



Received: 02-01-2026  
Accepted: 01-02-2026

ISSN: 2583-049X

## **Inclusive Pedagogical Practices and Student Participation in Greek Primary Education: A Qualitative Case Study**

**Eleftheria Tsiouri**

Head of 3rd Primary School of Ioannina, Greece

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2026.6.1.5799>

Corresponding Author: **Eleftheria Tsiouri**

### **Abstract**

Inclusive education is increasingly acknowledged as a pedagogical strategy executed through daily classroom practices that promote participation, engagement, and a sense of belonging for all students. This study investigates the application of inclusive pedagogical methods in a Greek public primary school, highlighting the significance of teaching strategies and interactional routines in fostering student engagement and a sense of belonging. The study utilizes a qualitative single-case methodology, using practice-based data including recorded classroom practices, comprehensive pedagogical initiatives, and reflective narratives of teaching and learning processes. The analysis reveals that inclusive pedagogy was executed through personalized instruction targeting common learning goals, dialogic and collaborative teaching strategies that amplified student voice and agency, and a sustained emphasis on socio-emotional growth and interpersonal relationships.

These techniques promoted students' active engagement in learning and fostered classroom cultures that valued and celebrated diversity. The study highlights pedagogical challenges related to curriculum mandates, time constraints, and the complexities of accommodating varied learning demands, asserting that inclusion is a negotiated and context-specific process rather than a fixed set of techniques. This study offers a practice-oriented viewpoint from Greek primary education, contributing to global research on inclusive pedagogy by clarifying the development of participation and belonging through standard teaching techniques in a public school environment. The findings underscore the critical importance of classroom pedagogy in attaining inclusive education and stress the need for continuous professional reflection and systemic support for inclusive teaching.

**Keywords:** Inclusive Pedagogy, Student Participation, School Belonging, Qualitative Case Study, Primary Education

### **Introduction**

Inclusive education is becoming recognized worldwide as a rights-based and equity-centered initiative aimed at reforming schooling to allow all learners to participate meaningfully in collective educational settings. Inclusion is now acknowledged as a continuous process of identifying and alleviating obstacles to learning and participation, while improving the conditions that promote engagement, belonging, and achievement for all, rather than being perceived as an auxiliary for particular groups <sup>[1, 2]</sup>. This transition has redirected attention from placement-focused reforms to the everyday practices of teaching: the actions of educators, the dynamics of classroom relationships, and the organization of learning opportunities to foresee and embrace diversity as a normative element of educational settings.

This educational shift foregrounds two interrelated themes central to contemporary inclusion research: student engagement and a sense of belonging. Participation involves not only attendance or compliance but also the ability for learners to engage, exert influence, and be recognized as legitimate members of the classroom community. Belonging includes students' reported sense of acceptance, respect, and support within the educational setting, and it is consistently associated with diverse motivational, socio-emotional, behavioral, and academic outcomes <sup>[9]</sup>. Recent syntheses highlight the complex nature of belonging, focusing on the interaction of individual characteristics, peer and teacher relationships, classroom strategies, and overarching institutional and policy structures <sup>[15]</sup>. From the perspective of inclusive pedagogy, these insights underscore that teachers' interactional practices and classroom dynamics are essential: inclusive teaching is achieved through the organization of learning, the development of relationships, and the engagement of students as active contributors to knowledge construction.

A notable progression in this field is the heightened emphasis on student voice, not merely as a superficial consultation but as a

systematic and pedagogical strategy for understanding challenges, improving methods, and strengthening inclusive learning communities. Research in primary school environments suggests that including student voice may improve inclusion by making involvement visible, challenging established assumptions, and promoting collaborative examination of classroom dynamics [12]. This body of work demonstrates that inclusive pedagogy is improved when students are viewed as competent informants and co-creators of learning environments, especially when schools seek to address subtle forms of marginalization that may not be captured in formal classifications or achievement metrics.

