The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 4 | Issue 10 | October 2026
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online), SJIF IF(2026): 5.6
Website: www.theacademic.in

Integrating Neuroeducation into Contemporary Educational Models: A Conceptual Framework for Inclusive Education

Huma Perveen

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Education & Training

Prof. Shaikh Wasim

CDOE, MANUU, Hyderabad

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24490989

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Received: 23-10-2026

Accepted: 08-11-2026

Published: 20-11-2026

Keywords:

Neuroeducational Approaches; Inclusive Pedagogy; Modern Educational Frameworks; Neuroscience-Informed Learning; Educational Sciences

ABSTRACT

Today's classrooms need teaching strategies that are evidence-based, learner-centred, and inclusive, due to the increasing diversity of students enrolled in classes. Different educational models promote meaningful learning and active participation of the students. These models include constructivism, universal design for learning (UDL), differentiated instruction, experiential learning, and transformative learning. However, the knowledge of neuroeducation, an interdisciplinary field that combines neuroscience, psychology and education to improve teaching and learning (Tokuhama-Espinosa, 2011; Howard-Jones, 2014), can be incorporated into these models to make them more effective. The present paper is a conceptual paper that addresses the inclusion of neuroeducation in the current educational models so as to promote inclusive education. The paper reviews and synthesises the existing literature to describe the relationship between principles of brain-based learning and major educational models. The paper examines how neuroeducation-informed practices, including supporting working memory, attention, executive functions, and emotional engagement, can be applied to meet the diverse educational needs of students. This analysis results in a proposal of a conceptual framework that shows how

Disclaimer: The opinions, interpretations, conclusions, recommendations, analyses, and statements expressed in this research article are solely those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views, policies, or positions of the Publisher, Chief Editor, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or their affiliated institutions. The author(s) are solely responsible for ensuring the originality, authenticity, and integrity of the manuscript and for ensuring that it is free from plagiarism, AI-generated content, copyright infringement, data falsification, and any other form of academic misconduct.

the integration of neuroeducation with existing educational models can contribute to inclusive teaching and better learning outcomes. The paper also considers implications for teachers, curriculum developers, teacher educators and policymakers. To summarise, this conceptual paper offers a theoretical framework for developing more inclusive, evidence-based, and brain-informed educational practices that can promote equitable learning for all learners.

1. Introduction

Contemporary education is characterised by substantial variability among learners. Differences may occur in prior knowledge, language, attention, working memory, executive functioning, motivation, emotional experience, culture, socioeconomic circumstances and learning opportunities. Consequently, the assumption that one instructional pace, representation or assessment format will serve all learners equally is increasingly difficult to sustain.

Inclusive education requires more than the physical placement of learners in common educational settings. It involves identifying and reducing barriers to access, participation, learning and belonging. UNESCO's (2020) Global Education Monitoring Report, Inclusion and Education: All Means All, presents inclusion as a process concerned with the participation and learning of all learners and encourages education systems to recognise learner diversity rather than treating difference as a reason for exclusion.

Neuroeducation is a potentially useful perspective as learning is influenced by the interaction of cognitive and affective processes. Educational neuroscience has emerged at the interface of neuroscience, cognitive psychology and education, aiming at establishing a meaningful dialogue between brain knowledge and educational practice (Frei-Landau et al., 2023; Le Cunff et al., 2024). Working memory, attention, long-term memory, executive functions, emotion and motivation all relate directly to learning in the classroom. Working memory, attention, long-term memory, executive functions, emotion and motivation are all directly related to learning in the classroom.

At the same time, the integration of neuroscience into education must be approached critically. Howard-Jones (2014) has documented the persistence of neuromyths and the gap in communication between neuroscience and education. More recently, similar comments highlighted the need for neuroeducation to be better evidenced, more interdisciplinary in its collaborations and careful in translating scientific findings into educational contexts (Le Cunff et al., 2024). Thus, the present paper does not treat neuroeducation as a

collection of universal brain-based techniques. Instead, it conceptualises neuroeducation as an evidence-informed foundation for pedagogical reasoning.

