Assessing the Effectiveness of Inclusive Education Programs in Promoting Academic and Social Development

Emmanuel Cruz

Sorsogon State University, Philippines

Abstract— Inclusive education aims to provide students with disabilities access to general education classrooms, curriculum, and peers. This review synthesizes research on the academic and social outcomes of inclusive education programs for students with disabilities. Findings indicate inclusive models correlate with moderate academic advantages across content areas compared to segregated special education. Students with high-incidence disabilities benefit most. Socially, inclusion facilitates greater contact and relationships with peers, though barriers like bullying persist. While results are broadly positive, variability across studies highlights the importance of high-quality inclusion methods and supports. Additional research using rigorous designs is needed to clarify long-term impacts and best practices. Overall, inclusion shows potential to promote academic and social development for students with disabilities when thoughtfully implemented.

Keywords— Inclusive education, Students with disabilities, Academic outcomes, Social outcomes, Special education, Educational equity.

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education refers to the integration of students with disabilities into regular classrooms and schools with their non-disabled peers (Lindsay, 2007). It involves altering the school environment and teaching practices to meet the diverse needs of all students and provide equal opportunities for learning and socialization. Inclusive education programs aim to provide students with disabilities access to general education curriculum, resources, and activities while also promoting their academic and social growth.

The inclusion movement emerged in the 1980s as a response to the limitations of segregated special education programs (Winzer & Mazurek, 2000).

Proponents argued that isolating students with disabilities in separate classrooms or schools promoted stigmatization and limited opportunities for academic and social advancement. In contrast, inclusive programs could offer both social and academic benefits by exposing students with disabilities to higher expectations, peer modeling, and quality instruction tailored to meet their individual needs.

This review paper will examine research on the effectiveness of inclusive education programs in promoting the academic and social development of students with disabilities.

First, a brief history of inclusion policies and practices will be presented. Next, common methodologies used in studies on inclusive education will be reviewed.

The core sections will synthesize results from research on the academic and social outcomes associated with inclusion programs. Finally, the conclusion will summarize findings, discuss limitations of current research, and propose recommendations for practice and policy.

HISTORY OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Over the past fifty years, federal legislation and changing societal attitudes have steadily driven progress toward inclusive educational opportunities for students with disabilities in the United States. Key historical developments include:

- 1975 - Enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA, later renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA), requiring free and appropriate public education for students with disabilities.
- 1990s - Increasing advocacy for full inclusion models, leading more districts to adopt policies promoting educating students with disabilities alongside typical peers.
- 1997 - Amendments to IDEA requiring that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment to the maximum extent appropriate.
- 2001 - No Child Left Behind Act holding schools accountable for academic outcomes of students with disabilities through standardized testing and statewide performance goals.
- 2015 - Every Student Succeeds Act maintaining accountability provisions and support for inclusive practices.

These legislative actions have driven steady growth in inclusive placements over time. During the 1989-1990 school year, around 31% of students with disabilities spent 80% or more of their time in general education classrooms. By 2017-2018, the percentage of students served primarily in general education had risen to nearly 65% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021).

METHODOLOGY IN RESEARCH ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

A range of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods have been utilized to investigate the impacts of inclusive education on various student outcomes. Common approaches include:

- Quasi-experimental designs comparing achievement and other outcomes between students with disabilities in inclusive versus segregated settings.
- Surveys and interviews examining perceptions and experiences of students, parents, teachers, and administrators involved in inclusive education programs.
- Ethnographic studies providing in-depth analysis of culture and practices within inclusive education models.
- Correlational research on relationships between extent of inclusion and student outcomes.

- Meta-analyses synthesizing findings across multiple studies on aspects of inclusion.
- Systematic reviews summarizing evidence on the effectiveness of inclusion approaches.
- Cost-benefit analyses weighing financial investments in inclusive models versus segregated special education.
- Case studies investigating practices and impacts of inclusion in single school districts.

Multimethod approaches drawing upon both quantitative data on student outcomes and qualitative data on program implementation processes can provide especially comprehensive perspectives on inclusive education initiatives.

