

ARTYKUŁY I ROZPRAWY

GABRIELLE WILCOX*

IS FULL INCLUSION ALWAYS THE ANSWER?

Introduction

Inclusive education as a policy has increased in popularity in recent decades and has often been viewed as a moral imperative. This move has been fueled by the historic lack of care in general education regarding students with more complex needs, which has led to two systems with little interaction in between. Unfortunately, this seems to be a reactionary approach that simplifies a complex issue into a dichotomous choice: either full inclusion or special education. This chapter represents alternative voices in arguing for a more nuanced approach to inclusive practice that demands better quality research on which decisions can be based and puts students' needs and goals above blanket policies that are applied indiscriminately.

What is Inclusive Education?

While the OECD (2000) asserted that there is agreement on what inclusive education is and that resistance to change is the only impediment to its effective implementation, others suggest that there is a continuing lack of conceptual clarity regarding what constitutes inclusive education. Currently, there is not a single, agreed upon definition of what inclusive education is, which makes it difficult to compare studies and to determine its efficacy and effectiveness (Göransson, Niholm, 2014; Niholm, Göransson, 2017). Further more, some arguing for inclusion for all students assume that the local rather than instructional support is the most critical aspect of instructional decisions and that any support provided outside of this specific location is discriminatory (Kauffman, Ward, Bader, 2016). Part of the rationale is that students should socially interact with

* Gabrielle Wilcox (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9295-2011>); University of Calgary 2500 University Dr. NW Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4, EDT 536; tel. +1 403 2202534; e-mail: gwilcox@ucalgary.ca

typically developing peers. There is also an assumption that all students can feel they belong to general education classroom. However, some students feel a stronger sense of belonging in classrooms with students who experience challenges similar to theirs (Hornby, 2015).

Fuchs and Fuchs (1994) argue that full inclusion has been championed by supporters of social integration for students with intellectual disabilities (ID), especially in increasing acceptance of peers with differences in regular students. However, this is achieved while notably ignoring the academic needs of students with special education needs (SEN), especially the academic needs of those with specific learning disorders (SLD). In full inclusion models, students with disabilities tend to receive accommodations rather than interventions, e.g. they may be given a calculator rather than being provided with an evidence-based intervention to teach them how to compute long division (Fuchs, Fuchs, 1994; Kauffman et al., 2018).

What is the State of Evidence?

Academic

Unfortunately, general student performance is often less than ideal (Canadian Council on Learning, 2008), and teachers report that they do not generally use evidence-based curricula in general education instruction (Kretlow, Helf, 2013). Therefore, it remains unclear how school personnel implementing the full-inclusion system can support the varied, and often significant, difficulties of students with needs related to various disabilities (Fuchs, Fuchs, 1994). Furthermore, there is evidence that students with SLDs do not achieve well academically in inclusive classrooms, making limited gains over a three-month period (Fuchs et al., 2015; Fuchs, Fuchs, Fernstrom, 1993). This suggests that inclusive classrooms do not meet the academic needs of all students. One meta-analysis of academic achievement in inclusive education acknowledged the challenge of uneven definitions of inclusive education but did not account for this in the analysis; this study found significant but weak impact of inclusive classrooms, highlighting the variable findings (Szumski, Smogorzewska, Karwowski, 2017). Nienke M. Ruijs and Thea T.D. Peetsma (2009) conducted a review of research on the impact of inclusive practices on students with and without SEN; however, this part of the review excluded students who had moderate to severe needs. Their summary concluded that there were mixed results regarding the academic performance of students with mild to moderate disabilities and students without special needs. Additionally, the definition and amount of inclusion varied, and most studies were descriptive or did not utilize a control group. Their overall conclusions suggest variable findings including positive effects, negative effects, and no effects, which likely hides differential effects of inclusion providing academic benefits for some and not others (Ruijs, Peetsma, 2009).

A recent randomized controlled trial examined academic gains of students with an SLD in math receiving either inclusive education or specialized instruction over three years (Fuchs et al., 2015). Students who received the specialized intervention demonstrated better results and smaller gaps in knowledge than students receiving inclusive education. The effect sizes were large which suggests that for the specific math areas covered in this study, specialized instruction with specific strategies resulted in stronger academic gains than inclusive education.