Despite the growing proliferation of worldwide discussions, there remains a need for contextually informed narratives concerning the application of inclusive teaching methods in everyday instruction, particularly within public institutions facing organizational and resource constraints. Recent evaluations within the Greek context indicate that empirical research on inclusive education in primary schools is scarce and inconsistent, with educators frequently reporting challenges related to preparedness, support systems, and the application of inclusive principles in ongoing classroom practice [14]. Comprehensive school approaches emphasize that inclusive practices depend on the coherence of pedagogy, relationships, and support structures, with classroom activities representing the concrete context in which inclusion manifests for students [8]. These points highlight the importance of qualitative case study research that documents inclusive pedagogy as implemented practice and examines how participation and belonging are fostered through routine instructional and relational processes.

This study investigates inclusive educational approaches in a Greek public primary school using a qualitative case study focused on student participation and sense of belonging. The research examines how educators develop learning opportunities for diverse students, the role of classroom interactions and routines in promoting involvement, and the influence of practices centered on voice and relationship-building on students' sense of belonging. This article offers a practice-oriented perspective from Greek primary education, contributing to international discussions on inclusive pedagogy by examining how participation and belonging are enacted through everyday classroom practices within a centralized public education system. By foregrounding pedagogical routines, interactional structures, and relational work, the study provides analytically transferable insights into how inclusion is negotiated and sustained in ordinary classroom contexts operating under structural constraints.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Inclusive pedagogy constitutes the primary conceptual framework for this study, framing teaching as a profession centered on participation, equity, and the recognition of learner diversity as a normative condition in classrooms, rather than an exception requiring separate interventions. This viewpoint fundamentally dismisses deterministic notions of capability and asserts that all learners may participate meaningfully when training is customized to address diversity [6]. Inclusive pedagogy emphasizes expanding access for all learners rather than depending on exclusion or specialized remediation, viewing teachers' daily decisions as pivotal instances where inclusion is either promoted or constrained [5].

In this context, student participation is characterized as a multidimensional term encompassing access to educational opportunities, active engagement in classroom interactions, and recognition as a legitimate contributor to collaborative learning activities. Participation includes both observable activities and the social and discursive settings that dictate whose voices are recognized and valued in the classroom [2]. Studies in inclusive education demonstrate that pedagogical strategies such as open-ended tasks, collaborative learning, dialogic teaching, and flexible assessment methods can improve participation by alleviating barriers related to prior achievement, linguistic background, or learning differences [7]. These behaviors are particularly evident in primary school, when classroom routines and teacher-student relationships profoundly influence students' evolving identities as learners.

The notion of belonging, intricately associated with participation, has received more attention as a core outcome of inclusive pedagogy. Belonging refers to students' personal experience of acceptance, respect, and support within the educational community, shaped by everyday pedagogical and relational practices rather than merely by formal inclusion policies [3]. Inclusive pedagogical strategies foster a sense of belonging by developing robust teacher-student relationships, promoting peer collaboration, and instituting classroom norms that value variety and mutual support. Empirical research demonstrates that students who experience a sense of belonging are more likely to engage actively, persist in their educational pursuits, and develop positive attitudes toward school, thereby strengthening the interdependent relationship among pedagogy, participation, and well-being [9].

The student voice is a vital component of the theoretical framework behind this inquiry. From the perspective of inclusive pedagogy, engaging with student voice transcends mere consultation; it entails recognizing students as knowledgeable contributors in the creation of their learning environments [11]. Dialogic methodologies that enable students to reflect on learning processes, express problems, and propose adjustments might reveal obstacles to participation and promote more flexible teaching. Student voice is understood as relational and contextual; the acknowledgment of specific voices and the conditions of this acknowledgment are shaped by classroom power dynamics and pedagogical standards. Inclusive pedagogy requires intentional strategies to ensure that student voice practices do not reinforce existing injustices [12].

This study situates inclusive pedagogy within the broader context of whole-school conditions, while maintaining a specific analytical focus on classroom activities. Although organizational structures, leadership, and legislative frameworks affect pedagogical opportunities, inclusion ultimately becomes meaningful for students through their daily educational experiences. The theoretical framework underscores inclusive pedagogy, participation, and belonging, enabling an exploration of the lived and negotiated experiences of inclusion in classrooms, while accounting for the contextual limitations that influence pedagogical choices and execution.