Research recently supports the need for such an integration. Frei-Landau et al. (2023) examined 193 student-teachers in a digitally delivered educational-neuroscience course and identified results concerning brain-based understanding, empathy, professional perceptions, and pedagogical adaptations. Rusconi and Squillaci (2023) reviewed 12 studies on UDL training and found evidence that the training improves teachers' appreciation of learner diversity and planning of accessible lessons. Most directly, Espinoza-Casco et al. (2026) studied neuroeducation and UDL as predictors of inclusive-education training with 129 higher education participants. Their results showed a good predictive performance; however, a non-experimental cross-sectional design cannot establish causality. They found high predictive performance. However, the cross-sectional non-experimental design does not allow for causal inference.

The present paper responds to this fragmented evidence base by proposing an integrative framework connecting neurocognitive foundations, contemporary educational models, inclusive classroom practices and educational outcomes.

2. Rationale and Significance

The rationale of the paper rests on the convergence of three concerns. First, inclusive education requires educational environments that respond to learner variability. Second, cognitive and affective research provides information relevant to the conditions under which learning occurs. Third, contemporary pedagogical models such as UDL, differentiated instruction and learner-centred education provide practical mechanisms for responding to diversity. The conceptual challenge is to explain how these domains can be connected without reducing neuroscience to simplistic classroom recipes.

The proposed integration is significant for teacher education, curriculum design, assessment, classroom practice and policy. It also provides a critical distinction between evidence and implementation: neuroscience may explain a cognitive or affective process, but pedagogical theory and professional judgement are required to decide how, when and for whom a teaching response is appropriate.

3. Objectives

The overall objective is to develop a theoretically grounded conceptual framework explaining how neuroeducation can be integrated with contemporary educational models to strengthen inclusive education.

- To conceptualise neuroeducation as an interdisciplinary foundation for understanding cognitive and affective processes relevant to learning.
- To examine the relevance of attention, working memory, memory, executive functions, emotion, motivation, neuroplasticity and cognitive load to inclusive educational design.
- To analyse the relationship between neuroeducation and contemporary models including learner-centred education, Universal Design for Learning, differentiated instruction, inclusive pedagogy, technology-enhanced learning and social-emotional learning.
- To develop the Neuroeducation-Informed Inclusive Education Framework (NIIEF) as an integrative conceptual model.
- To identify research gaps and propose directions for empirical validation of the framework.

4. Research Questions

- What neuroeducational principles are most relevant to inclusive teaching and learning?
- How can neuroeducational principles be translated through contemporary educational models?
- How can neuroeducation-informed pedagogy respond to learner variability without creating fixed neurological labels?
- What are the major research gaps in integrating neuroeducation with inclusive educational practice?

.5. Conceptualising Neuroeducation

Neuroeducation may be understood as an interdisciplinary area connecting neuroscience, cognitive psychology and education. Its value lies not in importing brain terminology into education, but in improving dialogue between scientific knowledge and pedagogical decision-making. The literature and the ongoing debate on evidence and translation are characterized by this interdisciplinary orientation (Frei-Landau et al., 2023; Le Cunff et al., 2024).

5.1 Neuroplasticity

Neuroplasticity provides a broad basis for understanding learning-related change. Educationally, it supports the importance of experience, practice and feedback. It should not, however, be used to make deterministic claims about a learner's potential or to classify students into permanent brain types.

5.2 Attention

Attention determines which information receives greater processing. Inclusive instruction can support attention through clear goals, relevant cues, manageable lesson segments, meaningful activity and opportunities to re-engage with important information.

5.3 Working Memory

Working memory temporarily maintains and manipulates information during cognitive activity. Baddeley's (2000) model highlights interacting components and the episodic buffer. Because working memory is limited, instructional design should avoid unnecessary simultaneous demands and should connect new information with organised prior knowledge.

5.4 Long-Term Memory and Retrieval

Long-term memory provides organised knowledge that supports the interpretation of new information. Retrieval practice provides repeated opportunities to access knowledge. Karpicke and Blunt (2011) reported stronger learning from retrieval practice than from elaborative studying with concept mapping in their experimental comparison.

