Teaching and Teacher Education 186 (2027) doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24399732

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Teaching and Teacher Education

journal homepage: https://www.teachingandteachereducation.org

Research paper

# Inclusive Education and Academic Well-Being: Emerging Challenges in Contemporary Educational Systems

Luis Joel Chávez Castillo*, Cruz Rafael de la Coromoto Mungarrieta Virguez, Dimas Encarnación Verdu Tonito, Luis Carmelo Rada Mota, Melva Neida Magallanes Correa

*Universidad Cesar Vallejo, Universidad Nacional Federico Villareal, Universidad Tecnologica del Peru*

ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:*
Inclusive education
Academic well-being
Contemporary
Teacher Agency

ABSTRACT

This study examines the multidimensional relationship between inclusive education practices and academic well-being in contemporary educational systems through a critical integrative review of 61 international peer-reviewed studies and policy frameworks published between 2014 and 2026. It analyzes institutional, pedagogical, technological, and socio-emotional challenges, considering dimensions such as Universal Design for Learning, neurodiversity, intersectionality, digital equity, teacher self-efficacy, and post-pandemic psychosocial vulnerability. The study proposes an Integrative Ecological Model of Inclusive Academic Well-Being, highlighting that physical access to education alone does not guarantee genuine inclusion. Instead, equitable learning environments require curricular flexibility, emotional support, collaborative teacher practices, and institutional commitment to student diversity. The proposed framework contributes to the development of transformative educational policies and pedagogical strategies that strengthen academic achievement, social participation, and sustainable student well-being.

## Introduction

Over the past three decades, inclusive education has undergone a profound conceptual and policy transformation, evolving from a specialized administrative concern focused narrowly on the integration of students with clinically diagnosed disabilities into a comprehensive global mandate aimed at guaranteeing equitable, high-quality learning opportunities for every learner regardless of neurodevelopmental profile, socioeconomic condition, cultural identity, gender expression, or linguistic heritage (UNESCO, 2020; Ainscow, 2020). Anchored in landmark international instruments such as the 1994 Salamanca Statement, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD, Article 24), and Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), contemporary educational systems across primary, secondary, and tertiary sectors have dramatically expanded formal access for historically marginalized populations. Yet the global expansion of physical access has frequently outpaced the structural transformation of institutional cultures, standardized assessment regimes, curricular architectures, and teacher preparation programs. As a consequence, contemporary educational systems confront an enduring structural paradox: physical presence within mainstream classrooms does not automatically translate into psychological safety, authentic epistemic participation, or academic well-being (Florian & Beaton, 2018; Göransson & Nilholm, 2014).

Academic well-being—conceptualized as a multidimensional construct encompassing students' cognitive engagement, emotional equilibrium, sense of institutional belonging, academic self-efficacy, and resilience against chronic academic burnout or alienation (Hascher, 2010; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2014)—has increasingly been recognized as a foundational determinant of educational persistence, deep learning, and holistic human flourishing. In twenty-first-century classrooms characterized by heightened demographic and neurocognitive heterogeneity, rapid algorithmic mediation, post-pandemic socio-emotional vulnerabilities, and intensified neoliberal accountability pressures, both students and educators navigate increasingly complex cognitive and affective

demands (OECD, 2023; Ball, 2016). A growing body of empirical evidence indicates that when educational authorities mandate inclusive enrollment without providing commensurate curricular flexibility, specialized interprofessional support, and emotionally responsive school climates, marginalized and neurodivergent learners frequently experience heightened performance anxiety, social invisibility, sensory overload, and academic underachievement (Goodall, 2020; Rose et al., 2021).

Crucially, the pedagogical quality and long-term sustainability of inclusive education are inextricably bound to the professional agency, self-efficacy, and occupational well-being of teachers. Educators serve as the primary street-level architects of inclusive classroom ecosystems, translating macro-level equity mandates into everyday curricular, relational, and evaluative practices (Hattie, 2009; Florian & Spratt, 2013). Nevertheless, international research consistently documents a stark discrepancy between teachers' philosophical endorsement of inclusive principles and their perceived self-efficacy to differentiate instruction across complex cognitive, multilingual, and behavioral profiles (Sharma & Sokal, 2016; Woodcock et al., 2022). Work intensification, elevated student-to-teacher ratios, bureaucratic compliance documentation, and competing standardized attainment pressures frequently trigger emotional exhaustion and occupational burnout among educators, which

in turn erode instructional adaptability and compromise students' socio-emotional well-being (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Herman et al., 2018; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017).

Despite substantial scholarly expansion across both inclusive education and student mental health research, these two domains have largely developed along parallel disciplinary tracks. Critical inclusive education scholarship has rigorously interrogated structural ableism, exclusionary tracking, and curriculum rigidity (Slee, 2018; Waitoller & Artiles, 2013), yet it has less systematically operationalized multidimensional psychological well-being as a primary benchmark of inclusive effectiveness. Conversely, educational psychology has generated sophisticated empirical models of student engagement, achievement emotions, and school burnout (Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2014; Putwain et al., 2021), but has frequently under-theorized how institutional architecture, neurodiversity, and intersectional power relations shape students' affective and cognitive trajectories. Bridging this conceptual divide is essential for advancing teacher education, institutional governance, and educational equity. Accordingly, this article critically examines the intersection of inclusive education and academic well-being, analyzes five emerging systemic challenges in contemporary educational systems, constructs a multi-level Integrative Ecological Model with testable theoretical propositions, and articulates concrete implications for teacher education and policy reform.