In addition to specific academic gains, Lynn S. Fuchs and colleagues (2015) found that teachers in inclusive education classrooms do not use differential behavioral and instructional strategies for students with SLDs. Instead, students with SLDs were less engaged in class activities, and they interacted less frequently with both peers and teachers. Additionally, an international survey found that in inclusive classrooms, teachers consistently reported spending less time with students with SEN (Cooc, 2019), which is concerning considering that students with SEN require more instructional time. Moreover, Spencer J. Salend (2001) noted that students with intellectual and developmental disabilities were included for socialization, but there was little emphasis on academic and adaptive skills necessary for successful transition to adulthood.

A suggestion that placement in inclusive setting with accommodations will provide appropriate access to instruction implies that students with SEN will have equal access to the curriculum without specialized instruction (Gilmour, Fuchs, Wehby, 2019). However, many strategies that fall under inclusive practice are not evidence-based (Fuchs, Fuchs, 2015) and, as noted, their impact on academic functioning is variable with little information suggesting improved academic outcomes for students with SEN. Students' limited academic achievement is related to insufficient instruction because inclusive education teachers 'do not recognize the need for it and the know-how to provide it' (Fuchs, Fuchs, 2015, p. 105).

Social, Emotional, and Behavioural Functioning

A primary outcome of inclusive education is social integration and belonging. However, students diagnosed with behavioral and emotional disorders demonstrated higher rates of disruptive behaviors in inclusive classrooms than in specialized classrooms, which likely impeded their sense of belonging (Salend, 2001). Furthermore, students in special education placements actually reported higher academic self-concept than those in inclusive settings and demonstrated a smaller decrease in academic motivation over two years (Kocaj, Kuhl, Jansen, Pant, Stanat, 2018). Students with SEN who attended inclusive classrooms were surrounded by higher-performing peers with whom they likely compared their own progress, decreasing perceptions of their own academic progress. Susanne Schwab, Markus Gebhardt, Mathias Krammer, and Barbara Gasteiger-Klicpera

(2015) found that students with SEN, with varying levels of inclusion, felt less socially included than their peers, suggesting that inclusive education may not meet its primary objective for all students.

After graduation, students with ID tend to purposefully limit their social interactions to family, agencies, and others who have disabilities to increase their sense of safety and belonging (Butcher, Wilton, 2008). This suggests that the level of social interaction in inclusive education is not demonstrated in post high school interactions of students with ID. Even in employment-related inclusion, there has been little focus on the individuals' view of whether they feel socially included in the workplace, making it difficult to draw conclusions about its effectiveness (Lysaght, Cobigo, Hamilton, 2012).

Ruijs's and Peetsman's (2009) review also included studies on the social-emotional functioning of students with mild to moderate disabilities in inclusive settings. Again, findings were inconclusive and did not address the impact of social interaction outside of school, but evidence suggested that both peers and students with SEN perceive themselves less positively in general education classrooms. The authors also found a slightly positive effect for students without special needs on social outcomes, implying that inclusion may be more beneficial for typically developing students than for students with additional needs.

Parent and Family Views

In research on the impact of inclusive education on instruction and outcomes for students with SEN, parents' views are rarely explored, which is problematic as parents continue to support students with SEN after they transition to adulthood. Interestingly, parents of children with SEN supported the idea of inclusive education, but about half of them did not think it was the best option for their children (de Boer, Pijl, Minnaret, 2010). Students' needs differ, and the post-graduation goals that they and their families have also differ; for some students, inclusive placements are an appropriate choice to meet those goals, but for others, inclusive placements interfere with preparing for post graduation goals (Wilcox, McQuay, Jones, 2019). Consequently, a policy that does not consider the needs of students and the desires of parents who will continue to support them after graduation will not meet the needs of a large number of students. Additionally, students who do not receive adequate support, tend to have limited employment opportunities, restricted access to social and leisure activities, and impaired mental and physical health as adults. This is why there is an emphasis on transition planning during secondary school for students with disabilities. Addressing these goals in inclusive secondary classrooms would likely interfere with the load of material that must be covered in secondary schools (Talaparta, Wilcox, Roof, Hutchinson, 2019).

