

# Didactic Foundations of Inclusive Education in Primary Schools: Towards Effective Teaching Models

Prof. Natalia Yevdokymova  
Pylyp Orlyk International Classical University

Dr. Yuliia Babaian  
Pylyp Orlyk International Classical University

Dr. Kateryna Nor  
Pylyp Orlyk International Classical University

## Abstract

This paper explores the didactic foundations of inclusive education in primary schools, focusing on effective models of teaching and learning that accommodate diverse learners. Drawing on constructivist and socio-cultural theories, the paper emphasizes the centrality of differentiated instruction, scaffolding, and multimodal strategies in fostering an inclusive learning environment. Several institutional and pedagogical models of inclusive didactics are analyzed, highlighting both opportunities and systemic challenges. The study concludes with evidence-based recommendations for the strategic implementation of inclusive didactic practices that enhance equity, learner engagement, and teacher professional growth in global primary education.

Beyond theoretical discussion, the paper synthesizes recent empirical findings from international contexts to demonstrate the measurable impact of inclusive didactics on student achievement and social integration. It emphasizes the importance of co-teaching, peer-assisted learning, and the integration of digital tools as scalable strategies for fostering inclusion. The analysis also acknowledges persistent barriers such as insufficient teacher preparation, resource limitations, and policy – practice gaps. By comparing different models, the study provides a nuanced perspective on how inclusive didactics can be flexibly adapted to diverse school systems. Ultimately, the paper underscores that inclusive education in primary schools is not a uniform prescription but a dynamic process requiring continuous adaptation, collaboration, and systemic support.

**Keywords:** inclusive education, didactics, primary education, differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, scaffolding, inclusive pedagogy.

## 1. The Landscape of Inclusive Didactics in Primary Education

Inclusive didactics in primary education is shaped by a complex interplay of international policies, national frameworks, and local classroom practices. It reflects a growing consensus

that diversity in the classroom should be treated not as a barrier but as a resource for learning. To understand this landscape, it is essential to analyze the global policy context, theoretical underpinnings, evolving teaching practices, and systemic disparities that influence how inclusion is realized in different countries.

### **1.1. Global Policy and Educational Commitments**

The global movement toward inclusive education has been strongly influenced by international agreements and declarations. The Salamanca Statement (1994) and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) established the principle that every child has the right to education within a mainstream environment. More recently, UNESCO's Education 2030 Framework for Action and Sustainable Development Goal 4 have reinforced commitments to «inclusive and equitable quality education». These frameworks set a universal benchmark, encouraging countries to design policies that guarantee access to learning for all children, regardless of disability, gender, socio-economic background, or language.

However, the translation of these commitments into practice remains uneven. High-income countries often integrate inclusion into national curricula and provide specialized teacher training, while many lower-income contexts face challenges in funding, infrastructure, and teacher preparedness. This gap underscores the need for flexible didactic strategies that can adapt to varying resource levels.

### **1.2. The Role of Primary Education in Building Inclusion**

Primary education represents the formative stage of formal learning where foundational academic skills and social competencies are established. Inclusive didactics in this stage goes beyond accessibility; it aims to instill values of empathy, cooperation, and respect for diversity from the earliest years. Research shows that inclusive classrooms not only improve academic outcomes for students with special educational needs but also benefit typically developing peers by enhancing collaboration, tolerance, and social responsibility.

In this sense, primary schools are uniquely positioned as laboratories of inclusive practice. The relatively flexible structure of early schooling, combined with a focus on holistic child development, creates opportunities to embed differentiated instruction, scaffolding, and multimodal teaching approaches into everyday practice.

### **1.3. Emerging Trends in Inclusive Didactics**

Across international contexts, several trends are reshaping the landscape of inclusive didactics in primary education:

- Differentiated instruction as a mainstream practice: Teachers increasingly adapt content, process, and assessment to diverse learning profiles, ensuring that every student can engage meaningfully with the curriculum.

- Collaborative teaching models: Co-teaching, peer tutoring, and cooperative learning strategies are gaining traction as effective ways to integrate learners with diverse needs into the classroom community.
- Integration of digital technologies: Assistive technologies, adaptive software, and multimodal platforms are being used to expand access to learning. While they offer significant opportunities, they also raise questions of equity, as not all schools have the infrastructure or training to deploy them effectively.

