Teaching and Teacher Education 186 (2027) doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24401118

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Teaching and Teacher Education

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

Research paper

Attention to Neurodivergence and Educational Inclusion: Strategies for Supporting Diverse Learning Needs

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

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

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Neurodivergence
Inclusive
education
Differentiated
Teacher agency

ABSTRACT

Educational institutions increasingly serve neurodiverse students, including learners with autism, ADHD, dyslexia, dyspraxia, and dyscalculia. However, traditional pedagogical approaches often fail to accommodate their cognitive, sensory, and learning needs, creating barriers to inclusion and academic well-being. This study examines evidence-based strategies for promoting neurodiversity within inclusive educational systems through a critical integrative review of 65 peer-reviewed studies, meta-analyses, and international policy frameworks published between 2014 and 2026. Based on this synthesis, it proposes a Five-Pillar Neurodiversity-Affirming Pedagogical Framework integrating Universal Design for Learning, sensory regulation, executive-functioning support, multimodal assessment, and interprofessional co-teaching. The study highlights the need to move beyond deficit-oriented approaches toward flexible curricula, accessible learning environments, and collaborative teaching practices that recognize learner diversity as an opportunity to strengthen educational equity and academic achievement.

This study examines the multidimensional relationship between inclusive education practices and academic well-being in contemporary educational systems through a critical integrative review of 65 international peer-reviewed studies and policy frameworks published between 2014 and 2026.

Introduction

Contemporary educational systems across primary, secondary, and tertiary sectors are experiencing an unprecedented demographic and epistemological transformation characterized by growing recognition of human neurocognitive diversity (UNESCO, 2020; Pellicano & den Houting, 2022). Historically, mainstream schools and universities were engineered around an implicit assumption of neurotypical homogeneity—designing standardized curricula, linear instructional pacing, uniform sensory environments, and time-pressured summative examinations for an imagined statistical average learner (Rose et al., 2013; Slee, 2018). Within such standardized architectures, students whose neurological wiring diverges from statistical norms—including learners on the autism spectrum, students with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), dyslexia, dyscalculia, developmental coordination disorder (dyspraxia), Tourette syndrome, and other neurodevelopmental profiles—have systematically encountered structural barriers that misinterpret cognitive difference as academic deficit or behavioral non-compliance (Singer, 2017; Armstrong, 2012).

Over the past two decades, international human rights mandates—most notably the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD, Article 24) and Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4)—have propelled widespread legislative commitments to inclusive education (Ainscow, 2020; Florian & Beaton, 2018). Consequently, increasing proportions of neurodivergent students are enrolled in general education classrooms and higher education institutions worldwide. However, empirical investigations consistently reveal a persistent gap between physical placement in mainstream classrooms and genuine epistemic, social, and emotional inclusion (Göransson & Nilholm, 2014; Goodall, 2020). When neurodivergent learners are integrated into rigid educational environments without corresponding transformations in pedagogical design, sensory ecology, executive-functioning scaffolding, and assessment practices, physical inclusion frequently degenerates into covert marginalization, chronic academic anxiety, sensory overwhelm, and elevated rates of school refusal or university attrition (Hull et al., 2017; Rose et al., 2021).

Crucially, the capacity of educational institutions to respond effectively to neurodiversity depends on the pedagogical repertoire, self-efficacy, and collaborative support structures available to teachers (Hattie, 2009; Sharma & Sokal, 2016). Educators occupy the front line of inclusive transformation, translating abstract equity policies into everyday curricular decisions, classroom routines, and relational interactions (Florian & Spratt, 2013). Yet international surveys repeatedly demonstrate that both pre-service and in-service teachers feel underprepared to support the complex, overlapping cognitive, communicative, sensory, and socio-emotional profiles of neurodivergent students (Woodcock et al., 2022; Kiel et al., 2020). Relying predominantly on retroactive, individualized accommodations—such as isolated pull-out remediation or last-minute exam extensions—not only places unsustainable administrative burdens on educators, but also stigmatizes neurodivergent learners by marking their needs as burdensome exceptions to an unexamined norm (Waitoller & Artiles, 2013; Meyer et al., 2014).

Despite rapid growth in both neurodiversity studies and inclusive pedagogy research, practical guidance for educators often remains fragmented across clinical sub-disciplines (e.g., separate intervention manuals for autism, ADHD, or dyslexia) rather than synthesized into cohesive, classroom-wide pedagogical strategies that benefit all learners (Fletcher-Watson & Happé, 2019; CAST, 2024). Addressing this fragmentation requires bridging developmental cognitive science, critical disability studies, and inclusive instructional design. Accordingly, this article critically examines the paradigm shift from medical-deficit remediation to neurodiversity-affirming inclusion, synthesizes evidence-based classroom strategies across five core pedagogical domains, analyzes systemic barriers in contemporary educational institutions, and articulates concrete implications for teacher education and educational policy.