## 2. Literature Review And Theoretical Framework

### *2.1. Conceptual Evolution of Inclusive Education in Contemporary Systems*

The intellectual history of inclusive education reflects a decisive paradigm shift from the traditional medical-deficit model—which locates learning difficulties within individual biological, sensory, or cognitive impairments and prescribes segregated remediation—toward the social, human-rights, and bioecological models of disability and human diversity (Oliver, 2013; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Under the medical model, institutional routines were treated as fixed, neutral standards to which individual learners had to assimilate or face exclusion. In contrast, contemporary inclusive scholarship conceptualizes inclusion as an ongoing, principled process of systemic institutional transformation aimed at identifying and dismantling curricular, pedagogical, cultural, and physical barriers to presence, meaningful participation, and achievement for all learners (Booth & Ainscow, 2016; Slee, 2018).

Despite widespread legislative adoption across both Global North and Global South jurisdictions, the operationalization of inclusive education remains deeply contested in policy and daily school practice. Nilholm and Göransson (2017) delineate a critical typology distinguishing narrow, placement-based definitions—focused primarily on relocating students with formally diagnosed special educational needs into mainstream classrooms—from community-oriented definitions that reimagine educational institutions as democratic learning communities valuing human variability as an epistemic and social resource. When schools and universities adopt purely placement-driven integration without restructuring inflexible curricula, linear pacing, or high-stakes standardized examinations, they inadvertently reproduce micro-exclusions within ostensibly inclusive classrooms, whereby marginalized students are physically present yet pedagogically sidelined and socially isolated (Waitoller & Artiles, 2013; Messiou, 2017).

Across international policy landscapes, this conceptual tension is further complicated by uneven resource distribution and fragmented governance between general education ministries and specialized disability or welfare agencies (UNESCO, 2020). Bridging the gap between aspirational inclusive legislation and everyday classroom equity therefore requires coherent institutional alignment across curriculum, assessment, funding, and professional

Teaching and Teacher Education 185 (2027)
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24399732

### 2.2. Multidimensional Perspectives on Academic Well-Being

Academic well-being extends substantially beyond the mere absence of clinical psychopathology, disciplinary infractions, or academic failure; it encompasses positive cognitive, affective, social, and psychosomatic functioning within educational contexts (Seligman, 2011; Ryff, 2014). Synthesizing established frameworks in educational psychology, academic well-being can be conceptualized across four mutually reinforcing dimensions: (a) affective well-being, reflected in positive academic emotions such as curiosity, enjoyment, and pride, alongside low levels of chronic school anxiety, shame, or fear of failure; (b) cognitive-academic well-being, characterized by robust academic self-efficacy, perceived competence, constructive academic buoyancy, and intrinsic motivation; (c) social-relational well-being, grounded in peer acceptance, trusting teacher–student relationships, and a secure sense of institutional belonging; and (d) psychosomatic and behavioral equilibrium, indicated by resilience against academic burnout and sustained constructive engagement (Hascher, 2010; Wang et al., 2020; Putwain et al., 2021).

Longitudinal and meta-analytic investigations demonstrate that academic well-being functions both as an intrinsic ethical outcome of humane educational environments and as a proximal psychological catalyst for deep cognitive processing, persistence, and long-term educational attainment (Suldo et al., 2011; Bücker et al., 2018). Crucially, students' academic well-being is highly sensitive to stage–environment and person–environment fit—the degree of alignment between learners' developmental, cultural, and neurocognitive profiles and the pedagogical, social, and sensory demands of their institutional context (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). When educational systems impose rigid normative expectations that disregard learner variability, chronic stress, diminished self-worth, and academic disengagement predictably emerge.

Moreover, cross-cultural research in educational psychology underscores that the relative salience of academic well-being dimensions varies across developmental stages and sociocultural contexts (Hascher, 2010; Wang et al., 2020). While peer belonging and autonomy become particularly salient during adolescence and emerging adulthood, emotional safety and warm adult scaffolding remain foundational across the entire educational lifespan.

### 2.3. Universal Design for Learning and Pedagogical Accessibility

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) has gained international prominence as a scientifically grounded pedagogical framework capable of operationalizing inclusive education while actively promoting academic well-being (Meyer et al., 2014; CAST, 2024). Rooted in cognitive neuroscience and the learning sciences, UDL challenges the traditional reliance on retroactive, individualized accommodations—which often stigmatize learners and burden teachers—by advocating proactive curriculum design around three core principles: providing multiple means of engagement (the affective 'why' of learning), multiple means of representation (the recognition 'what' of learning), and multiple means of action and expression (the strategic 'how' of learning) (Capp, 2017; Al-Azawei et al., 2016).

The psychological mechanisms linking UDL to enhanced academic well-being align directly with Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020), which establishes that human motivation, vitality, and psychological flourishing depend on the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. By offering meaningful instructional choices, scaffolded entry points, multimodal conceptual representations, and flexible pathways to demonstrate mastery, UDL mitigates extraneous cognitive load, reduces evaluation anxiety, and strengthens learners' perceived competence and agency (Katz, 2013; Flood & Banks, 2021). Conversely, inflexible one-size-fits-all instructional models systematically privilege narrow neurotypical cognitive styles while inducing learned helplessness and chronic distress among diverse learners.

Empirical meta-analyses confirm that UDL-aligned instructional environments yield significant gains not only in academic achievement across diverse learner subgroups, but also in student engagement, self-regulation, and perceived classroom fairness (Capp, 2017; Flood & Banks, 2021). By normalizing variability as an expected feature of every classroom rather than an exception requiring special permission, UDL dismantles the stigma traditionally attached to academic support.

