ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

Perspectives of Special Education Teachers on the Push-In Model: Challenges and Opportunities for Advancing Inclusive Education

Marife Ferrer De Guzman
University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Las Piñas City, Philippines
mrfdgzmn72@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
August 19, 2026

Date Accepted:
September 27, 2026

Date Published:
October 29, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.23748720

ABSTRACT

This qualitative descriptive study examined the perspectives of teachers with direct experience implementing the push-in model in general education classrooms in selected schools in Nevada, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, United States. It explored perceived educational value, implementation challenges, collaborative practices, professional roles, and opportunities for growth, and used the findings to formulate the Collaborative Push-In Enhancement Program (C-PEP). Participants were purposively selected from teachers experienced in push-in delivery or collaboration; the methodology described 11 co-participants, although another part of the dissertation reports a different sample count. Semi-structured interview accounts were examined using the six-phase thematic-analysis approach described in the dissertation. Five overarching themes were developed: push-in as inclusive and collaborative support for diverse learners; navigation of instructional, structural, and relational challenges; collaboration as the foundation of effective implementation; evolving instructional roles and complementary push-in/pull-out functions; and professional growth with holistic student development. Participants described greater classroom participation, confidence, access to grade-level teaching, and belonging, while emphasizing constrained planning time, scheduling, resources, and ambiguous teacher roles. The proposed C-PEP integrates differentiated instruction, problem-solving, co-planning, role clarification, mentoring, learner monitoring, and sustainability measures. Findings concern teachers' reported experiences rather than independently measured student outcomes. The study highlights how inclusive practice depends on both responsive instruction and organizational support.

Keywords: *push-in model; inclusive education; special education teachers; co-teaching; thematic analysis; collaborative instructional support*

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education calls for equitable access, meaningful engagement, and individualized support for students with disabilities in the shared classroom. Within the push-in model, special education (SPED) teachers deliver accommodations, differentiated instruction, and timely interventions inside the general education setting rather than automatically withdrawing learners for separate teaching. The approach can support curriculum participation and peer interaction, but its value depends on the quality of instruction and the conditions under which teachers collaborate. Previous discussions of inclusive preparation and classroom service arrangements have similarly emphasized the importance of teacher learning and responsive support (Ackah-Jnr, 2020; Loreman, 2021; Sharma et al., 2022).

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

Although push-in settings bring instructional expertise together, physical co-presence does not itself establish co-teaching. SPED and general education teachers must align their lesson planning, role expectations, communication, and classroom decisions. Qualitative work on collaborative service delivery and push-in co-teaching suggests that professional relationships and coordination shape implementation, while resource pressures can complicate the process (Brimo & Huffman, 2023; Kooner, 2021; Sims, 2021). In schools that lack protected planning time or clear responsibility-sharing, inclusive intentions may be difficult to translate into day-to-day practice.

The dissertation examined this issue in selected educational settings across Nevada, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, where local staffing, schedules, resources, and school arrangements may differ. Its particular contribution lies in attending to the accounts of teachers who negotiate inclusion while providing or working alongside specialized support. These perspectives offer a view of classroom-level decision-making that complements more general policy and professional-development discussions (Kivirand et al., 2022; Vansteenkiste et al., 2020).

The study sought to describe teachers' perceptions of the push-in model's effectiveness, challenges and coping responses, collaborative experiences, interpretations of SPED responsibilities relative to pull-out services, and opportunities for professional and student development. It also developed a proposed Collaborative Push-In Enhancement Program (C-PEP) grounded in the themes. The inquiry did not directly test academic gains or compare schools statistically; its conclusions therefore concern the experiences and interpretations represented in the qualitative dataset.

Literature Review

Inclusive Education and the Educational Purpose of Push-In Support

Inclusive education involves meaningful access and participation, not merely placement in a general education room. The dissertation drew on inclusive special education as a learner-centered theoretical orientation and situated push-in services within the wider movement toward responsive provision for learners with disabilities. Armstrong (2021) and Loreman (2021), as discussed in the source review, were used to frame the role of inclusion and teacher preparation. Classroom support becomes relevant insofar as it enables learners to remain connected to classroom activities while receiving appropriate assistance.