2. Theoretical Foundations: From Deficit Models To Neurodiversity-Affirming Inclusion

2.1. The Neurodiversity Paradigm and the Social-Ecological Model of Disability

Coined in the late 1990s by sociologist Judy Singer and expanded by neurodivergent scholars and advocates, the neurodiversity paradigm challenges the traditional pathologization of neurological variations (Singer, 2017; Walker, 2021). Just as biodiversity is indispensable to the resilience of ecological systems, neurodiversity posits that variations in human brain wiring—affecting attention, sensory processing, social communication, memory, motor coordination, and symbolic decoding—constitute natural, evolutionarily valid expressions of human diversity rather than intrinsic biological flaws requiring eradication or behavioral normalization (Pellicano & den Houting, 2022; Chapman, 2021). Within this conceptual vocabulary, neurodiversity refers to the totality of neurological variation across the human species, neurotypical describes individuals whose neurocognitive functioning aligns with dominant societal expectations, and neurodivergent designates individuals whose cognitive, sensory, or behavioral functioning diverges significantly from those dominant norms.

The neurodiversity paradigm aligns closely with the social and bioecological models of disability (Oliver, 2013; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Whereas the medical model locates educational failure exclusively inside the student's neurology and prescribes individual remediation to make the learner appear neurotypical, the social-ecological model distinguishes between neurological impairment or difference and environmental disablement. Disablement occurs when institutional spaces, curricular formats, communicative norms, and evaluative instruments are designed exclusively for neurotypical brains, thereby creating artificial barriers to participation (Slee, 2018; Booth & Ainscow, 2016). Shifting from deficit remediation to neurodiversity-affirming inclusion therefore redirects pedagogical inquiry from asking how to fix the neurodivergent student to asking how to redesign learning environments so that diverse minds can thrive authentically.

Importantly, adopting a neurodiversity-affirming stance does not deny the real, tangible challenges, co-occurring conditions, or support needs experienced by many neurodivergent learners—such as debilitating sensory pain, executive dysfunction, dyslexia-related decoding strain, or emotional dysregulation (Pellicano & den Houting, 2022; Chapman, 2021). Rather, it rejects stigmatizing deficit narratives and coercive behavioral compliance training (such as suppressing harmless self-regulatory stimming or forcing neurotypical eye contact) in

Teaching and Teacher Education 185 (2027)
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24401118

favor of strengths-based, respectful scaffolding that honors learner autonomy and dignity.

Within teacher education and educational policy, adopting a neurodiversity-affirming orientation also transforms how classroom diversity is conceptualized: rather than viewing neurodivergent students as a separate clinical subgroup requiring specialized segregation, educators recognize neurological variability as a universal dimension of every classroom community (Florian & Beaton, 2018; Slee, 2018).

2.2. Cognitive, Sensory, and Socio-Emotional Profiles Across Neurodivergent Learners

Effective pedagogical support requires educators to understand the multidimensional neurocognitive mechanisms underlying diverse learning profiles without reducing students to rigid diagnostic stereotypes. Across autism, ADHD, specific learning differences (dyslexia, dysgraphia, dyscalculia), and dyspraxia, three cross-cutting domains of neurocognitive variability profoundly shape classroom experiences: executive functioning, sensory-perceptual processing, and social-communicative reciprocity (Fletcher-Watson & Happé, 2019; Barkley, 2015).

First, executive functioning—comprising working memory, cognitive flexibility, inhibitory control, sustained attentional regulation, task initiation, and temporal estimation—exhibits substantial heterogeneity across neurodivergent learners (Diamond, 2013; Barkley, 2015). Students with ADHD or autism frequently demonstrate interest-based nervous systems or monotropic attentional focus (Murray et al., 2005), enabling extraordinary hyperfocus and analytical depth on intrinsically engaging problems while creating acute friction during fragmented, externally imposed task transitions or multi-step verbal instructions that overload working memory. Similarly, learners with dyslexia or dyscalculia experience elevated cognitive load during automated phonological decoding or numerical magnitude processing, leaving fewer working-memory resources available for higher-order conceptual synthesis unless scaffolding tools are provided (Shaywitz & Shaywitz, 2020).

Second, atypical sensory-perceptual processing—including hyper-reactivity (sensory defensiveness) and hypo-reactivity across auditory, visual, tactile, proprioceptive, and interoceptive modalities—affects up to 90% of autistic learners and a substantial proportion of individuals with ADHD and dyspraxia (Robertson & Baron-Cohen, 2017; Goodall, 2020). Conventional classrooms saturated with flickering fluorescent lights, unpredictable acoustic reverberation, crowded corridors, and pungent odors can trigger acute physiological fight-or-flight responses, severely impairing prefrontal cognitive processing and precipitating emotional meltdowns or shutdowns.