5.5 Executive Functions

Executive functions support planning, inhibition, cognitive flexibility and self-monitoring. Classroom supports can include routines, planning prompts, checklists, scaffolding and gradual release of responsibility.

5.6 Emotion and Motivation

Affective and cognitive processes are interconnected. Immordino-Yang and Damasio (2007) emphasised the relevance of emotion and social processes to learning, attention, memory and decision-making. Le Cunff et al. (2024) identified emotional and mental well-being as a prominent neuroeducation research priority.

5.7 Cognitive Load Theory

Cognitive Load Theory relates the structure of human cognition to the design of instruction. The link between the restricted capacity of working memory and organised knowledge in long-term memory was pointed out by Sweller et al. (1998). The educational implication is to reduce unnecessary processing demands while retaining meaningful intellectual challenge.

6. Inclusive Education: Conceptual Foundation

Inclusive education should not be conceptualised only in relation to disability. Learner diversity can involve cognitive differences, learning difficulties, disability, language, culture, socioeconomic circumstances, emotional needs, attention differences and varied educational experiences. UNESCO (2020) provides a broad foundation by placing participation and learning of all learners at the centre of inclusion.

An important conceptual shift is from asking what is wrong with a learner to asking what barriers exist in the educational environment. Curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, resources, classroom organisation and school culture can either create or reduce such barriers. Neuroeducation can contribute knowledge about cognitive and affective processes, while inclusive pedagogy provides the educational and ethical orientation for using that knowledge without deficit-based labelling.

7. Contemporary Educational Models

7.1 Learner-Centred Education

Learner-centred education emphasises active participation, prior knowledge, agency, meaningful learning and reflection. The model is compatible with neuroeducation because learning is understood as dynamic and influenced by experience and engagement.

7.2 Universal Design for Learning

UDL anticipates learner variability through multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression. It provides a strong bridge between neurocognitive variability and inclusive instructional design. Rusconi and Squillaci (2023) reported positive evidence for UDL training regarding teachers' valuing of learner diversity and accessible lesson planning. Almeqdad et al. (2023) conducted a review of 13 empirical studies and reported positive overall effects with considerable heterogeneity.

7.3 Differentiated Instruction

Differentiated instruction adapts aspects of content, process, product, pacing or support in response to learner readiness, interests and learning profiles (Tomlinson et al., 2003). Differentiation in the proposed framework supports UDL by offering responsive adaptation when universal design is not enough.

7.4 Inclusive Pedagogy

Inclusive pedagogy seeks to extend meaningful learning opportunities to all learners and avoid treating difference primarily as a deficit requiring separate provision. This orientation is essential because neuroeducation should increase flexibility rather than produce neurological labels.

7.5 Technology-Enhanced Learning

Technology can provide multiple representations, accessibility features, flexible pacing and feedback. However, technology is not automatically inclusive. “Technology can transform education for the better but only if it is well designed, well governed and available to all” (UNESCO, 2023).

7.6 Social and Emotional Learning

Social-emotional learning adds to the framework by looking at self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationships and responsible decision-making. It connects the emotional aspect of learning to the inclusive classroom climate and sense of belonging.

8. Methodological Approach

This paper adopts an integrative conceptual review and synthesis rather than an experimental research design. The purpose is to identify conceptual relationships across four broad domains: (a) Neuroeducation and educational neuroscience; (b) cognitive and affective processes in learning; (c) contemporary educational models; and (d) inclusive education. The Previous literature includes foundational theoretical papers, systematic reviews, qualitative teacher-education research and recent quantitative evidence. The synthesis is thematic rather than a statistical meta-analysis.

Seminal works are retained where they provide essential theoretical foundations, while recent studies are prioritised for contemporary developments. The paper distinguishes theoretical arguments from empirical evidence, and does not equate conceptual arguments with causal findings. Therefore, the proposed framework is a conceptual proposal that requires expert review and empirical validation in future.