### 2.4. Neurodiversity, Intersectionality, and Equity in Modern Classrooms

Contemporary educational scholarship increasingly examines classroom diversity through the complementary analytical lenses of neurodiversity and intersectionality. Originating in disability rights advocacy and now informing developmental science, the neurodiversity paradigm reframes neurodevelopmental variations—including autism, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), dyslexia, and dyspraxia—not as pathological deficits requiring behavioral normalization, but as natural variations in human neurocognitive architecture that thrive when environments accommodate diverse sensory, communicative, and executive-functioning profiles (Singer, 2017; Pellicano & den Houting, 2022). However, conventional educational settings—frequently characterized by fluorescent lighting and acoustic overload, rigid behavioral conformity, implicit social rules, and timed linear assessments—often compel neurodivergent learners to engage in chronic social camouflaging or masking, resulting in severe emotional exhaustion, anxiety, depression, and school refusal (Hull et al., 2017; Goodall, 2020).

Concurrently, intersectional theory demonstrates that educational vulnerability and exclusion rarely stem from a single, isolated identity axis (Crenshaw, 1991; Artiles, 2013). Students positioned at the intersection of multiple marginalized social categories—such as socioeconomic precarity, linguistic minority status, forced migration, racialized identity, disability, or gender diversity—confront compounded institutional barriers that simultaneously restrict academic opportunity and erode psychological well-being (UNESCO, 2020; Connor et al., 2016). Promoting academic well-being in contemporary educational systems therefore requires intersectionally responsive pedagogies capable of addressing overlapping structural inequities rather than fragmented, single-category interventions.

In higher education and secondary schooling alike, intersectional inequities frequently manifest through disciplinary disproportionality and differential referral patterns, wherein marginalized students are either over-identified for restrictive behavioral placements or under-identified for affirming academic supports (Artiles, 2013; Connor et al., 2016). Recognizing how ableism intersects with linguicism, classism, and racialization is therefore essential to designing equitable well-being interventions.

### 2.5. Teacher Self-Efficacy, Emotional Labor, and Bioecological Ecosystems

The translation of inclusive policy mandates into classroom reality and student well-being depends decisively on educators' beliefs, pedagogical competencies, and institutional working conditions (Hattie, 2009; Florian & Spratt, 2013). Teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices—defined as educators' professional confidence in designing differentiated instruction, fostering positive peer climates, managing diverse behavioral dynamics, and collaborating effectively with specialists and families—consistently predicts the enactment of student-centered pedagogies and supportive classroom environments (Sharma et al., 2012; Kiel et al., 2020).

Nevertheless, teachers frequently experience acute structural contradictions between inclusive pedagogical ideals and neoliberal accountability regimes predicated on standardized examination scores, institutional ranking tables, and performative auditing (Ball, 2016; Done & Andrews, 2020). Navigating elevated class sizes, complex trauma-related student needs, and expanding administrative documentation without adequate co-teaching or specialist support generates intensive emotional labor and occupational burnout (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Herman et al., 2018). Grounded in Bronfenbrenner's bioecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006), sustainable inclusive well-being requires coherent alignment across microsystems (daily classroom interactions), mesosystems (school–family–specialist partnerships), exosystems (teacher education, leadership, and resource allocation), and macrosystems (national equity legislation and cultural values).

Importantly, within Bronfenbrenner's bioecological perspective (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006), chronosystemic dynamics—such as longitudinal educational transitions, shifting socioeconomic conditions, and rapid technological disruption—continually reshape the interaction between teachers' working conditions and students' developmental trajectories. Consequently, institutional support for educator well-being cannot be treated as a one-time intervention, but must operate as an ongoing, adaptive organizational commitment.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Research Design and Analytical Approach

To synthesize multidimensional evidence across diverse disciplinary and methodological traditions, this study employs a critical integrative review and conceptual theory-building methodology (Torraco, 2016; Snyder, 2019). Whereas narrowly scoped systematic reviews restrict inclusion to homogeneous experimental or correlational designs, an integrative synthesis enables the rigorous consolidation of empirical investigations, meta-analyses, theoretical frameworks, and international policy reports across educational psychology, inclusive pedagogy, sociology of education, and teacher education. Consistent with Torraco's (2016) guidelines for conceptual advancement, this approach is uniquely suited to mature yet compartmentalized research domains where cross-disciplinary synthesis is needed to generate an integrative explanatory framework and formulate testable propositions for future empirical inquiry.

### 3.2. Literature Search Strategy, Databases, and Selection Criteria

A structured, multi-stage literature search was executed across Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection, and ERIC databases covering peer-reviewed publications between 2014 and 2026, supplemented by seminal foundational works in bioecological development, disability studies, and well-being theory. Search queries combined controlled descriptors and Boolean operators across two primary conceptual clusters: Cluster A ('inclusive education' OR 'educational equity' OR 'Universal Design for Learning' OR 'neurodiversity' OR 'special educational needs' OR 'teacher self-efficacy' OR 'inclusive pedagogy') and Cluster B ('academic well-being' OR 'school belonging' OR 'school burnout' OR 'achievement emotions' OR 'socio-emotional learning' OR 'student mental health' OR 'classroom climate').

Retrieved records were screened against four explicit inclusion criteria: (1) publication in peer-reviewed academic journals or authoritative international policy bodies (e.g., UNESCO, OECD); (2) substantive analytical focus on institutional, pedagogical, technological, or psychosocial mechanisms linking learner diversity with educational well-being; (3) conceptual or empirical applicability to contemporary primary, secondary, or higher education systems; and (4) methodological rigor, theoretical clarity, and direct relevance to teacher education or educational governance. Following title, abstract, and full-text evaluation, 61 core scholarly sources were retained for in-depth synthesis.