Third, social-communicative differences are increasingly understood through Milton's (2012) double empathy problem, which demonstrates that communicative breakdowns between autistic and non-autistic individuals stem from bidirectional differences in experiential framing and social signaling rather than a unilateral social deficit in neurodivergent learners. When neurodivergent students are compelled to suppress their natural communication styles and constantly imitate neurotypical social scripts—a phenomenon termed social camouflaging or masking—they incur severe cognitive fatigue, anxiety, depression, and erosion of authentic self-worth (Hull et al., 2017).

Crucially, neurocognitive profiles within and across diagnostic categories are highly dynamic and context-dependent rather than static traits (Fletcher-Watson & Happé, 2019; Diamond, 2013). A student who struggles to initiate a decontextualized worksheet in a noisy classroom may demonstrate extraordinary executive planning, creative synthesis, and sustained concentration when engaged in an intrinsically meaningful, sensory-regulated inquiry project—underscoring the decisive role of pedagogical design.

2.3. Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Self-Determination in Diverse Classrooms

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides the foundational pedagogical architecture for operationalizing neurodiversity-affirming inclusion across general education classrooms (Meyer et al., 2014; CAST, 2024). Informed by affective, recognition, and strategic brain networks, UDL shifts instructional planning away from retrofitting accommodations onto a rigid core curriculum toward designing flexible learning environments from the outset around three core principles: (1) multiple means of engagement, supporting diverse motivational triggers, self-regulation strategies, and emotional safety; (2) multiple means of representation, presenting conceptual content across visual, auditory, tactile, and linguistic modalities; and (3) multiple means of action and expression, allowing learners diverse pathways to navigate tasks and demonstrate mastery (Capp, 2017; Al-Azawei et al., 2016).

The psychological efficacy of UDL is reinforced by Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020), which establishes that intrinsic motivation, deep cognitive engagement, and psychological well-being flourish when educational environments satisfy learners' basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. When educators embed structured choice, transparent expectations, multimodal resources, and scaffolded goal-setting into everyday instruction, neurodivergent learners experience enhanced perceived competence and reduced evaluation anxiety, while neurotypical peers simultaneously benefit from clearer, richer pedagogical design (Katz, 2013; Flood & Banks, 2021).

Longitudinal synthesis research confirms that UDL-grounded instruction consistently improves academic achievement, task engagement, and perceived classroom belonging across both neurodivergent and neurotypical student cohorts (Capp, 2017; Flood & Banks, 2021). By embedding flexibility directly into the core curriculum, UDL eliminates the social visibility and stigma associated with singled-out special accommodations.

2.4. Intersectionality, Co-Occurring Profiles, and Equity in Educational Contexts

A nuanced understanding of neurodivergence in education must also account for neurodevelopmental co-occurrence (often termed 'AuDHD' when autism and ADHD co-occur, or overlapping dyslexia and dyspraxia) as well as intersectionality with socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, gender, and linguistic heritage (Crenshaw, 1991; Artiles, 2013; Connor et al., 2016). Diagnostic frameworks and teacher expectations have historically been normed on white, middle-class male presentations, leading to widespread under-identification or misdiagnosis of neurodivergent girls, gender-diverse youth, and racialized or low-income students (Hull et al., 2017; UNESCO, 2020).

Consequently, marginalized neurodivergent students frequently face compounded inequities: rather than receiving affirming pedagogical supports, their sensory distress or executive-functioning struggles are disproportionately met with punitive disciplinary sanctions, tracking into lower-expectation remedial streams, or academic exclusion (Artiles, 2013; Slee, 2018). An intersectionally informed inclusive pedagogy therefore insists on universal, non-stigmatizing classroom supports accessible to every student regardless of formal diagnostic documentation.

Moreover, intersectional scholarship underscores the importance of culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogy when supporting neurodivergent learners from bilingual, Indigenous, or migrant backgrounds (Paris & Alim, 2017; Artiles, 2013). Educators must carefully distinguish between second-language acquisition trajectories, cultural communication norms, and neurodevelopmental differences so that multilingual learners are neither misdiagnosed with learning disabilities nor denied affirming cognitive supports.

3. Methodology

3.1. Integrative Literature Review and Pedagogical Synthesis Design

To consolidate theoretical advances and empirical evidence across multiple disciplines, this study adopts a critical integrative review and conceptual synthesis methodology (Torraco, 2016; Snyder, 2019). Integrative reviews are uniquely suited to complex, rapidly evolving educational domains where insights from cognitive neuroscience, inclusive pedagogy, educational psychology, and teacher education must be synthesized into an actionable conceptual framework and evidence-informed practice guidelines. Following Torraco's (2016) methodological standards, the review was designed not merely to catalog existing studies, but to critically evaluate underlying paradigms, reconcile fragmented sub-disciplinary recommendations, and formulate a cohesive multi-pillar framework for supporting neurodivergent learners.