### **Methodology**

This study employed a qualitative single-case study design to examine the enactment of inclusive pedagogical practices within the everyday classroom setting of a Greek public

primary school, with particular emphasis on student participation and sense of belonging. Qualitative case studies are especially suited to investigating complex educational processes as they unfold in context, enabling an in-depth exploration of pedagogical practices, interactional routines, and meanings constructed through everyday teaching and learning, rather than the measurement of predetermined outcomes<sup>[17]</sup>. In inclusive education research, such techniques are particularly successful in clarifying the intricate, relational dimensions of teaching that influence students' experiences of inclusion<sup>[13]</sup>.

The case is situated in a public primary school operating within the Greek educational system, which is characterized by a centralized governance structure, a prescribed national curriculum, and limited institutional autonomy. The study focuses primarily on classroom practices implemented in upper primary grades (Grades 4–6), involving students approximately 9–12 years of age. The classroom constitutes the main unit of analysis, while the school is treated as a single bounded case within which inclusive pedagogy is enacted across interconnected teaching contexts. This context provides a relevant framework for examining inclusive pedagogy as it is applied in the classroom under structural constraints. The case is not intended to be representative but to offer transferable insights into the application of inclusive pedagogy in similar public school environments.

The researcher assumed the position of practitioner-researcher, participating continuously in the instructional life of the school. This insider positioning enabled sustained engagement with classroom practices, pedagogical decision-making, and interactional routines as they unfolded in everyday teaching, providing access to forms of professional knowledge that are often inaccessible to external observers. Practitioner research is widely recognized as a rigorous approach in educational inquiry when it is accompanied by systematic reflection, theoretical grounding, and methodological transparency<sup>[4]</sup>.

At the same time, the practitioner-researcher role necessitated explicit and ongoing reflexivity. Throughout the study, attention was given to how professional responsibilities, prior assumptions, and institutional positioning could shape data interpretation and analytical emphasis. Reflexivity was enacted through iterative engagement with the data, deliberate distancing during the analytic process, and continuous dialogue between empirical observations and the theoretical framework of inclusive pedagogy. This reflexive stance was intended not to eliminate subjectivity, but to render the researcher's positioning visible and analytically productive, thereby enhancing the trustworthiness of the study.

Data were collected over the course of one academic year, allowing sustained engagement with instructional routines, pedagogical decision-making, and classroom interactions. Practice-oriented data sources included documented classroom practices, records of learning activities designed to support engagement and differentiation, reflective narratives of teaching and learning processes produced by the practitioner-researcher, and materials related to school-wide pedagogical initiatives. These multiple sources enabled triangulation and supported a coherent examination of inclusive pedagogy as situated practice, enhancing the credibility of the analysis across classroom and school-level contexts<sup>[16]</sup>.

The data analysis utilized a thematic analytic method informed by the theoretical framework of inclusive education, participation, and belonging. The research progressed through iterative cycles of familiarization, coding, and theme development. Initial codes were generated inductively from the data, highlighting pedagogical methods, interactional dynamics, and elements affecting student involvement. The codes were further classified into comprehensive topics pertaining to inclusive pedagogy, student voice, and socio-emotional learning. The analytical process concentrated on facilitating practices and instructional disputes to avoid idealized representations of inclusion.

Ethical considerations were thoroughly evaluated. The research focuses on instructional procedures rather than individual students or educators, and it does not include any identifiable personal information. Descriptions are presented at an aggregated level to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The research complied with professional ethical norms, shown respect for participants, and ensured accountability to the school community.

This research, like all qualitative case studies, is subject to certain limitations. The findings are context-dependent and do not allow for statistical generalization; instead, the study aims for analytic transferability through a detailed and theoretically informed account of inclusive pedagogy as enacted in practice. In addition, the practitioner-researcher role, while offering depth and continuity of engagement, necessitated ongoing reflexivity regarding interpretation and analytical focus.

A further limitation concerns the absence of direct student-generated data, such as interviews or self-reported accounts. Student perspectives are therefore examined indirectly, through the analysis of pedagogical practices, interactional routines, and the conditions under which participation and belonging were made possible in classroom life. This methodological choice reflects the study's focus on inclusive pedagogy as enacted practice rather than on students' subjective narratives.