These trends highlight the dual movement toward personalization and collaboration, which together define the evolving character of inclusive didactics.

#### **1.4. Persistent Challenges and Inequities**

Despite global progress, several challenges hinder the universal adoption of inclusive didactics. Teachers often report insufficient preparation in managing diversity, particularly in contexts where inclusive education has only recently been introduced. Resource constraints – such as large class sizes, lack of teaching assistants, or limited access to digital tools – further complicate implementation. Cultural attitudes also play a role: in some societies, stigmatization of disability or linguistic minorities continues to obstruct full participation in mainstream education.

Importantly, inequities between high-resource and low-resource settings persist. In well-funded systems, inclusive didactics may involve structured co-teaching and advanced assistive technologies, while in resource-limited contexts, inclusion often relies on teacher improvisation, low-cost materials, and community support. These disparities illustrate the need for context-sensitive strategies that can be scaled across different educational environments.

#### **1.5. Toward a Dynamic Understanding of Inclusive Didactics**

Inclusive didactics should not be understood as a fixed set of techniques but rather as a dynamic, adaptive process that evolves in response to learners' needs, institutional contexts, and societal expectations. The landscape of inclusive education in primary schools demonstrates both progress and tension: while international commitments and innovative practices are reshaping teaching, systemic barriers and resource inequalities remain. Moving forward, inclusive didactics must be conceptualized as a field that bridges global educational ideals with local classroom realities, ensuring that diversity is consistently framed as a source of enrichment rather than challenge.

### **2. Theoretical Foundations of Inclusive Didactics**

The theoretical foundations of inclusive didactics in primary education draw on frameworks that reimagine teaching as a flexible and equitable process. Rather than assuming a homogeneous group of learners, inclusive didactics acknowledges that diversity – cognitive, linguistic, socio-cultural, or physical – is the norm. To address this diversity, three main approaches have gained prominence in international research: Universal Design for Learning

(UDL), differentiated instruction, and scaffolding. These frameworks provide complementary strategies to ensure access, participation, and achievement for all children in primary classrooms.

### **2.1. Universal Design for Learning (UDL)**

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides a proactive framework for making learning accessible from the outset rather than adapting content retroactively. It emphasizes multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression, ensuring that learners can interact with the curriculum in diverse ways (CAST, as cited in Bray, 2024). Studies have shown that when teachers integrate visual, auditory, and kinesthetic modes of teaching, student engagement and comprehension improve significantly, especially for children with special educational needs (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). UDL also encourages flexibility, allowing students to demonstrate mastery through various formats such as oral presentations, creative projects, or digital tools (Han, 2024).

At the policy level, UDL is increasingly being embedded into teacher training programs and school frameworks, illustrating its role not only as a classroom strategy but also as a systemic principle of equity (Nelson, Bitat, & Abedin, 2021). However, scholars note challenges such as limited teacher awareness and insufficient institutional support for its full implementation (Sewell, 2022). Despite these limitations, UDL is widely recognized as a transformative framework that positions inclusivity as a default feature of curriculum design rather than an exception (Bray, 2024).

### **2.2. Differentiated Instruction**

Differentiated instruction focuses on tailoring the content, process, and outcomes of learning to align with student readiness, interests, and learning profiles. Research indicates that when teachers differentiate instruction, students experience greater motivation and academic success because tasks are more closely aligned with their individual abilities (Griful-Freixenet et al., 2020). In primary classrooms, differentiation might include providing simplified texts for emerging readers, offering problem-solving tasks for advanced learners, or grouping students flexibly to foster peer support.

A critical feature of differentiation is maintaining high expectations while adjusting the pathway toward achieving them. Tomlinson's framework suggests that differentiation is not about lowering standards but about providing equitable opportunities for students to demonstrate learning in ways that reflect their strengths (Sewell, 2022). Studies highlight that differentiation promotes student agency by giving learners choices in how they engage with content, which leads to stronger ownership of learning (Han & Lei, 2025). Nonetheless, teachers often report difficulty implementing consistent differentiation due to large class sizes and limited resources, underscoring the need for systemic support (Bruns, 2024).