Comparisons of service models offer a more differentiated view. Blease (2023) described a school-based push-in intervention, whereas Mancera (2023) discussed push-in and pull-out arrangements. The dissertation synthesized this literature to argue that in-class support may favor peer participation and continuity of general instruction, while separate, intensive intervention can remain appropriate for specific individualized goals. The choice is therefore better understood as a responsive service decision than as a contest with one universally superior model.

Collaborative Practice, Co-Teaching, and Shared Responsibility

Effective push-in implementation requires cooperation that goes beyond friendly relations between staff. Collaborative instructional planning involves common goals, complementary professional contributions, and coordinated responses to learners. Brimo and Huffman (2023) examined educators' perceptions of collaborative service delivery, while Kooner (2021) and Sims (2021) addressed co-teaching partners' experiences and perceptions. These studies provided a context for interpreting participants' emphasis on shared responsibility, mutual trust, and consistency across classrooms.

Collaboration is also influenced by school-wide structures. A case study of in-service school-team learning described ways professional development can support school improvement on inclusion (Kivirand et al., 2022), and Vansteenkiste et al. (2020) located professional development within broader institutional and policy conditions. In the dissertation, these perspectives helped explain why effective partnership cannot be left entirely

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

to individual goodwill: time, communication routines, role agreements, and administrative recognition must support collaborative practice.

Professional Role Identity and Differentiated Instruction

The push-in model can change the perceived position of the SPED teacher from an itinerant provider of isolated services to an active classroom partner. This shift entails responsibility for scaffolding, targeted accommodations, collaborative assessment, and the interpretation of learners' needs within grade-level instruction. Work on individualized educational planning and teacher readiness points to the complexity of coordinating specialist and general instruction (Kozikoğlu & Albayrak, 2022; Alharbi & Iqtadar, 2024).

The reviewed literature also considers role ambiguity. SPED teachers can be treated as assistants even when they provide specialized instructional expertise, while classroom partners may disagree over how to divide teaching and behavior-management responsibilities. The dissertation approached these tensions through teachers' accounts and framed role clarification as a prerequisite for authentic co-teaching. This interpretation is consistent with research that places teacher preparation, professional learning, and supportive systems at the center of inclusive instruction (Ackah-Jnr, 2020; Sharma et al., 2022).

Implementation Barriers and Adaptive Teacher Responses

The literature surveyed in the dissertation identified practical obstacles including staffing, time, resource limitations, and teachers' preparedness to respond simultaneously to diverse learners. Mpu and Adu (2021) discussed challenges to inclusive education implementation, while Kim and Lee (2022) examined coping strategies in inclusive classrooms. These accounts offer context for interpreting organizational constraints alongside more immediate classroom demands, rather than attributing implementation difficulties solely to teacher motivation.

When institutional arrangements are imperfect, teachers may adapt by strengthening communication, reorganizing tasks, using differentiated scaffolds, and resolving conflicts around student needs. O'Connor and McNamara (2023) examined coping mechanisms in inclusive classrooms, while Triviño Amigo et al. (2022) discussed the importance of teacher training. This literature suggests that teacher adaptability is valuable, but cannot fully replace time, staffing, resources, and structured school support.

Professional Growth and Student Participation

Inclusion-oriented professional growth may arise through collaborative learning, exposure to new differentiation strategies, and reflection on instructional decisions. Vansteenkiste et al. (2020), Kivirand et al. (2022), and Triviño Amigo et al. (2022) provide complementary perspectives on professional development and preparedness for inclusive work. The dissertation used such scholarship to situate the potential for the push-in model to become a setting for reciprocal teacher learning rather than solely a mechanism for delivering services.