While this approach enables close examination of how participation and belonging are structured through teaching, it also limits the extent to which students' own interpretations of these experiences can be represented. Future research could complement this practice-oriented perspective by incorporating students' voices more directly, thereby enriching understanding of how inclusive pedagogical practices are experienced from the learner's standpoint.

## Findings

The findings are categorized thematically to underscore the application of inclusive educational methods in everyday instruction, highlighting student engagement and a sense of belonging. This analysis, consistent with inclusive pedagogy research, goes beyond simple activity descriptions to examine how pedagogical choices and interactional practices affected students' opportunities for meaningful participation and their recognition as valued members of the classroom community<sup>[5, 13]</sup>.

A central theme concerns the use of differentiated instruction as an inclusive pedagogical strategy oriented toward expanding participation rather than remediating perceived deficits. Instructional practices were deliberately designed to provide multiple entry points to shared learning

activities, enabling students to engage with common curricular goals through varied modalities, levels of scaffolding, and forms of expression. In this way, differentiation functioned not as an individualized accommodation for particular learners, but as a collective pedagogical resource available to all students.

Rather than organizing instruction around fixed ability groupings, teachers employed flexible grouping arrangements, open-ended tasks, and adaptive scaffolding that could be adjusted responsively during lessons. These practices disrupted normative assumptions about learners' capabilities and reduced the salience of difference as a criterion for participation. From an inclusive pedagogy perspective, such approaches align with the principle of extending what is ordinarily available to everyone, instead of introducing parallel or compensatory forms of provision [7].

Analytically, these practices supported participation by lowering structural and interactional barriers to engagement. Students who might otherwise have been marginalised due to differences in prior attainment, language use, or pace of learning were able to participate meaningfully alongside their peers. Participation thus emerged not merely as observable engagement in tasks, but as recognition of students as legitimate contributors to collective classroom activity.

A further theme concerns the pedagogical incorporation of student voice and agency as a means of restructuring participation in classroom interactions. Opportunities for students to express ideas, reflect on learning processes, and contribute to decisions affecting classroom routines were embedded systematically within everyday instruction. Student voice was therefore enacted not as an episodic consultative practice, but as an integral component of teaching and learning.

Dialogic teaching approaches, collaborative tasks, and structured reflective discussions positioned students as active contributors to knowledge construction rather than passive recipients of instruction. Analytically, these practices altered the interactional conditions of the classroom by expanding who could speak, when, and on what terms. In doing so, they made participation more visible and redistributed opportunities for recognition among students with differing levels of confidence, linguistic resources, or prior attainment.

Consistent with inclusive pedagogy principles, explicit strategies were employed to prevent student voice practices from reproducing existing hierarchies of participation. Structured turn-taking, the use of multiple response formats (oral, written, visual), and small-group interactions functioned as pedagogical mechanisms that widened access to expression. These strategies supported student agency by legitimizing diverse forms of contribution and ensuring that voice operated as a collective pedagogical resource rather than a privilege of a few [11, 12].

Socio-emotional learning emerged as a central dimension of inclusive pedagogy, closely intertwined with students' sense of belonging and their willingness to participate in classroom activities. Classroom routines deliberately incorporated practices aimed at developing emotional awareness, empathy, and respectful interaction, positioning socio-emotional learning not as an ancillary programme but as an integral element of everyday teaching.

From an analytical perspective, these relational practices functioned as enabling conditions for participation. The sustained emphasis on relationship-building, conflict prevention, and the explicit valuing of diversity contributed to the creation of a classroom climate in which students experienced psychological safety and interpersonal trust. Such conditions reduced the perceived risk associated with participation, particularly for students who might otherwise remain silent or marginalised within classroom interactions. Belonging, in this context, was not treated as an individual affective state but as a socially produced outcome of ongoing pedagogical and relational practices. Positive teacher–student interactions, peer collaboration, and consistent norms of respect shaped students' recognition as accepted and valued members of the classroom community. These findings reinforce research indicating that belonging is cultivated through everyday interactional work rather than formal inclusion policies alone [3, 9]. Participation was therefore mediated not only by instructional design, but also by the emotional and relational dynamics through which inclusion was enacted in practice.