While inclusion has been widely purported to benefit all students, review studies including students with emotional, behavioral, and learning disabilities

have not demonstrated consistent results, suggesting that those views are overstated (Limbach-Reich, 2015). There are multiple contributors to these uneven findings including a lack of a consistent definition, limited comparison or control groups, weak research designs, no measures of treatment fidelity, lack of clarity in outcome measures (academic, behavioral, adaptive, etc.), and also limited attention to what the benefits and detriments of inclusion are and how they may differ across populations (Limbach-Reich, 2015; Lindsay, 2003). Despite the limited evidence supporting the ideal of full inclusion for all, the moral rhetoric of inclusive education has made it difficult to challenge, even though the evidence of its effectiveness has been equivocal. Consequently, inclusion has been broadly implemented as a policy without evidence of its effectiveness (Haug, 2017).

It is concerning that empirical evidence has not only been unrequired before widely implementing full inclusion policies and practices. What is more, it is sometimes viewed as irrelevant to the debate (Haug, 2017; Kavale, Forness, 2000). Some argue that true social justice is only achievable when there is a range of instructional options available to address the needs and goals of students (Kauffman et al., 2018) and that students will continue to struggle until they receive the appropriate instruction to which they are entitled (Fuchs, Fuchs, 2015).

Is Specially Designed Instruction Different and Necessary?

Some students need specific instructional content and strategies that would not benefit most students in general education. By definition, students who are eligible for special education are likely not to learn at the same rate as students without disabilities. As a result, students with disabilities often require a slower pace of instruction and more intensive, individualized instruction with greater support and more repetitions and feedback than necessary for most students in general education (Cooc, 2019).

Naomi P. Zigmond and Amanda Kloo (2011) summarized some of the essential ways in which special education is different from general education. First, while general education is a right in many countries, special education is reserved for students who meet certain criteria. Second, general education focuses on a group level instruction while special education is modified to individual needs. While differentiated instruction is a useful tool in supporting diverse student needs in a general education classroom, it is often insufficient to meet the needs of students with disabilities, as students requiring special education often need a level of explicit, intensive instruction that is difficult to attain in regular education classrooms. Finally, 'general education is a place; special education is a service' (Zigmond, Kloo, 2011, p. 161), which is a primary argument in support of strong special education services.

Do Regular Education Teachers Have the Training and Support Necessary to Effectively Provide Inclusive Education?

Teachers indicate concerns regarding their preparation and skills in meeting the needs of diverse learners in their classrooms. Some concerns noted by teachers include not having an adequate training, the impact on other students, and a difficulty in effectively managing poor social skills or violent outbursts (Forlin, Keen, Barrett, 2008). While teacher's attitude toward inclusive education can positively impact outcomes, in other instances teachers who were initially enthusiastic demonstrated a decrease in their enthusiasm after implementing inclusive education practices because their expectations for success were not met (Forlin, Keen, Barrett, 2008). In one study, teachers who held more positive views of inclusive education, experienced greater levels of burnout related to self-fulfillment (Talmor et al., 2005). In addition to positive and inclusive attitudes, students with disabilities need teachers with competence in specific instructional strategies, especially in the evidence-based interventions to meet specific needs (Gilmour, Fuchs, Wehby, 2019). General education teachers typically learn few specific strategies they can utilize in teaching SEN students as their training focuses on content and general pedagogy whereas special education teachers receive specific training in how to modify and individualize (Zigmond, Kloo, 2011).

Teachers report that while they think they have the skills to create an inclusive classroom environment, they find it difficult to plan, prepare, manage, find activities and materials, and assess primary school students in an inclusive environment (Gaitas, Martins, 2017). A review of research noted that teachers reported that they feel unprepared to teach in inclusive settings and to meet student needs. Behavioral needs particularly interfered with their ability to meet the needs of the class as a whole, leading to additional work demands (Gray, Wilcox, Nordstokke, 2017). Furthermore, studies tend to focus on elementary settings, but the logistic and content demands of secondary schools significantly increase the aforementioned difficulties.

