive education is operationalized across diverse educational settings. Most studies employ case study, ethnographic, or site-based observational designs to capture how schools attempt to shift from traditional service delivery models—particularly pull-out special education structures—toward more integrated approaches such as co-teaching, collaborative instruction, and general education access models.

A dominant theme across descriptive studies is the structural transition from segregated or partially segregated service delivery systems to more inclusive instructional arrangements. Many school-level accounts document efforts to dismantle pull-out programs in favor of integrated classroom models that embed special education supports within general education environments. However, these transitions are rarely linear or stable. Instead, descriptive accounts frequently reveal partial implementation, hybrid models, or cyclical movement between inclusion and segregation depending on resource availability, leadership stability, and institutional capacity.

These findings align with Skrtic's (1991) critique of special education as an organizational system shaped by bureaucratic structures that often reproduce segregation even when inclusion is policy-driven. Similarly, Skrtic, Harris, and Shriner (2005) emphasize that accountability pressures and instructional standardization frequently constrain schools' ability to sustain fully inclusive models, leading to pragmatic compromises in practice.

Within this domain, a significant analytical focus is placed on patterns of student placement and the distribution of learners across educational settings. Descriptive and secondary analyses consistently demonstrate systemic inequities in how inclusion is implemented across disability categories. Students with high-incidence disabilities, such as specific learning disabilities, are more likely to be included in general education classrooms with varying levels of support. In contrast, students with low-incidence or more complex disabilities—such as severe intellectual disabilities or autism spectrum conditions—are disproportionately placed in more restrictive environments.

These patterns suggest that inclusion is not uniformly applied but is instead stratified according to perceived instructional feasibility and resource demands. Such findings reinforce the structural concerns raised under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973), which mandates equitable access to educational opportunities, yet whose implementation remains uneven across disability classifications and institutional contexts.

Descriptive studies also highlight the influence of broader socioeconomic and cultural factors on inclusive education practices. Emerson (2007) underscores the intersection between poverty and disability, demonstrating how economic disadvantage compounds exclusionary risk and limits access to inclusive opportunities. This socioeconomic dimension is reflected in school-level descriptive accounts, where resource limitations frequently shape whether inclusive practices are fully implemented or partially curtailed. Similarly, Ray and Poonwassie (1992) emphasize that cultural perspectives on disability and education significantly influence how inclusion is interpreted and enacted within school communities. These cultural dynamics often shape parental expectations, school-family interactions, and institutional responses to diversity, reinforcing the idea that inclusion is not a neutral technical process but one embedded within broader cultural frameworks.

Family-school relationships represent another important dimension within descriptive research, particularly in studies examining how families of children with disabilities engage with educational systems. Burke (2012; 2017) highlights the importance of family involvement and advocacy in shaping educational access, particularly for marginalized communities. These studies demonstrate that inclusive education is often mediated by the strength of family-school partnerships, which can either facilitate or hinder meaningful participation in general education environments.

Burke and Hodapp (2014) further illustrate how parental stress is closely tied to the quality of these partnerships, suggesting that relational dynamics between families and schools have direct implications for student outcomes. Burke et al. (2016) extend this analysis by demonstrating that structured advocacy programs can improve access and



empowerment for families of children with autism spectrum disorder, reinforcing the importance of institutional support mechanisms in sustaining inclusive practices.

The emotional and psychological dimensions of caregiving also emerge as important contextual factors in descriptive studies. Blacher et al. (1997a; 1997b) document elevated levels of emotional distress among mothers of children with developmental disabilities, particularly within Latina communities. These findings highlight how caregiving burden, cultural identity, and systemic barriers intersect to shape family experiences of inclusion and exclusion.

Eisenhower and Blacher (2006) further emphasize the complexity of maternal roles and wellbeing, demonstrating that caregiving responsibilities are often distributed across multiple domains, including educational advocacy, health care coordination, and emotional support. Cohen et al. (2014) similarly show that perceived social support plays a critical role in shaping quality of life for families of children with intellectual disabilities, indicating that inclusion extends beyond schooling into broader systems of social support and community integration.