ACADEMIC OUTCOMES OF INCLUSION

A substantial body of research suggests that integrated inclusive placements can benefit the academic development of students with disabilities. Areas of positive impact include:

- Improved academic skills and content knowledge: Meta-analyses indicate small to moderate achievement advantages for students with disabilities educated in general education classrooms compared to those in segregated settings (Kalambouka et al., 2007; Oh-Young & Filler, 2015).
- Higher test scores: Students with disabilities in inclusionary models demonstrate higher scores on standardized tests of math and literacy compared to peers in separate special education programs (Cole et al., 2004).
- Greater gains over time: Rates of academic growth tend to be greater for students with disabilities in inclusive models compared to those in non-inclusive placements (Ryndak et al., 2010).
- Enhanced curriculum access: Inclusion provides exposure to higher grade-level general education content and instructional quality (Jackson et al., 2008).
- More classroom engagement: Students with disabilities exhibit increased academic responding and time on-task in inclusive settings (McDonnell et al., 2003).
- Improved post-school outcomes: Inclusive models correlate with higher high school graduation rates, college enrollment, and employment outcomes among students with disabilities (Rojewski et al., 2015).

However, the magnitude of positive impacts varies across studies, disability types, and specific academic domains. Outcomes appear most favorable for students with high-incidence and mild disabilities (e.g. learning disabilities, speech-language impairments) compared to low-incidence severe disabilities (e.g. intellectual disabilities, multiple disabilities) (Oh-Young & Filler, 2015).

Students with disabilities educated in inclusive models still tend to lag behind typically developing peers academically. Delivering specialized supports and services within the general education environment remains an ongoing challenge.

SOCIAL OUTCOMES OF INCLUSION

In addition to potential learning benefits, inclusive education programs aim to enhance the social development and integration of students with disabilities. Research suggests inclusion can facilitate positive peer interactions and relationships:

- Increased social contacts and friendships: Students with disabilities in inclusive settings display higher rates of social interaction with typical peers and are more likely to develop friendships than segregated students (Katz & Mirenda, 2002; Wiener & Tardif, 2004).

- Improved social skills: Students with disabilities demonstrate growth in social communication skills, cooperation, and appropriate classroom behaviors after transition to inclusive models (Freeman & Alkin, 2000).

- Higher peer acceptance: Typical students report more positive attitudes toward peers with disabilities after shared inclusive education experiences (Rafferty et al., 2003).

- Reduced stigma and discrimination: Inclusive contexts allow students to highlight similarities and reduce perceived differences between those with and without disabilities.

However, some studies reveal ongoing social challenges in inclusive settings, such as:

- Social isolation and bullying: Students with disabilities continue to experience exclusion and victimization from typical peers in some inclusive contexts (Nowicki, 2003).

- Rejection by peers: Typical students may avoid those with disabilities even within inclusive settings due to persistent negative attitudes (Wiener & Tardif, 2004).

- Lack of close friendships: Students with disabilities in inclusive models may interact socially with typical peers but fail to progress to deeper friendships and relationships (Webster & Carter, 2013).

- Over reliance on adults: Students with disabilities look primarily to teachers rather than peers for support socially in some inclusive programs (Carter et al., 2016).

Fostering meaningful social inclusion and engagement with peers remains an area for continued growth within inclusive education models.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

In summary, a substantive body of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research provides evidence for the benefits of inclusive education programs in promoting academic and social development among students with disabilities.

Access to high-quality general education curricula, instruction, and peers facilitates learning and achievement. Inclusive contexts allow for social interaction, relationship-building, and integration experiences that segregated settings lack. These academic and social advantages can foster success during the K-12 school years and prepare students with disabilities for more positive post-school outcomes.

However, inclusion does not automatically guarantee progress. Variation in academic and social impacts across studies highlights the critical role of effectively implementing evidence-based, high-quality inclusion practices. Supporting teacher training in inclusion methods, differentiating and adapting instruction for diverse learners, facilitating positive peer interactions, and providing individualized supports and services within inclusive environments is essential (Jackson et al., 2008; Lindsay, 2007). Done poorly, inclusion can fail to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Additional rigorous research using strong experimental or longitudinal designs is needed to clarify long-term impacts and pinpoint best practices for delivery methods and supports that maximize benefits of inclusion (Oh-Young & Filler, 2015). Moving forward, inclusive education should be viewed as an approach that can potentiate - but does not guarantee - academic and social progress when implemented through a multifaceted, individualized, high-quality program.