Students with learning disabilities require an intense, direct, and systematic instruction in order to make effective gains. This is challenging for general education teachers to provide (Fuchs, Fuchs, 1994) both due to the limits of their training and the demands of large, busy classrooms. Full inclusion demands a level of differentiation that most teachers cannot achieve (Kauffman, Ward, Badar, 2016) and requires general education teachers of all class levels to meet the instructional needs of students who need feeding and toileting assistance, instruction in Braille and sign language, Applied Behavior Analysis, Picture Exchange Systems, and training in life and job skills, as well as intensive academic and study skills interventions.

A syntheses of research on the level of instruction that leads to academic gains in math and reading for students with SLD suggests that they require a small

group instruction ranging from one to four students depending on the specific intervention (Fuchs, Fuchs, 2015). Additionally, students with SLDs require longer teaching sessions, more sessions per week, and more weeks of the intervention. Even when general education teachers have the training to deliver these intensive interventions, it is logistically difficult to provide this type of intervention for multiple students with divergent needs while meeting the other diverse needs of students in the classroom. As an example of the intensity of instruction needed by students with SEN, the following paragraph provides descriptions of the instructional needs of students with reading difficulty and transitional needs of students with ID.

Research suggests that students with an SLD in reading require interventions delivered in small groups, with long sessions, over 20–30 weeks, utilizing explicit, direct instruction, active student engagement and practice (Vaughn, Denton, Fletcher, 2010). Most elementary school teachers in inclusive settings would struggle to provide this, even if they were trained, as they would have multiple students with differing SEN. In locations that require transition planning for students with SEN the specific goals are jointly created with families and students. There is also introduced a progress monitoring in areas such as independent living, employment skills, and functional academics (Landmark, Ju, Zhang, 2010; Talapatra et al., 2019). Most general education students do not work on these skills during school, making it difficult for teachers to meet the needs of the whole classroom and students with SEN.

Moving Forward to Support All Students

Approaches to providing education have tended to represent either/or thinking in determining how to meet the needs of diverse students, with the focus moving between full inclusion and full separate Special Education classes. Vaughn and Schumm (1995) outlined an approach to inclusive education over two decades ago that is flexible and focuses on the needs of students rather than on inflexible policies that promote only one way to support students. The main tenants of this approach are that teachers must choose to participate rather than being mandated to provide inclusive education. Most importantly though, Vaugh and Schumm assert that data must be collected and analyzed regularly to determine how effective practices are for the school, specific populations, and individual students. Focusing on implementation at the school level, with required data collection and analysis, will allow decisions that consider the needs of students in a given context. It will also enable individualized support and service delivery to meet the needs of students rather than the mandates of policies.

Parent and student goals need to be part of the planning and decision-making process as they can speak most clearly about their needs; ignoring the opinions of students and families marginalizes them and discounts their voice (Kauff-

man, Anastasiou et al., 2016). If students are required to participate in inclusive education even when it does not provide the instruction necessary to reach family and student goals, then inclusive education denies them access to education.

It is imperative that educational research provides clear conceptual definitions of what is meant by inclusion in order to provide clearer information on what aspects of inclusive practice are beneficial for various aspects of functioning (e.g., academic, social). It also needs to define the students who will potentially benefit because inclusive education is unlikely to support all students in the same way (Niholm, Göransson, 2017). Future research also needs to remediate current limitations including limited comparison or control groups, weak research designs, no measures of treatment fidelity, lack of clarity in outcome measures (academic, behavioral, adaptive, etc.), limited attention to what the benefits and detriments of inclusion are, and variable impact across populations (Limbach-Reich, 2015; Lindsay, 2003). Finally, randomized control trials should also be implemented (Fuchs et al., 2015).

Instructional and placement decisions must be made for individual students rather than for entire groups, and inclusion cannot be conflated with an intervention or instructional strategy to support students with disabilities (Kauffman, Anastasiou et al., 2016). While it is relatively easy to demonstrate location, it is much more difficult and much more important to demonstrate access to instruction. Students deserve to have educational planning decisions based upon what will best support their specific needs and provide them with an access to education rather than policy decisions about location.