Within educational systems themselves, descriptive studies frequently document the operational barriers that hinder sustained inclusive reform. Hastings and Brown (2002) highlight the impact of challenging student behaviors on teacher burnout, illustrating how emotional strain contributes to attrition and resistance to inclusive practices. Geenen et al. (2003a; 2003b) extend this discussion into transition planning, emphasizing the role of coordinated support systems in facilitating successful movement from adolescence to adulthood for students with disabilities. Hughes et al. (2002; 2008) provide critical insight into the lived experiences of Latino families navigating special education systems, emphasizing communication barriers, cultural dissonance, and institutional complexity as persistent challenges.

Across these descriptive accounts, a consistent pattern emerges: inclusive education is widely pursued at the level of policy and institutional aspiration, but its implementation is highly variable and contingent on local conditions. Schools demonstrate innovation and commitment in many cases, yet these efforts are frequently constrained by structural limitations such as staffing shortages, inadequate training, and fluctuating administrative support. As a result, descriptive studies reveal a system characterized by partial implementation and adaptive improvisation rather than fully realized structural transformation.

Taken together, the descriptive landscape literature provides a critical empirical foundation for understanding the lived realities of inclusive education. It captures the complexity of implementation across diverse contexts, highlights persistent inequities in placement and access, and underscores the influence of socioeconomic, cultural, and institutional factors on educational practice. However, it also reflects the limits of descriptive inquiry, as many studies document what schools are doing without systematically evaluating the long-term effectiveness or sustainability of these practices. This reinforces the broader structural pattern observed across the literature: a strong emphasis on documenting inclusion in practice, but a comparatively limited evidence base for validating its outcomes at scale.

Conclusion

This meta-interpretation highlights a persistent and consequential imbalance in the development of inclusive education scholarship in the United States. Across fifteen years of qualitative research, the field has generated a strong theoretical and conceptual foundation, alongside extensive documentation of stakeholder perceptions, systemic barriers, and policy-driven discourse. However, despite this intellectual depth, there remains a clear gap between theoretical justification and empirical implementation within authentic classroom settings. The evidence synthesized in this review suggests that inclusive education has been more extensively discussed and interpreted than it has been systematically tested and documented in practice-oriented, real-world environments.

While conceptual frameworks such as Least Restrictive Environment mandates under IDEA, disability rights legislation under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and socio-ecological models of disability have shaped the philosophical direction of the field, their translation into consistent instructional practices remains uneven. Much of the existing literature continues to focus on describing conditions, attitudes, and structural constraints rather than rigorously examining how inclusive strategies function when implemented under typical school conditions. As a



result, the operational meaning of “inclusion” often varies across studies, districts, and instructional contexts, reinforcing fragmentation in both research and practice.

A key insight emerging from this synthesis is that stakeholder experiences—particularly those of teachers, families, and administrators—are well documented, yet the lived experiences of students with disabilities in fully inclusive classrooms remain comparatively underrepresented. This absence limits the field’s ability to evaluate the actual effectiveness of inclusion as an instructional and social model. Without sufficient empirical grounding, policy aspirations risk remaining aspirational rather than transformative.

Moving forward, the central challenge for inclusive education research is to bridge this gap between ideology and implementation. The next phase of scholarship must prioritize the systematic development and evaluation of classroom-based interventions that can be scaled and adapted across diverse educational contexts. This includes not only documenting successful practices but also examining implementation fidelity, contextual constraints, and long-term student outcomes within inclusive environments.

Achieving this shift requires stronger collaborative partnerships between researchers, educators, families, and school leaders. Participatory and practice-based research models, including design-based research and action research approaches, offer promising pathways for co-constructing and refining inclusive practices in real time. By embedding research directly within general education classrooms, scholars can generate findings that are both contextually grounded and practically actionable.

Advancing inclusive education in the United States will depend on moving beyond descriptive and theoretical consolidation toward sustained empirical engagement. Only through deliberate, practice-centered inquiry can the field ensure that inclusive education is not only an ideological commitment but also a consistently realized educational reality.

References:

Agran, M., Grown, F., Hughes, C., Quirk, C., & Ryndak, D. (Eds.). (2014). *Equity and full participation for individuals with severe disabilities: A vision for the future*. Paul H. Brookes.