### 3.3. Iterative Thematic Synthesis and Conceptual Modeling

The retained corpus was analyzed through an iterative three-phase thematic synthesis protocol (Thomas & Harden, 2008). In Phase 1 (descriptive line-by-line coding), analytical extraction documented empirical findings and theoretical claims regarding structural, curricular, technological, and relational barriers affecting diverse learners and teachers. In Phase 2 (axial categorization), descriptive codes were clustered inductively and deductively into five overarching emerging challenges characterizing contemporary educational systems. In Phase 3 (analytical synthesis and ecological modeling), cross-cutting causal and moderating pathways were mapped across Bronfenbrenner's nested systems to construct an Integrative Ecological Model and derive four falsifiable theoretical propositions.

To ensure analytical transparency and conceptual rigor, quality appraisal during full-text synthesis evaluated each source based on theoretical coherence, empirical robustness, sample and contextual diversity, and explicit articulation of mechanisms connecting educational practices to psychological or relational outcomes (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2016).

## 4. Emerging Challenges In Contemporary Educational Systems

### 4.1. The Tension Between Performative Accountability and Inclusive Pedagogy

A foundational systemic challenge confronting contemporary educational systems is the structural contradiction between standardized, high-stakes accountability frameworks and the pluralistic, equity-oriented ethos of inclusive education (Ainscow, 2020; Slee, 2018). Across numerous national jurisdictions, schools and universities are governed through neoliberal performative metrics emphasizing standardized examination scores, institutional league tables, graduation rates, and narrow efficiency benchmarks (Ball, 2016). This accountability architecture incentivizes uniform curriculum pacing, summative testing, and risk-averse instructional routines that systematically disadvantage learners requiring individualized timelines, multimodal scaffolding, or alternative forms of expression (Done & Andrews, 2020).

For students, pervasive performative pressure correlates strongly with heightened test anxiety, maladaptive perfectionism, fear of public failure, and diminished institutional belonging, particularly among learners with disabilities, neurodivergent profiles, or socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds (Putwain et al., 2021). Furthermore, high-stakes accountability pressures frequently induce subtle institutional gatekeeping or covert exclusion—such as discouraging vulnerable students from enrolling in rigorous academic tracks or disproportionately applying disciplinary suspensions—thereby undermining both equity of access and psychological safety.

In higher education systems as well, market-driven performance indicators—such as rigid

Teaching and Teacher Education 185 (2027)
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24399732

credit-hour completion timelines, weed-out introductory courses, and norm-referenced grading curves—create structural friction with inclusive admissions policies (Ball, 2016; Done & Andrews, 2020). Students balancing employment, caregiving responsibilities, chronic health conditions, or neurodevelopmental differences often experience these rigid temporal structures as cumulative stressors that erode academic self-efficacy and drive attrition.

### *4.2. Post-Pandemic Psychosocial Vulnerabilities and Rising Student Distress*

Contemporary educational institutions are grappling with an acute, sustained escalation in student psychological distress, anxiety, emotional dysregulation, and chronic absenteeism following global pandemic disruptions and ongoing socioeconomic instability (OECD, 2023; Viner et al., 2022). Longitudinal international assessments demonstrate that vulnerable student cohorts—including learners with neurodevelopmental conditions, chronic health needs, low-income households, and linguistic minority or refugee backgrounds—experienced disproportionate instructional losses and social disconnection, substantially widening pre-existing disparities in academic well-being (UNESCO, 2020).

Many educational systems struggle to mount effective, holistic responses because academic instruction and psychosocial care remain administratively siloed within separate institutional departments. Reactive, referral-based clinical counseling models are frequently overwhelmed by acute demand, underscoring the urgent necessity of embedding trauma-informed, socio-emotional, and relational practices directly into daily inclusive classroom pedagogy rather than treating well-being as an extracurricular or purely clinical concern (Jennings, 2019; Wang et al., 2020).

Additionally, prolonged pandemic-era disruptions reshaped peer socialization norms and heightened sensitivity to social evaluation among adolescents and young adults (Viner et al., 2022; OECD, 2023). Rebuilding prosocial classroom norms requires intentional pedagogical time dedicated to community building, emotional literacy, and collaborative problem-solving rather than accelerating curriculum pacing to compensate for perceived academic deficits.

### *4.3. Digital Transformation, Algorithmic Bias, and the New Equity Divide*

The rapid integration of digital learning ecosystems, learning analytics, and generative artificial intelligence (AI) presents a complex, dual-edged dynamic for inclusive education and academic well-being (UNESCO, 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023). On the enabling side, assistive technologies, screen readers, speech-to-text interfaces, adaptive tutoring platforms, and AI-supported cognitive scaffolding can substantially enhance curricular accessibility, self-paced mastery, and learner autonomy for students with sensory, motor, or learning differences (Al-Azawei et al., 2016).

Conversely, unequal access to reliable high-speed broadband infrastructure, assistive hardware, and critical digital literacy threatens to entrench first-, second-, and third-level digital inequalities that compound academic disadvantage (van Dijk, 2020). Moreover, automated educational platforms and predictive learning analytics frequently embed algorithmic biases trained on neurotypical and culturally dominant datasets, risking misidentification, lowered algorithmic expectations, privacy erosion, or surveillance-induced anxiety among marginalized learners (Baker & Hawn, 2022; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). Without rigorous accessibility standards, ethical governance, and human-centered pedagogical oversight, educational digitalization can inadvertently amplify exclusion and technostress.

Specifically, the emergence of generative AI tools introduces both promise and peril for neurodivergent and multilingual learners (Kasneci et al., 2023). While AI-powered summarization, writing scaffolds, and multimodal translation can reduce cognitive barriers and enhance self-efficacy, punitive academic integrity policies and unreliable AI-detection software disproportionately flag non-standard linguistic expressions used by neurodivergent and non-native English-speaking students, generating acute anxiety and unjust disciplinary suspicion.