References

- Butcher, S., Wilton, R. (2008). Stuck in transition? Exploring the spaces of employment training for youth with intellectual disability. *Geoforum*, 39, 1079–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2007.11.002>.
- Cooc, N. (2019). Do teachers spend less time teaching in classrooms with students with special needs? Trends from international data. *Educational Research*, 48, 273–286. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X19852306>.
- Canadian Council on Learning. (2008). *Reading the future: Planning to meet Canada's future literacy needs*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- de Boer, A., Pijl, S.J., Minnaert, A. (2010). Attitudes of parents towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 25, 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856251003658694>.
- Forlin, C., Keen, M., Barrett, E. (2008). The concerns of mainstream teachers: Coping with inclusivity in an Australian context. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 55, 251–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10349120802268396>.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.S. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. *Exceptional Children*, 60, 294–309.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.S. (2015). Rethinking service delivery for students with significant learning problems: Developing and implementing intensive instruction. *Remedial and Special Education*, 36, 105–111. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0741932514558337>.

- Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D., Compton, D.L., Wehby, J., Schumacher, R.F., Gersten, R., Jordan, N.C. (2015). Inclusion versus specialized intervention for very-low-performing students: What does *access* mean in an era of academic challenge. *Exceptional Children*, 81, 134–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0014402914551743>.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.S., Fernstrom, P. (1993). A conservative approach to special education reform: Mainstreaming through transenvironmental programming and curriculum-based measurement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, 149–177. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312030001149>.
- Gaitas, S., Martins, M.A. (2017). Teacher perceived difficulty in implementing differentiated instructional strategies in primary school. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21, 544–556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2016.1223180>.
- Gilmour, A.F., Fuchs, D., Wehby, J.H. (2019). Are students with disabilities accessing the curriculum? A meta-analysis of the reading achievement gap between students with and without disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 85, 329–346. doi: 10.1177/0014402918795830.
- Göransson, K., Niholm, 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>.
- Gray, C., Wilcox, G., Nordstokke, D. (2017). Teacher mental health, school climate, inclusive education and student learning: A review. *Canadian Psychology*, 58, 203–210. doi: 10.1037/cap0000117.
- Haug, P. (2017). Understanding inclusive education: Ideas and reality. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 19, 206–217. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15017419.2016.1224778>.
- Hornby, G. (2015). Inclusive special education: Development of a new theory for the education of children with special needs and disabilities. *British Journal of Special Education*, 42, 237–256. doi: 10.1111/1467-8578.12101.
- Kauffman, J.M., Anastasiou, D., Badar, J., Travers, J.C., Wiley, A.J. (2016). Inclusive education moving forward. In J.P. Bakken, F.E. Obiakor (Eds.), *General and special education inclusion in an age of change: Roles of professionals involved* (pp. 153–178). Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Kauffman, J.M., Felder, M.F., Ahrbeck, B., Badar, J. (2018). Inclusion of all students in general education? International appeal for a more temperate approach to inclusion. *Journal of International Special Needs Education*, 21, 1–10. doi: 10.9782/17-00009.
- Kauffman, J.M., Ward, D.M., Badar, J. (2016). The delusion of full inclusion. In R.M. Foxx, J.A. Mulick (Eds.), *Controversial therapies for autism and intellectual disabilities: Fad, fashion, and science in professional practice* (pp. 71–86). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kavale, K.A., Forness, S.R. (2000). History, rhetoric, and reality: Analysis of the inclusion debate. *Remedial & Special Education*, 21, 279–296. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F074193250002100505>.
- Kocaj, A., Kuhl, P., Jansen, M., Pant, H.A., Stanat, P. (2018). Educational placement and achievement of students with special education needs. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 55, 63–83. <https://doi.org/j.cedpsych.2018.09.004>.
- Kretlow, A.G., Helf, S.S. (2013). Teacher implementation of evidence-based practices in tier 1: A national survey. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 36, 167–185.
- Landmark, L.J., Ju, S., Zhang, D. (2010). Substantiated best practices in transition: Fifteen plus years later. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 33, 165–176.
- Limbach-Reich, A. (2015). Reviewing the evidence on educational inclusion of students with disabilities: Differentiating ideology from evidence. *International Journal of Child, Youth, and Family Studies*, 6(3), 358–378.
- Lindsay, G. (2003). Inclusive education: A critical perspective. *British Journal on Special Education*, 30(1), 3–15.
- Lysaght, R., Cobigo, V., Hamilton, K. (2012). Inclusion as a focus of employment-related research in intellectual disability from 2000 to 2010: A scoping review. *Disability & Rehabilitation*, 34, 1339–1350.