3.2. Database Search Strategy, Inclusion Criteria, and Corpus Selection

A systematic multi-database literature search was conducted across Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection, and ERIC for peer-reviewed articles published between 2014 and 2026, complemented by seminal foundational texts in neurodiversity theory, bioecological development, and Universal Design for Learning. Boolean search strings combined neurodiversity descriptors ('neurodiversity' OR 'neurodivergent' OR 'autism' OR 'ADHD' OR 'dyslexia' OR 'executive functioning' OR 'sensory processing') with educational inclusion and strategy descriptors ('inclusive education' OR 'inclusive pedagogy' OR 'Universal Design for Learning' OR 'differentiated instruction' OR 'classroom accommodations' OR 'teacher self-efficacy' OR 'co-teaching').

Retrieved records underwent two-stage screening (title/abstract followed by full-text evaluation) against four inclusion criteria: (1) publication in peer-reviewed Q1/Q2 journals or authoritative international organizations (e.g., UNESCO, OECD); (2) explicit focus on pedagogical, environmental, technological, or institutional strategies supporting neurodivergent learners in primary, secondary, or higher education; (3) empirical robustness or rigorous theoretical grounding; and (4) clear applicability to classroom teaching and teacher education. A final analytical corpus of 65 core sources was retained for thematic extraction and synthesis.

3.3. Thematic Extraction and Framework Construction

The 65 retained sources were analyzed using an iterative thematic synthesis protocol (Thomas & Harden, 2008). In the initial coding stage, empirical findings and instructional strategies were extracted and categorized according to targeted neurocognitive mechanisms (e.g., working memory load, sensory regulation, motivational engagement, expressive flexibility). In the second stage, axial synthesis grouped overlapping interventions into five coherent pedagogical pillars capable of operating synergistically across diverse classrooms. In the final stage, systemic implementation barriers and institutional enablers were mapped across Bronfenbrenner's bioecological levels (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) to formulate four testable theoretical propositions and concrete recommendations for teacher preparation and policy.

Quality appraisal during full-text review evaluated each retained source across four methodological dimensions: theoretical clarity in defining neurodivergence and inclusion, empirical rigor and transparency of analytical procedures, contextual and demographic diversity of study samples, and direct applicability of findings to classroom pedagogy or teacher preparation (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2016).

4. Evidence-Based Pedagogical Strategies For Supporting Neurodivergent Learners

4.1. Pillar 1: Universal Design for Learning and Differentiated Curricular Architecture

The cornerstone of neurodiversity-affirming instruction is proactive curricular flexibility achieved through the systematic application of Universal Design for Learning (Meyer et al., 2014; CAST, 2024). Rather than delivering content exclusively through dense monologic lectures or single-format textbooks, educators can operationalize multiple means of representation by pairing verbal explanations with structured visual organizers, concept maps, dual-coded infographics, captioned video demonstrations, and glossaries of key disciplinary terminology (Al-Azawei et al., 2016; Capp, 2017). Providing advance access to digital lecture slides, annotated outlines, and worked examples prior to class sessions substantially reduces real-time auditory processing and note-taking strain for autistic, ADHD, and dyslexic learners, enabling deeper conceptual engagement during synchronous instruction.

Equally transformative is diversifying multiple means of engagement by leveraging learners' intrinsic passions, strengths, and monotropic focus (Murray et al., 2005; Katz, 2013). Incorporating structured choice boards, inquiry-based projects anchored in students' specialized interests, and real-world problem-solving tasks harnesses the deep attentional capacity of neurodivergent minds while fostering autonomy and intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Furthermore, differentiated tiering of conceptual entry points—offering foundational scaffolds alongside open-ended extension challenges—ensures that twice-exceptional (2e) learners who combine high intellectual curiosity with specific processing or executive challenges remain cognitively stimulated rather than bored or discouraged.

Across STEM, humanities, and arts curricula alike, UDL-aligned instructional design also benefits from integrating strengths-based neurodivergent role models and epistemologies into disciplinary content (Armstrong, 2012; Walker, 2021). Highlighting diverse modes of pattern recognition, systematic detail analysis, divergent creative synthesis, and hyperfocused inquiry affirms neurodivergent learners' intellectual identities and counters internalized stigma.

4.2. Pillar 2: Sensory-Responsive and Predictable Classroom Ecologies

Because sensory overwhelm directly compromises neurodivergent students' cognitive availability and emotional regulation, deliberate management of the physical and temporal classroom environment constitutes an essential instructional strategy rather than a peripheral comfort (Robertson & Baron-Cohen, 2017; Goodall, 2020). Sensory-responsive classroom design begins with proactive environmental auditing: replacing harsh fluorescent illumination with natural daylight or warm, dimmable LED lighting; installing acoustic dampening panels or soft seating to minimize echo and sudden auditory spikes; designating low-stimulation quiet zones or calm-down corners accessible without stigma; and normalizing the universal use of sensory regulation tools such as noise-canceling headphones, tinted overlays, fidget manipulatives, and flexible seating options (wobble

cushions, standing desks, or floor seating).