Teachers' perceptions of successful inclusion also encompass learner confidence, social belonging, participation, and increasing independence—not just test performance. The source review placed these outcomes alongside attention to individualized educational goals and equitable access (Armstrong, 2021; Blease, 2023). However, the dissertation gathered educators' descriptions rather than direct student assessment data. Its evidence therefore supports claims about teachers observed or perceived developments, not causal proof of measured learner gains.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

METHODS

Research Design

The study adopted a qualitative descriptive design to interpret teachers' experiences and perspectives regarding push-in services in general education classrooms. This approach allowed participants to explain perceived effectiveness, instructional challenges, partnership practices, evolving responsibilities, and professional opportunities. The analysis was thematic rather than experimental or statistically comparative.

Research Locale

The inquiry concerned selected schools in Nevada, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, United States, during Academic Year 2025–2026. The dissertation used the four-state setting to capture variation in organizational and educational contexts; it did not claim that its small purposive sample represented the states as populations.

Participants and Sampling Technique

Purposive selection targeted teachers with recent firsthand experience implementing or collaborating in push-in service delivery. The Methods chapter described 11 teacher co-participants drawn from SPED and general education roles. Its earlier scope section, however, referred to 10 SPED participants, whereas the findings explicitly included accounts identified as Participant 11. Because these statements are inconsistent, the article does not assign unsupported subgroup counts or infer state-level distributions. Eligible teachers had direct experience supporting learners with disabilities in general education settings and were willing to share detailed classroom accounts.

Research Instrument

The primary data-generation instrument was a researcher-developed semi-structured interview guide. Questions addressed the implementation of push-in support, differentiation and accommodations, perceptions of learners' participation, co-planning, communication, professional roles, implementation barriers, and perceived opportunities. The source provided an interview protocol among its appendices.

Data Gathering Procedure

The dissertation described requests for institutional permission, voluntary recruitment, orientation and consent, followed by individual interviews with eligible teachers. It specified that interviews could occur in person or through a secure online platform and provided for audio recording with consent, transcription, field notes, and reflective memos. The findings chapter contained attributed interview excerpts; operational details such as each respondent's interview date were not consistently reported, and therefore are not supplied here.

Data Analysis

Interview accounts were examined through the six phases of thematic analysis described by Braun and Clarke (2006): familiarization, initial coding, identification of candidate themes, theme review, definition and naming, and written interpretation. The dissertation organized its account of findings from participant extracts through codes and categories to overarching themes associated with its research questions. Its interpretive lens combined Social Systems Theory (Luhmann, 1995) with inclusive special education (Armstrong, 2021).

Ethical Considerations

The methodology discussed institutional permissions, informed consent, voluntary participation, participant codes or pseudonyms, confidentiality, secure handling of interview material, and withdrawal without penalty. The article preserves participant identifiers instead of disclosing school or individual identities. No separate institutional ethics approval number was provided in the manuscript and none has been invented.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of the participant accounts produced five overarching thematic findings. Table 1 maps the dissertation's original themes to the central interpretations. These are qualitative patterns of reported experience and should not be read as prevalence estimates or measured treatment effects.

Table 1. *Overarching themes retained from the dissertation's thematic analysis*

Source theme	Principal interpretive emphasis
1. Push-in as an inclusive and collaborative support framework	Classroom membership, reduced stigma, immediate support, flexible instruction, perceived student progress
2. Navigating instructional, structural and relational challenges	Competing learner needs, interruption concerns, time and resources, role ambiguity, adaptive problem-solving
3. Collaborative partnership as foundation for success	Shared responsibility, communication, trust, co-planning, coordinated differentiation
4. Evolving roles and complementary service models	SPED teacher as co-teacher and advocate; push-in/pull-out used according to needs
5. Professional growth and holistic student development	New teaching strategies, reflective practice, student engagement, independence and belonging

Inclusive Participation, Classroom Belonging, and Responsive Support

In Theme 1, teachers described the push-in model as an arrangement that allowed learners with disabilities to remain with peers while receiving support during regular instruction. Their narratives emphasized access to grade-level content, immediate clarification, differentiated activities, and continuity of classroom membership. They associated these conditions with reduced isolation, greater confidence, participation, and a sense of belonging. The findings are consistent with the inclusive purpose of classroom-based support discussed in the source review (Armstrong, 2021; Loreman, 2021).