Comprehensive educational initiatives improved inclusive practices and promoted engagement in diverse learning settings. Thematic projects, experiential learning activities, and interdisciplinary initiatives provided students with enhanced opportunities to engage with learning in various keyways. These activities cultivated a shared educational dialogue concerning inclusion and participation, improving the coherence between classroom practices and the fundamental ideals of the school. Research on whole-school inclusion demonstrates that alignment between classroom pedagogy and school-wide initiatives is crucial for sustaining inclusive learning environments [2].

The analysis also revealed a set of structural and pedagogical tensions that shaped the enactment of inclusive practices. Time constraints prescribed curricular demands, and the heterogeneity of students' learning needs at times limited teachers' capacity to sustain dialogic interactions, provide individualized scaffolding, or respond flexibly to emerging classroom dynamics. These tensions did not operate as external obstacles alone but were embedded within everyday pedagogical decision-making.

Analytically, such constraints highlight the negotiated character of inclusive pedagogy. Teachers were required to balance competing expectations related to curriculum coverage, classroom management, and responsiveness to learner diversity, often making moment-by-moment judgments about which inclusive practices could be prioritised in specific instructional contexts. These findings resonate with international research that frames inclusion not as a stable set of techniques, but as an ongoing process of professional negotiation within institutional and systemic conditions [13].

Importantly, the presence of tensions did not negate inclusive intentions or practices. Instead, they prompted continuous reflection, adaptation, and recalibration of pedagogical strategies. Inclusion thus emerged as a dynamic practice, enacted through teachers' efforts to work productively within constraints rather than as the implementation of an idealised or fully controllable model.

The results indicate that inclusive pedagogy was executed via a combination of differentiated instruction, dialogic practices, socio-emotional support, and integrated pedagogical tactics throughout the school. Student

participation and a sense of belonging emerged from everyday pedagogical decisions and interactions, underscoring the significance of classroom practices in attaining inclusive education.

### Discussion

This study examined how inclusive pedagogical practices were enacted in everyday classroom instruction in a Greek public primary school, with a particular focus on student participation and a sense of belonging. Building on the findings presented above, the analysis demonstrates that inclusion was realized through three interrelated pedagogical mechanisms: the expansion of access to learning through differentiated instruction, the restructuring of classroom interaction through student voice practices, and the cultivation of relational conditions that supported belonging. Together, these findings reinforce the view that inclusion is accomplished through routine pedagogical decisions and interactional work, rather than through isolated programmes or specialised interventions. This example illustrates inclusion as a dynamic process, highlighting the enhancement of participation opportunities for all learners in shared educational environments, consistent with inclusive pedagogy theory [5, 1].

A significant finding concerns the use of differentiated instruction as a means of expanding participation rather than categorising learners. As shown in the Findings, differentiation operated as a collective pedagogical strategy that provided multiple entry points to shared learning activities. This supports inclusive pedagogy scholarship that emphasises extending what is ordinarily available to all learners, rather than responding to diversity through individualised or compensatory provision [7]. Participation, in this sense, was enacted through access to common curricular goals and recognition as a legitimate classroom contributor. The educational approaches documented in the case closely align with Florian and Spratt's [7] inclusive pedagogy framework, particularly the emphasis on developing learning experiences that consider learner diversity and reject inflexible notions of competence. Differentiation was executed through flexible grouping, open-ended assignments, and adaptive scaffolding, enabling students with diverse learning profiles to engage in shared curricular goals.

The findings underscore the pedagogical significance of student voice in fostering inclusive classroom environments. As demonstrated in the analysis, dialogic and collaborative practices did not merely provide opportunities for expression but actively reshaped the interactional structure of the classroom by redistributing who could participate, how contributions were recognised, and whose perspectives were legitimised. This supports research that frames inclusive pedagogy as most effective when it prioritises participation and access to learning through everyday instructional and interactional practices, rather than through compensatory or deficit-focused approaches [11-13].

Opportunities for dialogue, reflection, and collaborative decision-making engaged students as active participants in learning processes, supporting research that emphasizes student voice as both a pedagogical strategy and an ethical imperative in inclusive education [11, 12]. The study demonstrates that student voice practices require careful instructional planning to ensure equitable participation, as unmoderated discussions may reinforce existing hierarchies

of confidence, language, or social capital. In this context, inclusive teaching involves not just seeking student input but also actively creating situations that enhance multiple perspectives.