Alongside sensory modulation, cognitive and emotional safety among neurodivergent learners is powerfully enhanced by environmental predictability and transparent structural routines (Fletcher-Watson & Happé, 2019). Posting clear visual schedules, articulating explicit step-by-step lesson agendas, providing advance countdown warnings before activity transitions, and explaining the underlying rationale for classroom norms reduce intolerance of uncertainty and conserve executive energy. Critically, educators should normalize self-regulatory behaviors—such as rhythmic movement, doodling, or averting eye contact during deep listening—recognizing these actions as adaptive neurocognitive strategies that support attentional focus rather than signs of disrespect or disengagement.

In laboratory, physical education, cafeteria, and digital learning spaces, sensory accessibility requires equally deliberate attention (Robertson & Baron-Cohen, 2017; Goodall, 2020). Offering advance previews of loud or chaotic transitions, allowing students to step briefly into designated low-sensory decompression spaces without punitive gatekeeping, and providing customizable digital interface themes (such as dark mode, sans-serif dyslexia-friendly typography, and adjustable line spacing) empower learners to proactively manage sensory load.

4.3. Pillar 3: Externalized Executive-Functioning Scaffolding and Cognitive Load Management

To support learners with diverse attentional, working-memory, and organizational profiles, educators must systematically externalize executive-functioning supports within daily instructional workflows (Diamond, 2013; Barkley, 2015). Cognitive Load Theory demonstrates that complex, multi-step assignments presented with ambiguous instructions rapidly saturate working memory, inducing task paralysis and avoidance among students with ADHD, autism, or specific learning differences. Effective instructional scaffolding involves decomposing large, open-ended projects into discrete, sequential micro-milestones with intermediate formative check-ins, explicit rubrics, and visual progress trackers.
Additional high-impact executive strategies include using visual timers (such as Time Timers) to make abstract temporal duration concrete, providing structured graphic organizers and sentence stems to scaffold written ideation, modeling explicit metacognitive self-monitoring checklists, and embedding brief, structured movement or brain breaks every 20 to 25 minutes to reset attentional vigilance (Katz, 2013; Wang et al., 2020). By embedding these organizational scaffolds into the shared classroom infrastructure for all learners, educators cultivate self-regulated learning skills while eliminating the stigma of individualized executive remediation.

Teachers can further strengthen executive functioning by integrating digital organizational ecosystems—such as shared visual Kanban boards, color-coded syllabus calendars, automated deadline reminders, and structured note-taking templates (e.g., Cornell notes or guided skeletal outlines)—into routine classroom workflows (Barkley, 2015; CAST, 2024). Teaching students explicitly how to select and customize these external scaffolds builds lifelong metacognitive autonomy.

4.4. Pillar 4: Multimodal Assessment, Flexible Pacing, and Assistive Technologies

Traditional assessment regimes—heavily reliant on timed, closed-book, handwritten essays or high-stakes standardized tests—frequently measure processing speed, handwriting stamina, and test-anxiety tolerance rather than genuine conceptual mastery (Shaywitz & Shaywitz, 2020; Putwain et al., 2021). Neurodiversity-affirming assessment aligns evaluation methods with construct-relevant learning objectives by offering multiple means of action and expression (CAST, 2024; Flood & Banks, 2021). Depending on curricular goals, students can demonstrate equivalent mastery through oral defenses, visual portfolios, podcast episodes, coded simulations, structured concept maps, or scaffolded written reports, supported by transparent analytic rubrics and opportunities for iterative formative revision.

Integrating assistive and educational technologies as universal learning tools further expands accessibility and learner independence (Al-Azawei et al., 2016; UNESCO, 2023). Text-to-speech readers, speech-to-text dictation software, predictive spelling tools, digital mind-mapping applications, smart pens, and ethically governed generative AI summarization or brainstorming assistants allow dyslexic, dyspraxic, and ADHD learners to bypass mechanical transcription bottlenecks and express complex ideas fluently (Kasneci et al., 2023). Normalizing universal extended time or untimed mastery assessments—where appropriate to the construct being measured—substantially reduces evaluation-induced distress and yields far more valid indicators of student learning.

Furthermore, formative feedback practices play a pivotal role in supporting neurodivergent learners' self-regulation and emotional equilibrium (Hattie, 2009; Putwain et al., 2021). Replacing vague, punitive margin comments with specific, strengths-based, actionable feedback—delivered through audio notes, brief one-on-one check-ins, or annotated rubrics—clarifies next steps without triggering rejection-sensitive dysphoria or shame.

4.5. Pillar 5: Relational Pedagogy, Peer Belonging, and Collaborative Co-Teaching

Pedagogical and technological strategies achieve enduring impact only within emotionally safe, affirming relational ecosystems (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Allen et al., 2018). Grounded in Milton's (2012) double empathy framework, neurodiversity-affirming relational pedagogy requires educators to practice explicit, literal, and non-judgmental communication, avoid sarcasm or ambiguous implied expectations, and validate diverse modes of emotional expression and social participation. Rather than forcing neurodivergent students into unstructured social mingling that often breeds peer rejection or bullying, teachers can foster authentic peer belonging through structured cooperative learning roles, interest-based peer clubs, and whole-class neurodiversity literacy education that normalizes cognitive differences as valued dimensions of human community (Rose et al., 2021; Goodall, 2020).