The accounts also distinguished inclusive placement from meaningful inclusion: simply positioning a SPED teacher beside a general education teacher did not guarantee adequate service. Participants viewed flexible lesson delivery, scaffolding and coordination as necessary to respond to distinct learner needs while preserving class progress. This distinction reflects the broader literature's emphasis on responsive preparation and school-wide support (Ackah-Jnr, 2020; Kivirand et al., 2022).

Instructional, Structural, and Relational Challenges

Theme 2 highlighted the difficulty of balancing intensive individual support with uninterrupted whole-class instruction. Participants described multiple learners requiring help simultaneously, uncertainty about when to intervene, classroom-management demands, and occasional lack of agreement about teacher roles. In addition, limited shared planning time, scheduling conflicts, large classes, staffing constraints, and uneven resources restricted coordination. The source interpreted these difficulties as both instructional and systemic, echoing discussions of barriers in inclusive education (Mpu & Adu, 2021; O'Connor & McNamara, 2023).

Teachers described responding through flexibility, advance planning when feasible, conversations after lessons, negotiation of responsibilities, and adjustments informed by learner response. Such responses suggest professional resilience but do not eliminate systemic constraints. The dissertation consequently argued for formal planning opportunities and school-level problem-solving rather than relying on individual improvisation. Table 2 retains selected short extracts that illustrate the reported patterns.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

Table 2. *Selected participants*

Participant	Verbatim excerpt	Analytical connection
P2	"Share responsibility, lessons run more smoothly and students receive consistent support"	Coordinated instructional support
P1	"Good collaboration creates a positive and inclusive classroom environment"	Relational dimension of inclusion
P11	"Where students feel supported by both teachers"	Shared classroom responsibility
P1	"In push-in, I am a support teacher inside the classroom, not just a helper. I work alongside the general teacher"	Role identity and agency
P8	"In push-in, I feel more like a co-teacher and advocate within the general classroom"	Advocacy and professional contribution
P11	"Collaboration and problem-solving skills"	Professional growth

Collaboration as the Foundation of Push-In Implementation

Theme 3 placed shared ownership at the center of effective implementation. Participants described partnership not as occasional consultation, but as co-planning, coordinated classroom assistance, shared responsibility for learners, and ongoing professional dialogue. Participant 2's account of smoother lessons when teachers shared responsibility, together with Participant 11's observation that learners felt supported by both teachers, connected instructional consistency to professional collaboration. These descriptions align with scholarship on collaborative service delivery and co-teaching experiences (Brimo & Huffman, 2023; Kooner, 2021; Sims, 2021).

Trust and respect were also central. Participants did not describe collaboration as the absence of disagreement; rather, successful partnerships relied on compromise and decisions organized around student needs. This finding suggests that schools should recognize co-planning as a structured part of teaching work. Collaborative support therefore requires organizational arrangements that allow role negotiation and classroom-level reflection to occur regularly (Kivirand et al., 2022; Vansteenkiste et al., 2020).

Professional Identity and Complementary Push-In and Pull-Out Practices

Theme 4 concerned the changing professional role of SPED teachers. Several participants rejected descriptions of themselves as classroom helpers and instead identified as co-teachers, instructional partners, and advocates. Participant 1 stated that push-in involved working alongside the general teacher, and Participant 8 associated the role with both co-teaching and advocacy. These accounts locate SPED expertise inside classroom decisions about accommodations, differentiation, and access, not only in separate remedial activities.