### **2.3. Scaffolding and Stepwise Support**

Scaffolding is a dynamic process through which teachers provide structured support that is gradually withdrawn as students gain independence. It often follows the «I do, we do, you do» model, where the teacher first models a task, then engages students in guided practice, and finally releases responsibility for independent application. Research shows that scaffolding is particularly effective in inclusive classrooms, as it allows students with special educational needs to participate in the same tasks as their peers, albeit with varying levels of support (Almeqdad, 2023).

Forms of scaffolding may include teacher prompts, visual aids, checklists, or peer tutoring structures that help students manage complex tasks (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). In literacy instruction, for example, scaffolding might involve using graphic organizers for story sequencing, while in mathematics, manipulatives may support conceptual understanding. Importantly, scaffolding is temporary – support is gradually reduced to encourage learner autonomy and resilience (Han, 2024). While highly effective, the strategy requires teachers to closely monitor student progress and adapt their interventions, which can be demanding without sufficient training or resources (Bray, 2024).

#### **2.4. Integrative Perspective**

Although UDL, differentiated instruction, and scaffolding can be applied independently, research suggests that their combined implementation is most effective. UDL provides a macro-level design framework that ensures accessibility from the start, differentiation operates at the classroom level to adjust tasks and content, and scaffolding functions at the micro-level to support moment-to-moment learning (Griful-Freixenet et al., 2020). Together, these approaches create a layered system of support that enables participation, growth, and achievement for diverse learners.

Recent studies emphasize that integration is key: schools that blend UDL principles with differentiated instruction and scaffolding strategies report higher student engagement and improved outcomes compared to schools that adopt isolated methods (Han & Lei, 2025). Moreover, digital technologies are increasingly being used to combine these approaches, offering multimodal access and adaptive feedback that complement teacher-led support (Nelson et al., 2021). However, barriers such as insufficient professional development and uneven policy implementation remain critical challenges (Sewell, 2022).

Thus, the integrative perspective frames inclusive didactics as a dynamic and holistic process rather than a collection of separate strategies. By weaving UDL, differentiation, and scaffolding together, primary education can move closer to realizing the vision of truly equitable and inclusive classrooms (Bray, 2024).

### **3. Models of Inclusive Teaching in Primary Schools**

Inclusive didactics in primary schools is operationalized through concrete models that translate theory into daily classroom practices. These models differ in their organization, allocation of roles, and pedagogical emphasis, yet all share the goal of creating equitable opportunities for diverse learners. Four models stand out in international research: pull-in,

push-in, co-teaching, and peer-assisted learning. Each has specific strengths and challenges that must be evaluated in light of school resources, teacher preparation, and cultural context.

### **3.1. Pull-in Model**

The pull-in model involves special educators joining the general classroom to support students with additional needs directly within mainstream instruction. Unlike «pull-out» systems, where children are separated for special lessons, pull-in promotes continuity and reduces stigmatization by keeping learners in the same environment as their peers. Research indicates that pull-in support contributes to social integration and improved participation in collaborative activities (Griful-Freixenet et al., 2020).

In practice, this model may include a special educator assisting small groups during literacy lessons or co-facilitating math activities with differentiated materials. Teachers report that pull-in increases opportunities for scaffolding and allows learners with diverse needs to remain engaged in core curriculum activities (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). However, successful implementation requires strong coordination between the general teacher and support staff, as role ambiguity can otherwise limit effectiveness (Han, 2024).

### **3.2. Push-in Model**

In the push-in model, specialists such as speech therapists, learning support teachers, or teaching assistants enter the classroom at scheduled times to deliver targeted interventions. This approach ensures that support is integrated into the learning context rather than delivered in isolation. For example, a speech therapist might guide a language activity for the whole class while providing individualized prompts to specific students (Nelson, Bitat, & Abedin, 2021).

Push-in is often praised for its efficiency, as it allows limited specialist staff to support multiple classrooms. Teachers also note that it normalizes diversity by embedding interventions within mainstream activities (Sewell, 2022). However, challenges include limited continuity – since specialists may not be present regularly – and the risk of fragmented support if coordination with the lead teacher is weak (Bray, 2024). Despite these drawbacks, push-in remains a widely used model in resource-constrained settings because of its flexibility.