At the institutional level, sustaining these five pedagogical pillars requires replacing isolated solo teaching with structured interprofessional collaboration (Friend et al., 2010; Florian & Beaton, 2018). Co-teaching partnerships between general educators and special education specialists—combined with consultative input from occupational therapists, speech-language pathologists, school psychologists, and families—enable shared instructional planning, fluid flexible grouping, and responsive classroom support without segregating neurodivergent learners.

Across critical educational transitions—such as the shift from primary to secondary school, entry into higher education, or transition into workplace internships—structured transition planning and peer mentorship programs are indispensable (Eccles & Roeser, 2011; Rose et al., 2021). Providing pre-transition campus walkthroughs, visual orientation guides, explicit breakdowns of hidden academic expectations, and neurodivergent peer-mentoring networks prevents sudden spikes in anxiety and attrition during periods of institutional change.

5. Systemic Barriers And Institutional Enablers In Contemporary Education

5.1. Performative Accountability Versus Inclusive Flexibility

Despite robust empirical validation of neurodiversity-affirming strategies, contemporary schools and universities face formidable structural barriers rooted in neoliberal performative accountability regimes (Ball, 2016; Ainscow, 2020). High-stakes standardized testing, rigid national curriculum pacing guides, and institutional ranking metrics incentivize uniform instructional delivery and narrow norm-referenced evaluation (Done & Andrews, 2020; Slee, 2018). Within such high-pressure environments, educators often experience acute role conflict—feeling compelled to prioritize rapid syllabus coverage and standardized test preparation over individualized pacing, multimodal assessment, and socio-emotional scaffolding.

For neurodivergent students, pervasive performative pressure amplifies test anxiety, maladaptive perfectionism, and internalizing distress (Putwain et al., 2021). Furthermore, bureaucratic funding formulas in many jurisdictions continue to require formal clinical diagnoses before unlocking classroom support resources, creating lengthy diagnostic bottlenecks that leave undiagnosed, low-income, or marginalized neurodivergent learners unsupported during critical developmental windows (UNESCO, 2020; Artiles, 2013).

In higher education contexts as well, rigid credit-hour completion rules, weed-out introductory courses with high-stakes timed exams, and inflexible attendance policies create structural friction with neurodivergent learners' fluctuating executive and sensory energy profiles (Done & Andrews, 2020; Ball, 2016). Reforming institutional academic regulations to permit flexible course loads, asynchronous participation options, and mastery-based assessment retakes substantially improves retention and academic well-being.

5.2. Gaps in Initial Teacher Education and Educator Emotional Labor

A second systemic barrier lies in the structure of initial teacher education (ITE) and ongoing professional development. Across numerous teacher preparation programs, neurodivergence and inclusive education are relegated to a single, theory-heavy elective course emphasizing clinical diagnostic labels rather than practical, classroom-wide instructional design (Florian & Spratt, 2013; Sharma & Sokal, 2016). Consequently, novice and experienced teachers alike frequently report low self-efficacy in differentiating instruction, managing sensory-driven behavioral distress, and collaborating with multidisciplinary specialists (Woodcock et al., 2022; Kiel et al., 2020).

When teachers are asked to support highly heterogeneous classrooms with large student-to-teacher ratios, minimal co-planning time, and mounting administrative paperwork, intensive emotional labor rapidly escalates into emotional exhaustion and occupational burnout (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Herman et al., 2018). Protecting educator well-being through collaborative school structures and practical pedagogical training is therefore an indispensable precondition for sustaining neurodiversity-affirming classrooms.

Addressing educator workload and emotional labor also requires revising institutional staffing formulas to recognize collaborative planning, family communication, and individualized scaffolding as core components of instructional workload rather than uncompensated extra duties (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Friend et al., 2010). When schools allocate dedicated weekly co-planning blocks and specialist consultation hours, educators experience higher collective efficacy and significantly lower emotional exhaustion.

5.3. Algorithmic Bias and Digital Accessibility Divides

As digital learning platforms, learning analytics, and generative AI become pervasive in schools and universities, new technological barriers and opportunities emerge for neurodivergent learners (UNESCO, 2023; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). Poorly designed learning management systems cluttered with uncaptioned media, inconsistent navigation, and flashing visual elements exacerbate sensory and cognitive overload. Moreover, automated proctoring software and predictive analytics trained on neurotypical behavioral norms frequently misflag atypical eye gaze, stimming movements, or non-linear writing rhythms of autistic, ADHD, and dyslexic students as signs of academic dishonesty or disengagement (Baker & Hawn, 2022; Kasneci et al., 2023). Establishing strict accessibility-by-design procurement standards (such as WCAG compliance) and ethical AI governance is vital to ensure digitalization promotes equity rather than algorithmic exclusion.