Blacher, J., Lopez, S., Shapiro, J., Diaz, L., & Fusco, J. (1997a). Depression in Latina mothers of children with mental retardation: A neglected concern. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 101, 483–496. <https://doi.org/10.2307/585093>

Blacher, J., Lopez, S., Shapiro, J., & Fusco, J. (1997b). Contributions to depression in Latina mothers with and without children with retardation: Implications for caregiving. *Family Relations*, 46, 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.2307/585093>

Burke, M. M. (2012). Examining family involvement in regular and special education: Lessons to be learned for both sides. In *International Review of Research in Developmental Disabilities* (Vol. 43, pp. 187–218). Academic Press.

Burke, M. M. (2017). Examining empowerment, family–school partnerships, and advocacy among rural and urban Latino families of children with disabilities. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 36, 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756870517707218>

Burke, M. M., & Hodapp, R. M. (2014). Relating stress of mothers of children with developmental disabilities to family–school partnerships. *Mental Retardation*, 52, 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1352/1934-9556-52.1.13>

Burke, M. M., Magaña, S., Garcia, M., & Mello, M. P. (2016). Brief report: The feasibility and effectiveness of an advocacy program for Latino families of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46, 2532–2538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-016-2765-x>



Comas-Díaz, L. (2001). Hispanics, Latinos, or Americanos: The evolution of identity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7(2), 115–

de Brey, C., Musu, L., McFarland, J., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Diliberti, M., Zhang, A., et al. (2019). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups 2018* (NCES 2019–038). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/>

Emerson, E. (2007). Poverty and people with intellectual disabilities. *Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 13, 107–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mrdd.20144>

Eisenhower, A., & Blacher, J. (2006). Mothers of young adults with intellectual disability: Multiple roles, ethnicity and well-being. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 50, 905–916. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2006.00913.x>

Geenen, S., Powers, L., Vasquez, A. L., & Bersani, H. (2003a). Understanding and promoting the transition of minority adolescents. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 26, 27–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088572880302600103>

Geenen, S. J., Powers, L. E., & Sells, W. (2003b). Understanding the role of health care providers during the transition of adolescents with disabilities and special health care needs. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32(3), 225–233. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X\(02\)00396-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X(02)00396-8)

Giangreco, M. F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). I've counted Jon: Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 59, 359–372.

Giordano, G. (2007). *American special education: A history of early political advocacy*. Peter Lang Publishing.

Hastings, R. P., & Brown, T. (2002). Coping strategies and the impact of challenging behaviors on special educators' burnout. *Mental Retardation*, 40(2), 148–156.

Hughes, M. T., Valle-Riestra, D. M., & Arguelles, M. E. (2002). Experiences of Latino families with their child's special education program. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 4, 11–17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327892mcp0401_3

Hughes, M., Valle-Riestra, D., & Arguelles, M. (2008). The voices of Latino families raising children with special needs. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, 7, 241–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430802100337>

Hunt, P., & McDonnell, J. (2007). Inclusive education. In S. L. Odom, R. H. Horner, M. E. Snell, & J. Blacher (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental disabilities* (pp. 269–291). Guilford Press.

Kamens, M. W., Loprete, S. J., & Slostad, F. A. (2003). Inclusive classrooms: What practicing teachers want to know. *Action in Teacher Education*, 25(1), 20–26.

Kalyanpur, M., & Harry, B. (1999). *Culture in special education: Building reciprocal family-professional relationships*. Brookes Publishing.

Kaur, A., Norman, M., & Awang-Hashim, R. (2016). Exploring strategies of teaching and classroom practices in response to challenges of inclusion in a Thai school: A case study. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(5), 474–485.

Kozulin, A., & Kazaz, S. (2017). Developing the concept of perimeter and area in students with learning disabilities (LD). *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 32(3), 353–366.