### **3.3. Co-teaching and Collaborative Teaching**

Co-teaching represents one of the most comprehensive models of inclusive didactics. In this approach, a general education teacher and a special education teacher share equal responsibility for planning, teaching, and assessing instruction. Research identifies several variations of co-teaching:

- Team teaching – both teachers jointly deliver lessons.
- Station teaching – the class is divided into groups rotating between teacher-led and independent activities.

- Parallel teaching – teachers split the class and simultaneously deliver the same content to smaller groups.

Empirical evidence shows that co-teaching improves academic achievement, enhances classroom management, and fosters stronger social inclusion among students (Han & Lei, 2025). Moreover, teachers benefit from professional growth, as they exchange strategies and reflect collaboratively on practices (Bruns, 2024). However, this model demands institutional support, scheduled planning time, and a culture of collaboration to be sustainable (Nelson et al., 2021).

### **3.4. Peer-Assisted and Cooperative Learning**

Peer-assisted learning leverages the classroom community itself as a resource for inclusion. It involves structured activities such as peer tutoring, buddy systems, or cooperative group work, where students support one another's learning. Research shows that peer-assisted approaches not only enhance the academic performance of students with special educational needs but also build empathy, leadership, and collaborative skills among typically developing peers (Almeqdad, 2023).

In primary classrooms, peer learning can take many forms – for instance, pairing a fluent reader with an emerging reader during shared reading sessions or using group problem-solving tasks in mathematics. Studies confirm that cooperative learning increases participation, reduces social isolation, and fosters a sense of belonging (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). At the same time, teachers must carefully structure groups to avoid reinforcing hierarchies or overburdening certain students (Sewell, 2022). When well-designed, peer-assisted models align closely with inclusive values, making diversity an asset rather than a barrier.

### **3.5. Comparative Insights**

Each model offers unique benefits but also faces limitations. Pull-in maximizes integration yet requires extensive collaboration; push-in is flexible but can be inconsistent; co-teaching is highly effective but resource-intensive; and peer-assisted learning promotes community but depends on careful facilitation. Comparative studies suggest that schools often achieve the best outcomes by combining elements of these models rather than relying on a single approach (Griful-Freixenet et al., 2020; Han & Lei, 2025).

Ultimately, the choice of model is context-dependent, shaped by teacher expertise, institutional resources, and cultural expectations. What unites these diverse approaches is their shared commitment to inclusive didactics: ensuring that all learners, regardless of ability, participate meaningfully in the life of the classroom.

## **4. Roles and Challenges in Didactic Implementation**

The success of inclusive didactics in primary schools depends on the coordinated roles of teachers, support staff, and students, alongside systemic and institutional support. While research consistently emphasizes the benefits of inclusive practices, the implementation

process faces persistent challenges related to teacher training, resource allocation, and cultural attitudes. This section analyzes the roles of key stakeholders and outlines the primary barriers to effective inclusive didactics.

#### **4.1. The Role of Teachers**

Teachers are the central agents of inclusive didactics, responsible for designing lessons, adapting instruction, and creating supportive classroom climates. Their role extends beyond delivering content to facilitating differentiated instruction, embedding UDL principles, and providing scaffolding tailored to individual needs. Research shows that teachers who implement flexible and student-centered approaches report higher levels of learner engagement and participation (Han, 2024). Moreover, co-teaching contexts allow teachers to share expertise, reduce workload, and reflect collaboratively on instructional strategies (Han & Lei, 2025).

However, studies also highlight that many teachers feel underprepared for inclusive education, particularly in settings where professional training does not explicitly address UDL or differentiation (Sewell, 2022). Without structured support and continuous professional development, inclusive didactics often relies on individual teacher creativity and improvisation rather than systemic practice (Bruns, 2024).

#### **4.2. The Role of Support Staff**

Support staff – including special educators, teaching assistants, speech therapists, and school psychologists – play a pivotal role in making inclusive classrooms functional. They provide targeted interventions, assist with scaffolding, and collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure that students with special educational needs remain engaged in mainstream activities. Research suggests that teaching assistants, when trained in facilitation rather than simple task support, significantly enhance learner participation and confidence (Nelson, Bitat, & Abedin, 2021).