Additionally, educational institutions must scrutinize the design of digital assessment platforms and learning analytics dashboards to prevent automated misinterpretation of neurodivergent learning behaviors (Baker & Hawn, 2022; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). Non-linear reading sequences, extended pause intervals during digital writing, or preference for asynchronous text-based discussion over rapid synchronous chat frequently reflect valid neurodivergent cognitive styles rather than disengagement. Co-designing educational technologies alongside neurodivergent students and educators ensures digital innovation enhances learner autonomy rather than enforcing algorithmic conformity.

5.4. Theoretical Propositions for Future Empirical Inquiry

Synthesizing our Five-Pillar Neurodiversity-Affirming Pedagogical Framework with Bronfenbrenner's bioecological systems perspective (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006), we advance four testable theoretical propositions to guide empirical research across K–12 and higher education contexts:

Proposition 1 (Universal Proactive Design Pathway): Classroom-wide implementation of UDL principles, sensory-responsive environments, and externalized executive-functioning scaffolds positively predicts neurodivergent students' academic self-efficacy, engagement, and sense of belonging while reducing academic anxiety and sensory exhaustion, independent of formal clinical diagnosis.

Proposition 2 (Camouflaging Reduction Mechanism): Neurodiversity-affirming relational pedagogy and whole-class neurodiversity literacy mediate the relationship between inclusive placement and student psychological well-being by reducing the perceived need for social camouflaging and peer rejection.

Proposition 3 (Teacher Self-Efficacy and Co-Teaching Mediation): Practice-oriented inclusive teacher education and institutionalized interprofessional co-teaching enhance teacher self-efficacy and mitigate occupational burnout, thereby increasing the fidelity and sustainability of differentiated classroom strategies.

Proposition 4 (Accountability and Digital Governance Moderation): Flexible assessment policies and accessibility-audited digital ecosystems positively moderate the translation of inclusive policy mandates into equitable learning outcomes for neurodivergent learners.

To bridge conceptual theory and institutional implementation, the Five-Pillar Neurodiversity-Affirming Pedagogical Framework operates across three interconnected levels of educational governance. At the micro-classroom level, teachers enact UDL lesson architectures, sensory regulation stations, decomposed task milestones, multimodal assessments, and explicit relational norms. At the meso-institutional level, school and university leaders institutionalize protected co-planning schedules, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), sensory-accessible physical and digital infrastructure, and participatory student-family advisory councils. At the macro-policy level, educational authorities align curriculum standards, teacher certification requirements, and universal capacity funding to reward inclusive pedagogical innovation and student well-being.

6. Discussion And Implications For Practice, Teacher Education, And Policy

6.1. Implications for Classroom Practice and Institutional Leadership

The findings of this integrative synthesis carry immediate operational implications for educators and school or university leaders. Rather than treating neurodivergence as an individual medical problem requiring segregated intervention, educational institutions should adopt a tiered, proactive Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) anchored in Universal Design for Learning (Meyer et al., 2014; CAST, 2024). At Tier 1 (universal classroom design), all instructors should routinely embed multimodal content delivery, advance lecture outlines, visual schedules, sensory regulation options, decomposed assignment milestones, and flexible assessment choices. These universal practices eliminate the majority of everyday learning barriers for neurodivergent students while enriching instructional clarity for all learners and reducing the administrative burden of managing dozens of separate individual accommodation plans.

School and university leaders play a decisive role in cultivating neurodiversity-affirming institutional cultures (Ainscow, 2020; Booth & Ainscow, 2016). Leadership actions include conducting participatory sensory and accessibility audits of physical campuses and digital platforms in partnership with neurodivergent students, protecting weekly collaborative planning schedules for general and special educators (Friend et al., 2010), establishing quiet sensory recovery spaces across campuses, and replacing punitive zero-tolerance behavioral codes with restorative, trauma-informed, and functionally supportive approaches to emotional dysregulation (Jennings, 2019).

At the higher education level specifically, institutional leadership must align disability support services with faculty development centers so that neurodiversity-affirming practices become embedded within mainstream disciplinary teaching rather than relegated to isolated compliance offices (Al-Azawei et al., 2016; CAST, 2024). Proactive syllabus redesign, universal lecture recording with accurate transcripts, flexible seminar participation modes, and neurodivergent student advisory boards foster inclusive university cultures that reduce the need for stigmatizing individual disclosures.

6.2. Transforming Initial Teacher Education and Professional Development

Preparing educators for neurodiverse classrooms requires structural reform of initial teacher education (ITE) and continuous professional development (CPD) (Florian & Beaton, 2018; Woodcock et al., 2022). Teacher preparation programs should discontinue fragmented, deficit-oriented courses organized around clinical pathology checklists and instead infuse neurodiversity-affirming inclusive pedagogy across all subject-matter methods courses, educational psychology modules, and assessment design workshops. Pre-service teachers must acquire applied fluency in cognitive load management, executive-functioning scaffolding, sensory environmental design, assistive technologies, and strengths-based communication informed by neurodivergent lived perspectives.