### *4.4. Gaps in Initial Teacher Education and Collaborative Support Structures*

A persistent operational barrier preventing inclusive policy commitments from translating into student well-being lies in the initial preparation and ongoing professional support of educators. Across many teacher education systems, inclusive education continues to be delivered as a fragmented, standalone introductory course focused on diagnostic categories rather than a transversal pedagogical philosophy integrated across subject-matter didactics, assessment design, and clinical practicum placements (Florian & Spratt, 2013; Sharma & Sokal, 2016). Consequently, both pre-service and in-service educators frequently report limited self-efficacy in differentiating instruction for complex neurodevelopmental, multilingual, and behavioral needs (Woodcock et al., 2022; Kiel et al., 2020).

Moreover, schools frequently lack institutionalized mechanisms for interprofessional collaboration among general classroom teachers, special educators, school psychologists, speech and occupational therapists, and families (Friend et al., 2010). Expecting individual teachers to manage highly diverse classrooms in professional isolation intensifies cognitive overload and emotional exhaustion, driving elevated teacher attrition and destabilizing the consistent adult relationships upon which student academic well-being depends (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Herman et al., 2018).

Addressing this structural gap requires rethinking teacher workload formulas to recognize collaborative planning, family engagement, and socio-emotional mentoring as core professional responsibilities rather than uncompensated extra duties (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). When school schedules protect dedicated time for co-teaching teams to align pedagogical strategies, both instructional coherence and teacher job satisfaction improve substantially (Friend et al., 2010).

### *4.5. Superficial Integration Versus Genuine Sense of Belonging*

Finally, contemporary educational systems frequently conflate physical proximity or administrative enrollment in mainstream classrooms with genuine social, emotional, and academic inclusion (Göransson & Nilholm, 2014). Empirical investigations consistently demonstrate that students with disabilities, refugee and migrant youth, and neurodivergent learners placed in mainstream settings without intentional peer-inclusion scaffolding experience disproportionately high levels of social isolation, peer rejection, bullying, and internalizing distress (Rose et al., 2021; Goodall, 2020).

A genuine sense of school belonging—defined as the extent to which students feel personally accepted, respected, included, and supported by peers and educators within the institutional social environment (Goodenow, 1993)—represents one of the most powerful protective determinants of academic well-being, motivation, and retention (Allen et al., 2018). Cultivating authentic belonging requires moving beyond passive coexistence toward intentional relational pedagogy, culturally sustaining curricula (Paris & Alim, 2017), and restorative classroom practices that actively dismantle ableism, racism, and social exclusion.

Across K–12 and higher education transitions—such as the move from primary to secondary school or entry into university—risks of superficial integration become particularly acute as institutional structures grow larger, more impersonal, and more competitively stratified (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). Proactive transition scaffolding, peer mentorship programs, and advisory structures are therefore indispensable to safeguard continuity of belonging and prevent sudden declines in academic well-being.

## 5. Conceptual Framework: An Integrative Ecological Model Of Inclusive Academic Well-Being

### *5.1. Multi-Level Architecture of the Model*

To synthesize these theoretical and empirical insights into a coherent analytical tool, we propose an Integrative Ecological Model of Inclusive Academic Well-Being. Grounded in bioecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) and Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020), the model conceptualizes students' academic well-being as an emergent property of dynamic, reciprocal interactions across four nested institutional and pedagogical levels:

1. Macro-Institutional Policy and Governance Level: Aligns national legislation, equitable funding formulas, flexible curriculum standards, and quality assurance frameworks so that student well-being, equity of participation, and holistic human development carry institutional parity alongside academic attainment indicators.

2. School Culture and Collaborative Leadership Level: Cultivates distributed inclusive leadership, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), protected co-planning time for interprofessional co-teaching, and reciprocal family–community partnerships that frame learner diversity as a core institutional strength rather than an administrative burden.

3. Classroom Pedagogical and Technological Design Level: Operationalizes Universal Design for Learning (UDL), culturally sustaining pedagogy, neurodiversity-affirming sensory and behavioral environments, and ethically governed assistive/AI technologies to eliminate structural barriers and foster learner autonomy.

4. Relational and Psychosocial Micro-Level: Centers emotionally responsive teacher–student relationships, structured peer connectedness, trauma-informed care, and educator occupational well-being as the immediate proximal mechanisms through which students experience belonging, competence, and affective equilibrium.

### *5.2. Theoretical Propositions for Empirical Testing*

Within this ecological architecture, teacher agency and occupational well-being operate as the decisive mediating bridge connecting macro- and meso-level institutional investments with micro-level student outcomes. Based on our integrative synthesis, we formulate four testable theoretical propositions to guide future empirical research:

Proposition 1 (Pedagogical Accessibility Pathway): Higher fidelity in the implementation of Universal Design for Learning and culturally sustaining pedagogies positively predicts students' cognitive-academic and affective well-being, mediated by increased satisfaction of basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) and reduced academic anxiety.

Proposition 2 (Teacher Agency and Emotional Labor Mediation): Institutional support structures—specifically collaborative co-teaching models, specialized resource availability, and practice-oriented inclusive professional development—enhance teacher self-efficacy and mitigate emotional exhaustion, which in turn positively predicts classroom relational climate and student belonging.

Proposition 3 (Accountability Moderation): High-stakes performative accountability pressures negatively moderate the relationship between inclusive policy mandates and inclusive classroom enactment, attenuating teachers' curricular flexibility and exacerbating students' academic distress unless counterbalanced by holistic well-being governance.

Proposition 4 (Digital Equity Interaction): Assistive and AI-supported educational technologies enhance academic well-being for neurodivergent and diverse learners only when accompanied by equitable infrastructure access, accessibility-by-design standards, and critical digital literacy scaffolding.