The dissertation also emphasized that push-in and pull-out services can be complementary. Participants valued push-in for curricular access, peer interaction, and classroom belonging, yet acknowledged that some learners may benefit from focused, time-limited intervention beyond whole-class teaching. This conditional approach parallels the distinction discussed by Mancera (2023) and the in-class intervention described by Blease (2023). Table 3 preserves the comparison as a qualitative interpretation rather than an experimentally demonstrated superiority claim.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

Table 3. *Comparative functions of push-in and pull-out*

Dimension	Push-in	Pull-out
Setting	Support within general classroom	Targeted instruction outside general classroom
Perceived strengths	Peer interaction, continuity, access, belonging, shared teaching	Dedicated time for intensive individualized teaching
Implementation considerations	Requires coordination and role clarity	Requires attention to missed class time and reintegration
Interpretation	Suitable where support can be embedded effectively	Retained where learner needs require concentrated intervention

Professional Development and Perceived Learner Growth

In Theme 5, teachers described acquiring new approaches to differentiation, managing unfamiliar needs, and becoming more reflective about inclusive instruction. Participant 1 observed that push-in "helps me learn new teaching strategies," while Participant 11 identified growth in collaboration and problem-solving skills. Such remarks indicated professional learning that developed through daily practice and interactions with colleagues. The source connected this to the value of continuing professional development and team-based learning (Triviño Amigo et al., 2022; Vansteenkiste et al., 2020).

Participants also interpreted student progress broadly, including participation, confidence, independence, social engagement, and belonging. Such observations are meaningful qualitative indicators, but the study did not directly measure student academic growth or conduct an experimental comparison of service models. Its contribution is therefore to describe what educators perceived as meaningful development and which institutional conditions they believed helped sustain it. These interpretations supplied the rationale for the proposed C-PEP rather than evidence that the program had already been implemented.

Proposed Collaborative Push-In Enhancement Program (C-PEP)

Central Question 6 led to a proposed enhancement program rather than a tested intervention. The dissertation's C-PEP translated the five themes into seven components addressing classroom support, school systems, and continuing professional development. Its intended users include SPED teachers, general education teachers, and school leaders; the plan calls for co-planning, professional learning, role clarification, formative review, and sustainable program adjustment. Table 4 condenses the original component matrix without asserting that implementation or evaluation occurred.

Table 4. *Summary of the proposed C-PEP components*

Component	Proposed activities	Intended result
Inclusive instruction	Workshops on differentiation, scaffolding, accommodations, and learner-centered support	More responsive assistance for diverse learners
Implementation problem-solving	Identify barriers; case discussions; scheduling and resource review	Greater capacity to navigate barriers
Collaboration and co-teaching	Co-planning; joint lessons; peer observation	Stronger teacher partnership
Role clarification	Role mapping; agreements; push-in/pull-out responsibility orientation	Greater clarity and shared ownership
Professional growth	Peer mentoring; coaching; reflection; professional learning communities	Improved adaptability and competence
Student progress monitoring	Collaborative formative assessment; intervention reviews; adjustments	Better-coordinated learner support
Sustainability	Program reviews; feedback and improvement planning	More consistent implementation

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 10 (October 2026)

The proposed program reflects the dissertation's core interpretation that sustainable inclusion depends on the intersection of professional skill, shared instructional responsibility, and supportive structures. Its practical significance rests in organizing action around identified teacher experiences. Future implementation would still require context-specific adaptation, appropriate resources, and evaluation to establish whether intended benefits are achieved.

CONCLUSION

The dissertation's qualitative findings portrayed the push-in model as a potentially valuable, though context-dependent, approach to inclusive education. Participating teachers described improved access to classroom participation, peer belonging and timely support, while repeatedly identifying collaboration as the pivotal condition for successful implementation. Their accounts revealed that unclear roles, insufficient planning time, scheduling constraints and limited resources could hinder consistent service delivery. In response, teachers drew on flexibility, communication and joint problem-solving. SPED professional identity was described as expanding toward co-teaching and advocacy, and push-in and pull-out approaches were understood as complementary responses to different learner needs. The principal contribution of the study is its organization of these experiences into a coherent basis for C-PEP. Because evidence derives from participants' interpretations rather than direct learner outcomes, the findings do not establish causal effects or broad statistical generalizability.