- Kurth, J. A., & Gross, M. (2014). *The inclusion toolbox: Strategies and techniques for all teachers*. Corwin Press.
- Kurth, J. A., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2012). Impact of setting and instructional context for adolescents with autism. *The Journal of Special Education*, 46(1), 36–48.
- Kurth, J. A., Morningstar, M. E., & Kozleski, E. B. (2014). The persistence of highly restrictive special education placements for students with low-incidence disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 39(3), 227–239.
- Lau, C. Y., Wang, C., Orsega, S., Tramont, E. C., Koita, O., Polis, M. A., & Siddiqui, S. (2014). International collaborative research partnerships: Blending science with management and diplomacy. *Journal of AIDS & Clinical Research*, 5(12), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2155-6113.1000385>
- Lebeer, J., Birta-Szekely, N., Demeter, K., Bohács, K., Araujo-Candeias, A., Sonnesyn, G., Partanen, P., & Dawson, L. (2012). Re-assessing the current assessment practice of children with special education needs in Europe. *School Psychology International*, 33(1), 69–92.
- Leigers, K. L., & Myers, C. T. (2015). Effect of duration of peer awareness education on attitudes towards students with disabilities: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools & Early Intervention*, 8(1), 79–96.
- Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C. (2013). Do pre-service teachers feel ready to teach in inclusive classrooms? A four-country study of teaching self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(1), 26–44.
- McCart, A., Sailor, W., Bezdek, J., & Satter, A. (2014). A framework for inclusive educational delivery systems. *Inclusion*, 2(4), 252–264.
- McDonnell, J., & Hunt, P. (2014). Inclusive education and meaningful school outcomes. In M. Agran, F. Grown, C. Hughes, C. Quirk, & D. Ryndak (Eds.), *Equity and full participation for individuals with severe disabilities* (pp. 155–176). Paul H. Brookes.
- McEllistrem, S., Roth, J. A., D'Agostino, T., & Brown, C. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Students with disabilities and special education law* (25th ed.). Center for Education and Employment Law.
- Messiou, K. (2017). Research in the field of inclusive education: Time for a rethink? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(2), 146–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2016.1223184>
- Ministerio de Educación Nacional & Ministerio de Educación. (2010). *Educación inclusiva con calidad: Construyendo capacidad institucional para la atención a la diversidad*. Ministerio de Educación.
- Muntaner, J. J., Rosselló, M. R., & de la Iglesia, B. (2016). Buenas prácticas en educación inclusiva. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, 34(1), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.6018/j/252521>
- Nilholm, C., & Göransson, K. (2017). What is meant by inclusion? An analysis of European and North American journal articles with high impact. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(3), 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2017.1295638>
- O'Dell, R. M., & Schaefer, M. (2005). IDEA compliance: A view from rural America. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 24(4), 9–17.



Pape, S. J., Prosser, S. K., Griffin, C. C., Dana, N. F., Algina, J., & Bae, J. (2015). Prime Online: Developing grades 3–5 teachers' content knowledge for teaching mathematics in an online professional development program. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 15(1), 14–43.

Pellegrino, A., Weiss, M., & Regan, K. (2015). Learning to collaborate: General and special educators in teacher education. *The Teacher Educator*, 50(3), 187–202.

Peña-Giraldo, R., & Aldana-Bermúdez, E. (2014). El problema social y cultural de la población sorda en el aprendizaje de las matemáticas se minimiza con la intervención del profesor. *Revista Latinoamericana de Etnomatemática*, 7(2), 29–43.

Pivik, J., McComas, J., & Laflamme, M. (2002). Barriers and facilitators to inclusive education. *Council for Exceptional Children*, 69(1), 97–107.

Ramos, C., & Huete, A. (2016). La educación inclusiva, ¿un bien necesario o una asignatura pendiente? *Prismasocial*, 16, 251–277.

Ray, D., & Poonwassie, H. (1992). *Education new and cultural perspectives differences*. Garland Publishing.

Rioux, M. (2007). Disability rights in education. In L. Florian (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of special education*. SAGE Publications.

Skrtic, T. M. (1991). *Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization*. Love Publishing.

Skrtic, T. M., Harris, K. R., & Shriner, J. G. (2005). *Special education policy and practice: Accountability, instruction, and social challenges*. Love Publishing.

U.S. Department of Education. (1973). *Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973*, 29 U.S.C. § 794 et seq.