### *5.3. Operational Matrix for Translating Ecological Principles into Practice*

To facilitate operational implementation across schools, universities, and teacher education institutions, each level of the Integrative Ecological Model corresponds to concrete institutional mechanisms and measurable well-being indicators. At the macro-institutional level, policy alignment requires replacing single-metric standardized evaluations with balanced accountability dashboards that track equity of participation, retention across marginalized cohorts, and school climate alongside academic mastery. At the school leadership level, operationalization entails establishing structured weekly co-planning schedules, multidisciplinary student support teams, and participatory student and family advisory councils that co-design institutional inclusion policies.

At the classroom pedagogical level, operationalizing UDL and neurodiversity-affirming design involves conducting proactive sensory and accessibility audits of physical and virtual learning spaces, offering untimed or multi-format assessments, and embedding assistive technologies as universal learning options rather than stigmatizing remedial tools. Finally, at the relational micro-level, daily routines such as restorative circles, strengths-based formative feedback, and structured cooperative learning directly cultivate peer connectedness and teacher–student trust, creating the psychological safety essential for sustained academic well-being.

Across higher education settings specifically, operationalizing this matrix involves embedding UDL principles into syllabus design, providing proactive academic and mental health literacy modules during first-year transitions, training university faculty in inclusive mentoring, and ensuring digital learning management systems comply with international accessibility standards (CAST, 2024; Al-Azawei et al., 2016).

## 6. Discussion And Implications For Teacher Education And Policy

### *6.1. Theoretical Contributions*

This study advances contemporary educational scholarship by establishing an explicit conceptual bridge between two historically compartmentalized domains: inclusive education

Teaching and Teacher Education 185 (2027)
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24399732

research and positive educational psychology. While critical inclusive education scholarship has powerfully exposed how ableism, rigid curricula, and neoliberal schooling reproduce marginalization (Slee, 2018; Ainscow, 2020; Done & Andrews, 2020), it has seldom incorporated multidimensional psychological well-being metrics as core criteria for evaluating inclusive reform. Conversely, academic well-being research has produced sophisticated models of student engagement, achievement emotions, and burnout (Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2014; Hascher, 2010), yet has frequently treated classroom environments as uniform contexts rather than spaces structured by neurodiversity, disability, and intersectional power dynamics. By uniting these traditions within an ecological framework, this article demonstrates that academic well-being is fundamentally a matter of educational justice and institutional design rather than merely individual psychological resilience.

Furthermore, positioning teacher agency and occupational well-being as central mediating variables resolves a longstanding blind spot in both literatures. Policy frameworks frequently treat teachers either as passive instruments of top-down reform or as sole culprits when inclusive initiatives falter. By conceptualizing teacher self-efficacy and emotional labor as properties shaped by institutional ecosystems, our model highlights the reciprocal interdependence between educator flourishing and student academic well-being.

At an epistemological level, this synthesis also challenges deficit-oriented interpretations of student distress within educational psychology. Rather than locating academic anxiety, burnout, or disengagement solely within individual cognitive vulnerabilities or family background, our ecological framework reframes these phenomena as diagnostic signals of institutional misfit—indicating where curricular rigidity, sensory hostility, or exclusionary assessment practices fail to accommodate human diversity (Eccles & Roeser, 2011; Slee, 2018).

### *6.2. Implications for Initial Teacher Education and Continuous Professional Development*

For initial teacher education (ITE) and continuous professional development (CPD), our synthesis highlights the imperative to move beyond additive, deficit-focused special education modules toward an integrated inclusive pedagogy model (Florian & Beaton, 2018). Pre-service curricula across all disciplinary specializations must equip teacher candidates with applied competencies in Universal Design for Learning, flexible formative assessment, neurodiversity-affirming classroom ecology, trauma-sensitive relational practices, and critical auditing of digital and AI tools for accessibility and algorithmic bias.

Clinical practicum experiences should be intentionally structured in partnership with mentor teachers and schools modeling collaborative co-teaching and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, enabling teacher candidates to observe and practice interprofessional problem-solving in authentic diverse classrooms (Friend et al., 2010). Equally important, teacher education programs must explicitly cultivate educators' socio-emotional competence, reflective boundary-setting, and collective efficacy, recognizing that sustainable inclusive teaching relies on institutionalized professional support rather than solitary heroic sacrifice (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Herman et al., 2018; Woodcock et al., 2022).

Furthermore, professional learning communities (PLCs) and lesson-study cycles anchored in inclusive inquiry enable practicing teachers to collaboratively analyze student well-being data, refine UDL lesson designs, and share emotional support (Ainscow, 2020; Waitoller & Artiles, 2013). Transitioning from isolated one-off workshops to sustained, school-embedded collaborative inquiry bridges the persistent gap between inclusive theory and daily classroom enactment.

### *6.3. Implications for Educational Policy and Institutional Governance*

At the level of educational policy and institutional governance, sustainable progress requires recalibrating quality assurance and accountability systems. Ministries of education, accreditation agencies, and university leaders should integrate validated indicators of student sense of belonging, psychological safety, equity of participation, and educator well-being alongside conventional academic achievement metrics (OECD, 2023). When institutional evaluations value holistic human flourishing alongside cognitive attainment, school leaders and educators gain the institutional legitimacy required to innovate pedagogically.

Furthermore, funding mechanisms should shift from reactive, diagnosis-contingent allocation—which often delays intervention until students experience acute academic failure or psychological crisis—toward proactive, school-wide capacity building. Investing in universal pedagogical flexibility, reduced class sizes, dedicated interprofessional co-planning hours, and accessible digital infrastructure creates preventive ecosystems that benefit all learners while substantially reducing long-term psychosocial and remedial costs.