Belonging emerged as a central pedagogical outcome of inclusive teaching practices, closely connected to students' willingness to participate in classroom life. As illustrated in the Findings, socio-emotional learning and sustained relational work functioned as enabling conditions for participation by fostering psychological safety and mutual recognition. This supports literature that conceptualises belonging not as an individual disposition, but as a socially produced outcome of everyday pedagogical and relational practices [3, 9]. The emphasis on socio-emotional learning, positive teacher-student relationships, and classroom norms of respect and empathy aligns with research linking a sense of belonging to student engagement, motivation, and well-being [3, 9]. The results demonstrate that belonging is not only a consequence of inclusion, but a pedagogical goal intentionally fostered via everyday interactions and classroom procedures. This highlights the literature's support for recognizing belonging as a crucial criterion of inclusive practice, alongside academic access and accomplishment.

The Discussion also highlights how the constraints identified in the Findings—such as curriculum demands, time limitations, and learner heterogeneity—shaped the enactment of inclusive pedagogy. Rather than undermining inclusion, these constraints required teachers to engage in continuous professional negotiation, balancing competing demands while making context-sensitive pedagogical decisions. This reinforces conceptualisations of inclusive pedagogy as a dynamic and negotiated practice, enacted within institutional conditions rather than implemented as a fixed model [13]. Curricular mandates, temporal limitations, and the heterogeneity of student requirements created conflicts that impacted teaching choices and limited the regular implementation of inclusive methodologies. These difficulties exemplify pervasive global concerns regarding the conditions under which educators must implement inclusive practices, particularly within centralized education systems that provide little flexibility [13, 8]. Rather than undermining the importance of inclusive pedagogy, these challenges illustrate its negotiated nature and the imperative for ongoing reflection and adaptation in practice.

This study situates inclusive pedagogy inside Greek public primary education, so augmenting global understanding of how participation and belonging are fostered under systemic constraints. This example demonstrates that inclusive teaching practices can be successfully developed in resource-limited settings, dependent on teachers' reflective engagement with their techniques and focus on relational and participatory elements of learning. This study offers practice-based evidence for inclusive education and underscores the significance of classroom pedagogy in realizing inclusive ideals.

### Conclusions

This study examined inclusive pedagogical techniques in a Greek public primary school, focusing on enhancing student participation and fostering a sense of belonging through regular teaching and learning activities. The article utilizes a qualitative case study method to offer practice-oriented insights into global discussions on inclusive education, emphasizing inclusion as a pedagogical and relational

process rather than simply a collection of technology adjustments. The findings support the view that inclusive education is crucial for students through classroom practices that recognize learner variety, promote engagement, and cultivate a sense of belonging<sup>[1,5]</sup>.

A key conclusion is that inclusive pedagogy is executed through instructors' ongoing efforts to develop learning experiences that are flexible, interactive, and relationally sensitive. Differentiated instruction, emphasizing participation over categorization, enabled students with diverse learning profiles to engage with shared curricular goals. Similarly, initiatives that promoted student voice and collaborative learning positioned students as active participants in classroom dynamics, thereby improving engagement and fostering a sense of belonging. These findings align with international research highlighting the significance of instruction and involvement in realizing inclusive principles<sup>[7,11]</sup>.

The study emphasizes the importance of socio-emotional dimensions of teaching in promoting inclusiveness. Belonging emerged as a crucial outcome of inclusive pedagogy, fostered by enduring relational practices, positive teacher-student relationships, and classroom norms that valued diversity and mutual respect. This highlights the growing emphasis in research on recognizing belonging as a crucial metric of inclusive education, alongside curricular access and academic success<sup>[3,9]</sup>.

The results concurrently highlight the constraints inherent in the use of inclusive pedagogy. Curricular requirements, time limitations, and varied student needs impacted teaching choices and required ongoing negotiation and modification. These issues highlight the imperative for institutional conditions that promote inclusive pedagogy, including professional development opportunities, curricular flexibility, and recognition of relational efforts as essential to teaching. The study asserts that inclusive pedagogy in teacher education and professional development must be viewed as a dynamic practice grounded in reflection, collaboration, and contextual responsiveness.