Recommendation

School leaders should protect regular co-planning time, support joint instructional decisions, clarify the respective contributions of SPED and general education teachers, and align schedules and resources with collaborative classroom work. Teacher teams should jointly design accommodations and differentiated strategies, discuss learner progress, and revise interventions according to individualized needs. Professional learning may focus on co-teaching models, embedded support, communication, role articulation, classroom-based problem-solving, and inclusive assessment (Sharma et al., 2022; Triviño Amigo et al., 2022).

The proposed C-PEP may be used as a planning framework after local stakeholder review, with implementation monitored through documented collaboration, teacher reflection, learner participation, and appropriate individualized progress indicators. Schools should retain flexibility to combine push-in with targeted pull-out assistance when required. Future research should examine the program's feasibility and outcomes, include direct classroom observations and learner measures, and extend qualitative or mixed-method inquiry to broader school contexts.

References

Ackah-Jnr, F. R. (2020). The teacher should be learning: In-service professional development and learning of teachers implementing inclusive education in early childhood education settings. International Journal of Whole Schooling, 16(2), 93–121.

Alharbi, H., & Iqtadar, S. (2024). "I never feel like I am prepared enough": Teachers' self-efficacy, challenges and experiences teaching students with disabilities. British Journal of Special Education. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12666

Armstrong, D. (2021). Inclusive special education: Theory and practice for teachers. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25(4), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1877263

Blease, J. (2023). A case study of a 1-to-1, TA-led, push-in, ASD intervention for Grade 8 students in an international school in Hong Kong. Case Studies from 2022–2023, 2(2). https://ojs.sunderland.ac.uk/index.php/sunrae/article/view/57

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

Brimo, D., & Huffman, H. E. (2023). A survey of speech-language pathologists' and teachers' perceptions of collaborative service delivery. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 54(3), 873–887. https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_LSHSS-22-00107

Kim, H. J., & Lee, S. Y. (2022). Coping strategies of elementary teachers in inclusive classrooms: A South Korean perspective. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 26(9), 935–952. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1800616

Kivirand, T., Leijen, Ä., & Lepp, L. (2022). Enhancing schools' development activities on inclusive education through in-service training course for school teams: A case study. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, Article 824620. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.824620

Kooner, V. (2021). Co-teaching partners and their experiences with a push-in co-teaching model. https://arcabc.ca/islandora/object/ufv%3A31211/datastream/PDF/view

Kozikoğlu, İ., & Albayrak, E. N. (2022). Teachers' attitudes and the challenges they experience concerning individualized education program (IEP): A mixed method study. Participatory Educational Research, 9(1), 98–115. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.6.9.13

Loreman, T. (2021). Teacher education for inclusion. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1003

Luhmann, N. (1995). Social systems (J. Bednarz, Jr., with D. Baecker, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Mancera, A. S. (2023). Push-in or pull-out? Two models in teaching children with disabilities. https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=conf_archers

Mpu, Y., & Adu, E. O. (2021). The challenges of inclusive education and its implementation in schools: The South African perspective. Perspectives in Education, 39(2). https://hdl.handle.net/10520/ejc-persed_v39_n2_a16

O'Connor, E., & McNamara, G. (2023). Coping mechanisms of teachers in mainstream inclusive classrooms in Ireland. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 38(2), 183–197.

Sharma, U., Aiello, P., Pace, E., & Round, P. (2022). Teacher preparation for inclusion: A global review of the literature. European Journal of Teacher Education, 45(3), 327–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2021.1937415

Sims, A. (2021). Teacher perceptions of co-teaching effectiveness in inclusive elementary classrooms [Master's thesis, Eastern Illinois University]. https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4869

Triviño Amigo, N., Mendoza, D. M., Mayordomo-Pinilla, N., & Barrios-Fernández, S. (2022). Inclusive education in primary and secondary school: Perception of teacher training. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(23), Article 15451. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192315451

Vansteenkiste, D., Swart, E., Van Avermaet, P., & Struyf, E. (2020). Professional development for inclusive education. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1013