Equally critical is the establishment of participatory governance structures that institutionalize student, family, and educator voice in school and university decision-making (Messiou, 2017). When marginalized learners and front-line teachers actively co-design institutional well-being policies, sensory environments, and assessment accommodations, reform initiatives gain contextual legitimacy and avoid top-down bureaucratic alienation.

### *6.4. Cross-Contextual Relevance Across Global North and Global South Systems*

While much empirical research on inclusive education and academic well-being has historically originated in high-income Global North contexts, the challenges analyzed in this review carry acute relevance across Global South educational systems, including Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, and South Asia (UNESCO, 2020; Ainscow, 2020). In rapidly expanding educational systems characterized by pronounced socioeconomic inequality, linguistic diversity, rural–urban infrastructure disparities, and constrained specialist budgets, importing resource-intensive diagnostic models often proves unsustainable and exclusionary.

In such contexts, universal, community-rooted, and low-cost inclusive strategies—such as peer-assisted cooperative learning, culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogy, flexible formative assessment, and collaborative teacher learning communities—offer highly scalable pathways to simultaneously advance equity and student academic well-being. Recognizing contextual diversity ensures that inclusive reform avoids neo-colonial policy borrowing and instead builds upon local community strengths and relational pedagogies.

In Latin American and other Global South higher education and school contexts, rapid massification of access has brought first-generation university students, Indigenous and Afro-descendant learners, rural youth, and students with disabilities into institutions originally designed for homogeneous elites (UNESCO, 2020). Strengthening institutional tutoring networks, intercultural bilingual curricula, flexible progression pathways, and faculty pedagogical training represents a decisive lever for converting formal access into genuine academic well-being and degree completion.

### *6.5. Limitations and Directions for Future Empirical Research*

Several methodological boundaries of the present study warrant consideration and point toward priority avenues for future inquiry. Because this work represents an integrative conceptual synthesis rather than a primary empirical investigation, the proposed ecological pathways and theoretical propositions require rigorous empirical testing across diverse institutional, developmental, and cultural settings.

Future research should employ longitudinal, mixed-methods, and multilevel structural equation modeling designs to examine how school-level leadership and accountability climates interact with classroom-level UDL practices and teacher well-being to shape longitudinal trajectories of student academic well-being. Particular priority should be given to participatory research designs that center the lived voices of neurodivergent students, learners with disabilities, and intersectionally marginalized youth across both Global North and Global South educational systems.

In addition, future empirical studies should prioritize developing and validating psychometrically robust, context-sensitive instruments capable of capturing multidimensional academic well-being alongside inclusive classroom climate from multiple informants—combining student self-reports, teacher perceptions, classroom observational rubrics, and institutional administrative indicators. Such multi-informant designs will reduce common-method variance and illuminate potential perception gaps between educators' intended inclusive practices and students' lived psychological experiences.

## 7. Conclusion

Inclusive education and academic well-being constitute inseparable pillars of equitable, high-quality educational systems in the twenty-first century. As contemporary schools and universities navigate unprecedented learner diversity, post-pandemic psychosocial vulnerabilities, rapid technological transformation, and persistent performative pressures, narrow models of physical placement or standardized remediation prove manifestly insufficient. Genuine inclusion demands the systemic transformation of curricular architectures, pedagogical practices, teacher preparation, and institutional accountability so that every learner experiences psychological safety, meaningful cognitive engagement, and an authentic sense of belonging. By placing academic well-being and teacher agency at the center of inclusive reform, contemporary educational systems can transcend bureaucratic compliance and build genuinely humane, resilient, and equitable learning communities.

## Credit Authorship Contribution Statement

Luis Joel Chávez Castillo: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Project administration. Rafael de la Coromoto Mungarrieta Virgüez: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Literature synthesis, Writing – review & editing. Dimas Encarnación Verdu Tonito: Methodology, Theoretical framework, Validation, Writing – review & editing. Luis Carmelo Rada Mota: Investigation, Policy analysis, Visualization, Writing – review & editing. Melva Neida Magallanes Correa: Supervision, Critical revision, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

## Declaration Of Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## Ethics Statement

This article is a theoretical and integrative literature review that does not involve human participants, personal data, or animal subjects; therefore, institutional ethics committee approval was not required.

## Data Availability

No primary empirical datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study. All analyzed sources are publicly available in the cited peer-reviewed litera