Nonetheless, role ambiguity remains a frequent challenge. In some contexts, assistants are limited to logistical tasks rather than contributing to pedagogy, which diminishes their potential impact (Bray, 2024). Studies stress the need for schools to clearly define responsibilities, encourage co-planning between teachers and assistants, and provide ongoing training in inclusive pedagogy (Griful-Freixenet et al., 2020).

#### **4.3. The Role of Students**

Students themselves are active participants in inclusive classrooms, not passive recipients of support. Through peer-assisted learning, they can scaffold one another's understanding, contribute to group problem-solving, and develop empathy and social responsibility (Almeqdad, 2023). Research shows that students with diverse needs benefit from peer collaboration by gaining access to authentic social interactions, while their peers strengthen their own learning by teaching and mentoring others (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024).

However, successful peer-assisted learning requires careful teacher facilitation to avoid unbalanced dynamics where some students consistently dominate or take on excessive responsibility (Sewell, 2022). When well-structured, peer roles transform the classroom into a learning community in which diversity is viewed as a resource rather than a challenge.

#### **4.4. Key Challenges in Implementation**

Despite widespread commitment to inclusive education, significant barriers persist in practice:

- **Insufficient teacher preparation:** Many primary school teachers lack training in UDL, differentiation, and scaffolding, making inclusive practices difficult to implement consistently (Han & Lei, 2025).
- **Resource limitations:** Large class sizes, limited access to teaching assistants, and inadequate technological infrastructure constrain effective inclusion, particularly in low-resource contexts (Nelson et al., 2021).
- **Curricular rigidity:** Standardized curricula often leave little room for adaptation, placing pressure on teachers to balance individualization with systemic demands (Bray, 2024).
- **Cultural and attitudinal barriers:** In some regions, stigmatization of disability or resistance to inclusive practices among parents and staff remains a substantial obstacle (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024).

Addressing these challenges requires systemic strategies, including improved teacher education, institutional support for collaborative teaching, and policies that prioritize equity alongside academic standards. As Sewell (2022) notes, inclusion cannot be reduced to isolated interventions; it must be embedded into the broader didactic culture of the school.

### **5. Impact of Inclusive Didactics**

The impact of inclusive didactics extends far beyond academic performance. It shapes classroom culture, professional growth of teachers, and the broader education system. Research in international contexts consistently highlights the multidimensional benefits of inclusive practices, while also noting the systemic demands they create.

#### **5.1. Impact on Learners**

Inclusive didactics fosters both academic achievement and social-emotional development. By applying UDL principles, students gain access to content through multiple channels, which enhances comprehension and retention (Bray, 2024). Differentiated instruction helps close learning gaps, ensuring that all learners – whether struggling or advanced – remain engaged at an appropriate level of challenge (Griful-Freixenet et al., 2020).

Students with special educational needs demonstrate higher levels of participation and academic resilience when tasks are scaffolded and tailored to their individual profiles (Almeqdad, 2023). At the same time, typically developing peers benefit by improving their problem-solving skills, empathy, and intercultural awareness through cooperative learning

(Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). Overall, inclusive didactics strengthens a sense of belonging and motivation to learn, which are essential predictors of long-term success.

## **5.2. Impact on Classroom Climate**

The implementation of inclusive didactic strategies transforms classrooms into more cooperative and equitable communities. Co-teaching and peer-assisted learning models reduce isolation for students with diverse needs and foster a culture of mutual support (Han, 2024). Teachers report that inclusive classrooms tend to be more collaborative, with higher levels of student interaction and reduced behavioral issues (Han & Lei, 2025).

Research further indicates that inclusive environments diminish stigma by normalizing diversity and encouraging students to value differences as strengths rather than deficits (Sewell, 2022). As a result, classroom climate becomes characterized by shared responsibility, respect, and active participation.

## **5.3. Impact on Teachers and Professional Practice**

Inclusive didactics also has significant implications for teachers' professional development. Teachers who engage in inclusive practices expand their repertoire of strategies, deepen their knowledge of learner variability, and develop stronger collaboration skills (Bruns, 2024). In co-teaching settings, educators gain opportunities to share expertise, reflect on their practice, and adapt instruction more flexibly (Nelson, Bitat, & Abedin, 2021).