9.1. Literature Synthesis

9.1 Neuroeducation: An Inter-Disciplinary Field

Howard-Jones (2014) emphasizes the value of nuanced communication between neuroscience and education and warns against neuromyths. Immordino-Yang and Damasio (2007) connect emotion to learning and cognition and set the stage for an affective and social neuroscience. In this debate Le Cunff et al . (2024)

join the discussion by outlining the current research priorities and the need for a collaboration between neuroscientists and educators. Le Cunff et al. (2024) add to this debate by defining their research priorities and the need for collaboration between neuroscientists and educators. This is also the way in which Le Cunff et al. (2024) push the discussion further, sketching their ongoing research priorities and emphasizing the collaboration between the neuroscientists and the educators. Le Cunff et al. (2024) continue the discussion by sharing their current research priorities and the need for neuroscientists and educators to work together.

9.2 Neurocognitive Foundations of Learning

Baddeley (2000) provides a theoretical account of working memory, while Sweller et al. (1998) connect cognitive architecture with instructional design. Together, these perspectives support attention to processing demands, prior knowledge, organisation, scaffolding and the design of learning materials.

9.3 Neuroeducation and Teacher Preparation

Frei-Landau et al. (2023) used qualitative data from 193 student-teachers learning a digitally delivered neuroscience course focused on neurodevelopmental disorders. The study identified four learning outcomes: understanding brain-based mechanisms, enhanced empathy, a changed perception of the teacher's professional role and pedagogical adaptations. This supports teacher preparation as an important mediator between scientific knowledge and inclusive practice.

9.4 UDL as a Bridge to Inclusion

UDL provides a practical mechanism for anticipating learner variability. Rusconi and Squillaci (2023) reviewed 12 studies and found that UDL training resulted in improved recognition of learner diversity, improved planning, and improved implementation of accessible lessons. Similarly, a systematic review and meta-analysis by Almeqdad et al. (2023) showed positive results, but with considerable heterogeneity among the studies included in this review. Similarly, positive findings were reported by a systematic review and meta-analysis by Almeqdad et al. (2023), but significant heterogeneity was observed in the same context. Also, positive effects were found in a systematic review and meta-analysis by Almeqdad et al. (2023) but with high heterogeneity.

9.5 Direct Neuroeducation–UDL–Inclusion Evidence

Espinoza-Casco et al. (2026) provide the closest recent empirical link to the present topic. In total, 129 higher education participants were involved in the study that examined neuroeducation and UDL as predictors of inclusive-education training. The authors reported strong predictive performance and identified diversity of participation, attention to diversity and inclusive pedagogical strategies as important predictors. Importantly, the authors caution that the cross-sectional, non-experimental design cannot establish a causal relationship.

10. Research Gap

The literature provides substantial knowledge on educational neuroscience, cognitive processes, UDL, differentiated instruction, inclusive pedagogy, teacher preparation and social-emotional learning. Recent work has also begun to examine direct relationships between neuroeducation and UDL in inclusive education contexts. Nevertheless, the evidence remains distributed across separate disciplinary and pedagogical domains. There is a need for a broader conceptual synthesis that explicitly positions neuroeducation as the cognitive and affective foundation, contemporary educational models as the pedagogical mechanism, and inclusive education as the overarching goal of equitable participation and learning. This is the central research gap addressed by the present paper.

11. Proposed Neuroeducation-Informed Inclusive Education Framework (NIIEF)

The proposed framework contains five interconnected layers. It is a design orientation rather than a fixed prescription.

Layer	Framework Component	Key Elements	Purpose
LAYER 1	**NEUROCOGNITIVE & AFFECTIVE FOUNDATIONS**	Attention • Working memory • Memory • Executive functions • Emotion • Motivation • Neuroplasticity • Cognitive load	Understanding conditions relevant to learning
LAYER 2	**NEUROEDUCATIONAL TRANSLATION**	Spacing • Retrieval • Chunking • Scaffolding • Multiple representations • Feedback • Emotional support • Self-regulation	Translating evidence into pedagogical principles

LAYER 3	**CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL MODELS**	Learner-centred education • UDL • Differentiation • Inclusive pedagogy • Technology • SEL	Providing pedagogical mechanisms
LAYER 4	**INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM PRACTICES**	Flexible instruction • Accessible resources • Multiple representations • Formative assessment • Flexible participation • Collaboration	Reducing avoidable barriers
LAYER 5	**EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES**	Accessibility • Participation • Engagement • Belonging • Retention • Conceptual understanding • Achievement • Equity	Defining desired educational outcomes