References

1. 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
2. Al-Azawei, A., Serenelli, F., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). Universal Design for Learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal papers from 2012 to 2015. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 16(3), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.19295
3. Allen, K., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., Hattie, J., & Waters, L. (2018). What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 30(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8
4. Artiles, A. J. (2013). Untangling the racialization of disabilities: An intersectionality critique across disability models. Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 10(2), 329–347. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000271
5. Baker, R. S., & Hawn, A. (2022). Algorithmic bias in education. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 32(4), 1052–1092. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00285-9
6. Ball, S. J. (2016). Neoliberal education? Confronting the slouching beast. Policy Futures in Education, 14(8), 1046–1059. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316664259
7. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2016). The index for inclusion: A guide to school development led by inclusive values (4th ed.). Index for Inclusion Network.
8. Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development (6th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 793–828). John Wiley & Sons.
9. Bücker, S., Nuraydin, S., Simonsmeier, B. A., Schneider, M., & Luhmann, M. (2018). Subjective well-being and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Journal of Research in Personality, 74, 83–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.02.007
10. Capp, M. J. (2017). The effectiveness of universal design for learning: A meta-analysis of literature between 2013 and 2016. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21(8), 791–807. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1325074
11. CAST. (2024). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0. CAST. https://udlguidelines.cast.org
12. Connor, D. J., Ferri, B. A., & Annamma, S. A. (Eds.). (2016). DisCrit: Disability studies and critical race theory in education. Teachers College Press.
13. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. Stanford Law Review, 43(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039
14. Done, E. J., & Andrews, M. J. (2020). How inclusion became exclusion: Policy, teachers and inclusive education. Journal of Education Policy, 35(4), 447–464. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2018.1552763
15. Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21(1), 225–241. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00725.x
16. Flood, M., & Banks, J. (2021). Universal Design for Learning: Is it gaining momentum in Irish education? Education Sciences, 11(7), Article 341. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11070341
17. Florian, L., & Beaton, M. (2018). Inclusive pedagogy in action: Getting it right for every child. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 22(8), 870–884. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1412513
18. Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2013). Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 28(2), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778111
19. Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 20(1), 9–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410903535380
20. Goodall, C. (2020). Inclusion is a feeling, not a place: A qualitative exploratory study of autistic young people's experiences of mainstream schools. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24(12), 1285–1310. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1523475
21. Goodenow, C. (1993). The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents: Scale development and educational correlates. Psychology in the Schools, 30(1), 79–90. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6807(199301)30:1<79::AID-PITS2310300113>3.0.CO;2-X
22. Göransson, K., & Nilholm, C. (2014). Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings: A critical analysis of research on inclusive education. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 29(3), 265–280. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933545
23. Hascher, T. (2010). Learning and emotion: Perspectives for theory and research. European Educational Research Journal, 9(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2010.9.1.13
24. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.
25. Herman, K. C., Hickmon-Rosa, J., & Reinke, W. M. (2018). Empirically derived profiles of teacher stress, burnout, self-efficacy, and coping and associated student outcomes. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 20(2), 90–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300717732066
26. Hull, L., Petrides, K. V., Allison, C., Smith, P., Baron-Cohen, S., Lai, M.-C., & Mandy, W. (2017). Putting on my best normal: Social camouflaging in adults with autism spectrum conditions. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 47(8), 2519–2534. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-017-3166-5
27. Jennings, P. A. (2019). The trauma-sensitive classroom: Building resilience with compassionate teaching. W. W. Norton & Company.
28. Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 79(1), 491–525. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693
29. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., ... & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
30. Katz, J. (2013). The Three-Block Model of Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Engaging students in inclusive education. Canadian Journal of Education, 36(1), 153–194.
31. Kiel, E., Braun, A., Muckenthaler, M., Heimlich, U., & Weiss, S. (2020). Self-efficacy of teachers in inclusive classes: Who needs what? International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24(7), 741–754. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1484525
32. 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
33. Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). Universal Design for Learning: Theory and practice. CAST Professional Publishing.
34. 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
35. OECD. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume II): Learning during – and from – disruption. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a97db61c-en
36. Oliver, M. (2013). The social model of disability: Thirty years on. Disability & Society, 28(7), 1024–1026. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2013.818773
37. Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world. Teachers College Press.
38. Pellicano, E., & den Houting, J. (2022). Annual research review: Shifting from normal science to neurodiversity in autism science. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 63(4), 381–396. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13534
39. Putwain, D. W., Wood, P., & Pekrun, R. (2021). Achievement emotions and academic achievement: Reciprocal relations and the moderating influence of academic buoyancy. Journal of Educational Psychology, 114(1), 108–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000637
40. Rose, R., Shevlin, M., Winter, E., & O'Raw, P. (2021). Project IRIS – Inclusive Research in Irish Schools: A longitudinal study of the experiences of and outcomes for pupils with special educational needs in Irish schools. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 36(3), 385–400.
41. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61, Article 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860
42. Ryff, C. D. (2014). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 83(1), 10–28. https://doi.org/10.1159/000353263
43. Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2014). School burnout and engagement in the context of demands–resources model. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(1), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12018
44. Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being. Free Press.
45. 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
46. Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2016). Can teachers' self-reported efficacy, concerns, and attitudes toward inclusion scores predict their actual inclusive classroom practices? Australasian Journal of Special Education, 40(1), 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1017/jse.2015.14
47. Singer, J. (2017). NeuroDiversity: The birth of an idea. Judy Singer.
48. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Still motivated to teach? A study of school context variables, stress and job satisfaction among teachers in senior high school. Social Psychology of Education, 20(1), 15–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-016-9363-9
49. Slee, R. (2018). Inclusive education isn't dead, it just smells funny. Routledge.
50. Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039
51. Suldo, S., Thalji, A., & Ferron, J. (2011). Longitudinal academic outcomes predicted by early adolescents' subjective well-being, psychopathology, and mental health status yielded from a dual factor model. The Journal of Positive Psychology, 6(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2010.536774
52. Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8, Article 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45
53. Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing integrative literature reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. Human Resource Development Review, 15(4), 404–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606
54. UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education—All means all. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://doi.org/10.54676/JJNK6989
55. UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501
56. van Dijk, J. (2020). The digital divide. Polity Press.
57. Viner, R., Russell, S., Saulle, R., Croker, H., Stansfield, C., Packer, J., ... & Minozzi, S. (2022). School closures during social lockdown and mental health, health behaviors, and well-being among children and adolescents during the first COVID-19 wave: A systematic review. JAMA Pediatrics, 176(4), 400–409. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.5840
58. Waitoller, F. R., & Artiles, A. J. (2013). A decade of professional development research for inclusive education: A critical review and notes for a research program. Review of Educational Research, 83(3), 319–356. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483905
59. Wang, M.-T., Degol, J. L., Amemiya, J., Parr, A., & Guo, J. (2020). Classroom climate and children's academic and psychological wellbeing: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Developmental Review, 57, Article 100912. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2020.100912