- Niholm, 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 Education Needs*, 32, 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2017.1295638>.
- OECD. (2000). *Inclusive education at work: Students with disabilities in mainstream schools*. Paris, France: Author.
- Ruijs, N.M., Peetsma, T.T.D. (2009). Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed. *Educational Research Review*, 4, 67–79.
- Salend, S.J. (2001). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practices*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Schwab, S., Gebhardt, M., Krammer, M., Gasteiger-Kilcpera, B. (2015). Linking self-rated social inclusion to social behavior. An empirical study of students with and without special needs in secondary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 30, 1–14.
- Szumski, G., Smogorzewska, J., Karwowski, M. (2017). Academic achievement of students with and without special education needs in inclusive classrooms. *Educational Research Review*, 21, 33–54.
- Talapatra, D., Wilcox, G., Roof, H., Hutchinson, C. (2019). Transition planning for students with disabilities: Perspectives of Canadian and American school psychologists. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, 1–17.
- Talmor, R., Reiter, S., Feigin, N. (2005). Factors relating to regular education teacher burnout in inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 20, 215–229.
- Vaughn, S., Denton, C.A., Fletcher, J.M. (2010). Why intensive interventions are necessary for student with severe reading difficulties. *Psychology in the School*, 47, 432–444.
- Vaughn, S., Schumm, J.S. (1995). Responsible inclusion for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 28(5), 264–270.
- Wilcox, G., McQuay, J., Jones, K. (2019). Transitioning to adulthood as a young person with an intellectual disability: Two case studies of mothers' perceptions. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 65(1), 1–21.
- Zigmond, N.P., Kloof, A. (2011). General and special education are (and should be) different. In J.M. Kauffman, D.P. Hallahan, P.C. Pullen (Eds.), *Handbook of special education*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.

IS FULL INCLUSION ALWAYS THE ANSWER?

Abstract

In this article the author presents inclusive education as a policy, which in recent decades has often been viewed as a moral imperative. She presents this issue in a dichotomous choice: either full inclusion or special education. This chapter joins other voices in arguing for a more nuanced approach to inclusive practice. One that demands better quality research on which to base decisions and puts student needs and goals above blanket policies that are applied indiscriminately. The author concludes future research also needs to remediate current limitations of research of the efficacy and effectiveness of inclusive education including: limited comparison or control groups, weak research designs, no measures of treatment fidelity, lack of clarity in the outcome measures (academic, behavioral, adaptive, etc.), limited attention to what the benefits and detriments of inclusion are, variable impact across populations, and to implement more randomized control trials.

Keywords: inclusive education, social/emotional/behavioral functioning, parents of children with Special Educational Needs (SEN), effective provision of inclusive education, support for all students

CZY PEŁNE WŁĄCZENIE JEST ZAWSZE ODPOWIEDZIĄ?*Abstrakt*

W artykule autor przedstawia edukację włączającą w kategoriach polityki, która w ostatnich dziesięcioleciach była często postrzegana jako imperatyw moralny. Uważa tę kwestię za dychotomiczny wybór: pełne włączenie lub kształcenie specjalne. Ten rozdział łączy się z innymi głosami, argumentując za bardziej szczegółowym podejściem do praktyki integracyjnej, która wymaga badań lepszej jakości, na podstawie których podejmowane są decyzje i stawia potrzeby oraz cele studentów nad ogólnymi zasadami, które są stosowane w sposób niedyskryminujący. Autor podsumowuje, że przyszłe badania muszą również zlikwidować obecne ograniczenia badań nad skutecznością i efektywnością edukacji włączającej, w tym ograniczone grupy porównawcze lub kontrolne, słabe projekty badawcze, brak miar wierności leczenia, brak jasności w pomiarach wyników (akademicki, behawioralny, adaptacyjny itd.), ograniczoną uwagę na korzyści i szkody związane z włączeniem, zmienny wpływ na populacje oraz wdrożyć bardziej randomizowane próby kontrolne.

Słowa kluczowe: edukacja włączająca, funkcjonowanie społeczne/emocjonalne/behawioralne, rodzice uczniów ze specjalnymi potrzebami edukacyjnymi (SEN), skuteczne zapewnianie edukacji włączającej, wsparcie wszystkich uczniów