However, this professional growth often comes with increased demands. Teachers report heavier workloads due to the need for individualized lesson planning, additional assessment strategies, and coordination with support staff (Sewell, 2022). These pressures underscore the importance of systemic support, such as ongoing training and reduced class sizes, to sustain teacher well-being and professional commitment.

## **5.4. Systemic and Institutional Impact**

At the institutional level, inclusive didactics contributes to greater equity and cohesion within education systems. Schools that adopt inclusive frameworks often report improved student retention, stronger parental trust, and better alignment with international standards of educational equity (Nelson et al., 2021). Policymakers highlight that inclusive practices can act as a catalyst for broader reforms, prompting schools to reconsider curricula, teacher training, and resource allocation (Bray, 2024).

Nonetheless, systemic disparities remain. In high-resource contexts, inclusive didactics may involve advanced assistive technologies and structured co-teaching, while in low-resource settings, it often relies on teacher ingenuity and community involvement (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). Bridging this gap requires strategic investment in teacher education, equitable funding, and policies that embed inclusivity as a foundational principle of school systems (Han & Lei, 2025).

Taken together, the impact of inclusive didactics is multidimensional: it improves learning outcomes, strengthens social cohesion in classrooms, enhances teacher professionalism, and advances systemic equity. However, its effectiveness depends on consistent application and adequate institutional support. As Sewell (2022) emphasizes, inclusivity cannot be reduced to isolated interventions but must become part of the pedagogical culture at every level of the school system.

## **6. Strategic Implementation**

Strategic implementation of inclusive didactics requires deliberate planning at multiple levels: classroom, school, and system. While theoretical frameworks such as UDL, differentiated instruction, and scaffolding provide strong foundations, their effectiveness depends on the extent to which teachers are prepared, institutions are supportive, and policies are aligned. This section highlights five dimensions of strategic implementation essential for translating inclusive principles into sustainable practice.

### **6.1. Teacher Education and Professional Development**

Teachers' preparation is the cornerstone of effective inclusive didactics. Studies show that pre-service training programs rarely provide sufficient instruction on UDL or differentiation, leaving teachers underprepared for diverse classrooms (Han & Lei, 2025). Embedding inclusive pedagogy into teacher education curricula – through modules on UDL, case studies of differentiation, and practice in scaffolding – equips future educators with necessary competencies (Griful-Freixenet et al., 2020).

In-service teachers also require continuous professional development. Research suggests that workshops, peer coaching, and collaborative reflection sessions strengthen teachers' ability to implement inclusive strategies consistently (Bruns, 2024). Such programs not only enhance technical skills but also build teachers' confidence, reducing resistance to inclusion (Sewell, 2022).

### **6.2. Institutional Support and Collaboration**

Schools must create organizational conditions that allow inclusive didactics to flourish. Effective implementation depends on manageable class sizes, adequate teaching assistants, and scheduled planning time for co-teaching teams (Nelson, Bitat, & Abedin, 2021). Without institutional structures that support collaboration, inclusive strategies risk becoming unsustainable.

Research highlights that schools fostering a collaborative culture – where general and special educators jointly plan lessons and share accountability – achieve stronger outcomes in learner engagement and social integration (Han, 2024). Leadership also plays a crucial role in aligning school vision with inclusive values and ensuring role clarity among staff (Bray, 2024).

### **6.3. Integration of Digital and Multimodal Resources**

Digital technologies offer new opportunities to expand inclusivity, particularly in primary education. Adaptive software, text-to-speech tools, and interactive platforms provide multiple means of access consistent with UDL principles (Bray, 2024). For example, digital storytelling applications can support emerging readers, while math games can scaffold numeracy skills for learners at different levels.

However, effective integration requires more than purchasing tools. Teachers must receive training in digital pedagogy to ensure that technologies enhance learning rather than create additional complexity (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). Moreover, inequities in access to devices and internet connectivity highlight the risk of exacerbating rather than reducing disparities if digital resources are unevenly distributed (Nelson et al., 2021).