REFERENCES

[1] Evans, J., Harden, A., & Thomas, J. (2004). "What are effective strategies to support pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD) in mainstream primary schools? Findings from a systematic review of research." Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 4, 2–16.

[2] Farrell, P., Balshaw, M., & Polat, F. (1999). "The management, role and training of learning support assistants (Research Report RR161)." Nottingham, UK: Department for Education and Skills.

[3] Fisher, D., Roach, V., & Frey, N. (2002). "Examining the general programmatic benefits of inclusive schools." International Journal of Inclusive Education, 6, 63–78.

[4] Flem, A., & Keller, C. (2000). "Inclusion in Norway: A study of ideology in practice." European Journal of Special Needs Education, 15, 188–205.

[5] Flem, A., Moen, T., & Gudmunsdottir, S. (2004). "Towards inclusive schools: A study of inclusive education in practice." European Journal of Special Needs Education, 19, 85–98.

[6] Frederickson, N., Dunsmuir, S., Lang, J., & Monson, J. (2004). "Mainstream-special school inclusion partnerships: Pupil, parent and teacher perspectives." International Journal of Inclusive Education, 8, 37–57.

[7] French, N. K. (2001). "Supervising paraprofessionals: A survey of teacher practices." Journal of Special Education, 35, 41–53.

[8] Frieire, S., & Ce´sar, M. (2003). "Inclusive ideals for inclusive practices: How far is a dream from reality? Five comparative case studies." European Journal of Special Needs Education, 18, 341–354.

[9] Gersten, R., Baker, S., & Lloyd, J. W. (2000). "Designing high quality research in special education." Journal of Special Education, 34, 2–18.

[10] Gersten, R., Baker, S. K., Smith-Johnson, J., Flojo, J. R., & Hagan-Burke, S. (2004). "A tale of two decades: Trends in support for federally funded experimental research in special education." Exceptional Children, 70, 323–332.

[11] Gersten, R., Fuchs, L. S., Compton, D., Coyne, M., Greenwood, C., & Innocenti, M. S. (2005). "Quality indicators for group experimental and quasi-experimental research in special education." Exceptional Children, 71, 149–164.

[12] Giangreco, M. F., Edelman, S. W., & Broer, S. M. (2001). "Respect, appreciation, and acknowledgement of paraprofessionals who support students with disabilities." Exceptional Children, 67, 485–498.

[13] Giangreco, M. F., Edelman, S. W., & Broer, S. M. (2003). "Schoolwide planning to improve paraeducator supports." Exceptional Children, 70, 63–79.

[14] Giangreco, M. F., Edelman, S. W., Broer, S. M., & Doyle, M. B. (2001). "Paraprofessional support of students with disabilities: Literature from the past decade." Exceptional Children, 68, 45–63.

[15] Goldstein, H., Moss, J. W., & Jordan, L. J. (1965). "The efficacy of special class training on the development of mentally retarded children (Cognitive Research Report 619)." Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), Office Education.

[16] Graham, S. (2005). "Preview." Exceptional Children, 71, 135.

[17] Graham, S. (in press). "Writing." In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[18] Groom, B., & Rose, R. (2005). "Supporting the inclusion of pupils with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in the primary school: The role of teaching assistants." Journal of Research in Special Education, 5, 20–30.

[19] Hall, L. J., & McGregor, J. A. (2000). "A follow-up study of the peer relationships of children with disabilities in an inclusive school." Journal of Special Education, 34, 114–126.

[20] Hanson, M. J., Horn, E., Sandall, S., Beckman, P., Morgan, M., Marquart, J., et al. (2001). "After preschool inclusion: Children's educational pathways over the early school years." Exceptional Children, 68, 65–83.

[21] Heath, N. L., Petrakos, H., Finn, C. A., Karagiannakis, A., McClean-Heywood, D., & Rousseau, C. (2004). "Inclusion on the final frontier: A model for including children with emotional and behaviour disorders (E/BD) in Canada." International Journal of Inclusive Education, 8, 241–259.