Furthermore, clinical practicum placements should intentionally pair teacher candidates with mentor educators practicing collaborative co-teaching and UDL in genuinely heterogeneous classrooms (Sharma & Sokal, 2016; Kiel et al., 2020). For practicing educators, sustained school-embedded professional learning communities (PLCs) and lesson-study cycles—where teachers collaboratively analyze student engagement, refine multimodal lesson plans, and share emotional support—prove far more effective at building enduring self-efficacy than isolated one-day workshops (Waitoller & Artiles, 2013; Herman et al., 2018).

Equally vital is establishing structured mentorship and coaching models within schools and universities that pair novice teachers with experienced inclusive practitioners (Florian & Spratt, 2013; Woodcock et al., 2022). Reflective video analysis, co-planned lesson demonstrations, and peer observation protocols rooted in neurodiversity-affirming principles enable educators to translate theoretical knowledge of executive functioning and sensory regulation into habitual classroom routines.

6.3. Policy Reform and Global South / Latin American Contextualization

At the macro-policy level, ministries of education and higher education accreditation bodies must align funding, curriculum standards, and quality assurance frameworks with inclusive equity principles (UNESCO, 2020; OECD, 2023). Transitioning from diagnosis-contingent funding—which delays support and privileges families able to afford private clinical assessments—to universal, school-wide inclusive capacity grants enables educational institutions to invest proactively in co-teaching teams, smaller class sizes, assistive technologies, and sensory-accessible infrastructure. Concurrently, national assessment frameworks must permit construct-valid multimodal accommodations and flexible pacing without penalizing schools or students.

These policy imperatives hold particular significance for educational systems across Latin America and the broader Global South, where rapid expansion of school and university enrollment has welcomed historically excluded populations amid constrained specialist budgets and pronounced socioeconomic disparities (UNESCO, 2020). In contexts where clinical diagnostic infrastructure is unevenly distributed across urban and rural regions, universal low-cost pedagogical strategies—such as peer-assisted cooperative learning, visual structuring, flexible formative assessment, culturally sustaining pedagogy, and collaborative teacher learning networks—offer equitable, scalable pathways to support neurodivergent learners without relying on expensive medical gatekeeping.

In Latin American and other Global South universities and schools, rapid enrollment expansion has brought first-generation, Indigenous, Afro-descendant, rural, and neurodivergent learners into institutions historically structured around rigid, lecture-dominated pedagogies (UNESCO, 2020). Embedding accessible academic tutoring, flexible progression pathways, intercultural bilingual supports, and faculty training in Universal Design for Learning represents a decisive strategy for converting formal access into genuine academic belonging and degree completion.

6.4. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

As a critical integrative review and conceptual synthesis, this study is bounded by the scope of existing peer-reviewed literature, which remains disproportionately concentrated in high-income Global North contexts and primary/secondary schooling relative to higher education and Global South institutions. Future empirical research should employ longitudinal, mixed-methods, and multilevel designs to test the proposed theoretical propositions across diverse cultural and institutional settings. Priority should be given to participatory, co-produced research methodologies led alongside neurodivergent students, families, and educators to evaluate how specific combinations of UDL, sensory adjustments, and co-teaching influence long-term academic persistence, self-determination, and psychological flourishing (Pellicano & den Houting, 2022; Messiou, 2017).

Furthermore, future research should develop and validate multi-informant assessment instruments capable of evaluating neurodiversity-affirming classroom climates from the converging perspectives of neurodivergent learners, neurotypical peers, classroom teachers, and support specialists. Incorporating physiological and ecological momentary assessment methods—such as wearable sensory-stress indicators or daily diary measures of cognitive fatigue and camouflaging—can illuminate real-time micro-interactions between classroom design and student well-being that conventional cross-sectional surveys overlook.

7. Conclusion

Attending meaningfully to neurodivergence is one of the defining pedagogical and ethical imperatives of twenty-first-century educational inclusion. Moving beyond superficial physical integration or stigmatizing deficit remediation requires reimagining classrooms, curricula, assessments, and institutional cultures around the reality of human neurocognitive variability. By integrating Universal Design for Learning, sensory-responsive environments, externalized executive-functioning scaffolding, multimodal assessment, and collaborative relational pedagogy within supportive institutional ecosystems, educators can dismantle disabling barriers and unlock the academic potential and well-being of every learner. Sustaining this transformation demands coherent investment in practice-oriented teacher preparation, interprofessional collaboration, and equity-centered educational governance that celebrates neurodiversity as an enduring asset to learning communities.

Credit Authorship Contribution Statement

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

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
60. Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learning, Media and Technology, 45(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995
61. Woodcock, S., Sharma, U., Subban, P., & Hitches, E. (2022). Teacher self-efficacy and inclusive education practices: Rethinking teachers' engagement with inclusive practices. Teaching and Teacher Education, 117, Article 103802. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103802