This study demonstrates the value of qualitative, practice-oriented case studies in advancing international understanding of inclusive education as a pedagogical and relational process. By examining inclusive pedagogy as enacted in everyday classroom practice, the study contributes to inclusive education research in three key ways: first, by conceptualising participation as a pedagogical achievement rather than an individual learner attribute; second, by illustrating how student voice operates as an interactional mechanism that restructures access to participation; and third, by positioning belonging as a socially produced outcome of sustained relational and socio-emotional work. These contributions offer analytically transferable insights for educators and researchers working across diverse educational systems in which inclusion must be negotiated within institutional and curricular constraint. Future research could augment this study by explicitly incorporating student perspectives, examining inclusive teaching in varied educational contexts, or assessing longitudinal changes in engagement and sense of belonging. The findings affirm that inclusive pedagogy is a dynamic process of developing learning settings that promote involvement, belonging, and significant learning for all students.

## References

1. Ainscow M. Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nord J Stud Educ Policy*. 2020; 6(1):7-16. Doi: 10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587
2. Ainscow M, Dyson A, Goldrick S, West M. Using collaborative enquiry to foster equity in school systems: Opportunities and barriers. *Sch Eff Sch Improv*. 2016; 27(1):7-23. Doi: 10.1080/09243453.2014.939591
3. Allen K-A, Kern ML, Vella-Brodrick D, Hattie J, Waters L. What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. *Educ Psychol Rev*. 2018; 30(1):1-34. Doi: 10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8
4. Cochran-Smith M, Lytle SL. *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2009.
5. Florian L. On the necessary co-existence of special and inclusive education. *Int J Incl Educ*. 2019; 23(7-8):691-704. Doi: 10.1080/13603116.2019.1622801
6. Florian L, Black-Hawkins K. Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *Br Educ Res J*. 2011; 37(5):813-828. Doi: 10.1080/01411926.2010.501096
7. Florian L, Spratt J. Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice. *Eur J Spec Needs Educ*. 2013; 28(2):119-135. Doi: 10.1080/08856257.2013.778111
8. Kenny N, McCoy S, O'Higgins Norman J. A whole education approach to inclusive education: An integrated model to guide planning, policy, and provision. *Educ Sci*. 2023; 13(9):959. Doi: 10.3390/educsci13090959
9. Korpershoek H, Canrinus ET, Fokkens-Bruinsma M, De Boer H. The relationships between school belonging and students' motivational, social-emotional, behavioural, and academic outcomes in secondary education: A meta-analytic review. *Res Pap Educ*. 2020; 35(6):641-680. Doi: 10.1080/02671522.2019.1615116
10. Kozleski EB. Disrupting What Passes as Inclusive Education: Predicating Educational Equity on Schools Designed for All. *Educ Forum*. 2020; 84(4):340-355. Doi: 10.1080/00131725.2020.1801047
11. Messiou K. Understanding marginalisation in education: The voice of children. *Eur J Psychol Educ*. 2006; 21(3):305-318. Doi: 10.1007/BF03173418
12. Messiou K, De Los Reyes J, Potnis C, Dong P, Rwang VK. Student voice for promoting inclusion in primary schools. *Int J Incl Educ*. 2025; 29(7):1168-1182. Doi: 10.1080/13603116.2024.2317729
13. Norwich B. Research about inclusive education: Are the scope, reach and limits empirical, methodological and/or conceptual and evaluative? *Front Educ*. 2022; 7:937929. Doi: 10.3389/educ.2022.937929
14. Sakellaropoulou G, Spyropoulou N, Kameas A. Exploring Greek primary teachers' perspectives in inclusive education for special educational needs (SEN) students and related research trends: A systematic literature review. *Educ Sci*. 2025; 15(7):920. Doi: 10.3390/educsci15070920
15. Štremfel U, Šterman Ivančič K, Peras I. Addressing the sense of school belonging among all students? A systematic literature review. *Eur J Investig Health Psychol Educ*. 2024; 14(11):2901-2917. Doi:

10.3390/ejihpe14110190

16. Tracy SJ. Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact. 2nd ed. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2020.
17. Yin RK. Case study research and applications: Design and methods. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2018.  
Doi: 10.4135/9781506336161