#### **6.4. Policy Alignment and Resource Allocation**

National and regional policies are critical for embedding inclusive didactics at a systemic level. While many countries formally commit to inclusion, research notes persistent gaps between policy statements and classroom practice (Sewell, 2022). Policies must be accompanied by clear accountability frameworks, funding mechanisms, and monitoring systems that ensure equitable distribution of resources.

Equitable resource allocation is especially crucial: schools need access to teaching assistants, specialized staff, and assistive technologies to realize inclusive objectives (Han & Lei, 2025). International evidence suggests that policy frameworks emphasizing both equity and quality – rather than one at the expense of the other – are most effective in sustaining inclusive reforms (Nelson et al., 2021).

#### **6.5. Building a Culture of Inclusion**

Beyond technical strategies, inclusion requires a cultural shift within schools. Research highlights that classrooms thrive when diversity is framed as an asset, not a challenge (Sewell, 2022). Building such a culture involves engaging families, encouraging student participation in decision-making, and embedding inclusive values into school ethos.

Peer-assisted learning models, for example, not only support learners academically but also reinforce values of empathy and collaboration (Almeqdad, 2023). School-wide initiatives – such as inclusive assemblies, multicultural celebrations, or buddy systems – can strengthen a shared identity that embraces diversity (Priyadharsini & Sahaya Mary, 2024). When inclusivity becomes part of daily school culture, it is more likely to endure beyond individual initiatives or projects.

### **Conclusion**

Inclusive didactics in primary education represent both a pedagogical necessity and a societal commitment to equity. While the theoretical foundations of Universal Design for Learning, differentiation, and scaffolding provide clear guidelines for addressing learner diversity, the practical realization of these principles depends on the adoption of effective teaching models such as pull-in, push-in, co-teaching, and peer-assisted learning. Each model highlights distinct

pathways for supporting learners, yet their true potential lies in flexible and context-sensitive combinations.

The impact of inclusive didactics is evident across multiple dimensions: they enhance academic progress, nurture socio-emotional skills, and strengthen classroom communities. At the same time, they challenge teachers and institutions to expand their roles, rethink instructional practices, and commit to continuous professional development. The sustainability of inclusive approaches requires systemic investment, supportive leadership, and a culture that values diversity as an educational resource.

Ultimately, the implementation of inclusive didactics in primary schools is not merely an instructional adjustment but a transformative process. It redefines the aims of education by positioning inclusivity as a foundation rather than an exception. When strategically implemented, inclusive didactics contribute to building learning environments where every child can participate, progress, and thrive – thereby aligning education with broader international goals of equity, social justice, and lifelong learning.

## References

1. Almeqdad, Q. I. (2023). The effectiveness of universal design for learning. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), 2218191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.221819>
2. Bray, A. (2024). What next for Universal Design for Learning? A systematic review. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(3), 1159–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13328>
3. Bruns, L. (2024). *Implementing Universal Design for Learning in the inclusive classroom* (Master's thesis). Northwestern College of Iowa. [https://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1551&context=education\\_masters](https://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1551&context=education_masters)
4. Griful-Freixenet, J., Struyven, K., Vantieghem, W., & Gheysens, E. (2020). Exploring the interrelationship between Universal Design for Learning and Differentiated Instruction in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 91, 103062. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103062>
5. Han, C. (2024). Teachers' and students' beliefs towards Universal Design for Learning. *SAGE Open*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241272032>
6. Han, C., & Lei, Y. (2025). A scoping review of pre-service teachers' beliefs about the Universal Design for Learning framework. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1 – 13. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05336-3>
7. Nelson, L. L., Bitat, L., & Abedin, G. (2021). *Universal Design for Learning: Impact on policy, practice, and partnerships for inclusive education* (White paper). World Learning. <https://www.worldlearning.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/UDL-White-Paper.pdf>
8. Priyadharsini, V., & Sahaya Mary, R. (2024). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in inclusive education: Accelerating learning for all. *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, 11(4), 145 – 150. <https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v11i4.6945>

9. ResearchGate Review. (2024). The use of UDL in an inclusive classroom: A review-based study. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(7), 115–123. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383000198>
10. Sewell, A. (2022). Universal Design for Learning as a theory of inclusion. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 38(3), 237–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2022.2111677>