NEUROEDUCATION

↓

COGNITIVE + AFFECTIVE UNDERSTANDING

↓

CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL MODELS

↓

INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM PRACTICES

↓

PARTICIPATION • ACCESSIBILITY • ENGAGEMENT • BELONGING • EQUITY

12. Neuroeducational Principles–Pedagogy–Inclusion Mapping

Neuroeducational principle	**Cognitive/affective function**	**Pedagogical application**	**Inclusive contribution**
Neuroplasticity	Learning-related change	Practice and feedback	Supports continued learning opportunities

Working memory	Temporary processing and manipulation	Chunking, sequencing, scaffolding	Reduces unnecessary cognitive demands
Attention	Selective processing	Clear cues, structured segments, re-engagement	Supports attention variability
Retrieval	Access to stored knowledge	Low-stakes recall and spaced review	Supports retention
Multiple representations	Integration of information	Relevant visual, verbal and concrete representations	Provides alternative access routes
Emotion	Affect-cognition relationship	Supportive climate and meaningful contexts	Supports engagement and belonging
Executive functions	Planning and self-regulation	Routines, planning prompts, self-monitoring	Supports self-regulation
Cognitive load	Processing demands	Sequencing and removal of unnecessary complexity	Reduces avoidable barriers

13. A gap between evidence and practice.

Teacher competence also includes inclusive pedagogical knowledge, assessment literacy, classroom management and the ability to adapt instruction without lowering expectations. (Frei-Landau et al., 2023) The influence of educational neuroscience studies on empathy and pedagogical reform in teacher education research UDL research further suggests that professional development enhances the understanding of student diversity and creation of accessible lessons (Rusconi & Squillaci, 2023). Studies on UDL (Rusconi

& Squillaci, 2023) show that teacher education may improve competence in learner diversity and accessible lesson planning.

14. Discussion

The framework suggests that neuroeducation should inform rather than replace pedagogy. Neurocognitive and affective knowledge can help explain why instructional organisation, pacing, representation, retrieval, feedback and emotional climate matter; contemporary educational models determine how these considerations are enacted.

UDL is a particularly important bridge because it begins from learner variability rather than requiring learners to fit a predetermined instructional format. Differentiated instruction adds responsive adaptation, inclusive pedagogy provides a non-deficit orientation, technology can extend accessibility when appropriately governed, and SEL addresses emotional and relational dimensions.

The framework deliberately avoids fixed neurological categories. A learner should not be labelled as a particular 'brain type' and then given a predetermined method. Howard-Jones (2014) shows why such simplification is problematic. Inclusion instead requires flexible opportunities and evidence-informed professional judgement.

The model also suggests that inclusion should be understood as an interaction among learner, teacher, curriculum, environment and assessment. Neuroeducation contributes knowledge about learning processes, but educational outcomes remain dependent on context, resources, teacher competence and institutional culture.

Finally, the recent Espinoza-Casco et al. (2026) study strengthens the case for examining neuroeducation and UDL together, while its methodological limitations reinforce the need for future empirical work. The present framework extends this emerging relationship to additional contemporary models rather than treating UDL as the only pathway.

15. Implications

15.1 Teacher Education

Teacher-preparation programmes can integrate responsible educational neuroscience, cognitive science, UDL, inclusive pedagogy and neuromyth awareness.

15.2 Curriculum Design

Curriculum materials can anticipate variability through clear sequencing, multiple representations, meaningful practice and flexible opportunities for demonstrating learning.

15.3 Assessment

Formative and accessible assessment can provide varied opportunities for learners to demonstrate understanding while generating information for instructional adaptation.

15.4 Practice in the Classroom Rather than isolated 'brain-based' activities, teachers can embed evidence-informed cognitive supports with inclusive pedagogy.

15.5 Policy

Policy can support evidence-informed professional development, accessibility, teacher capacity and equitable access to learning resources.

16. Limitations

· The paper is conceptual and does not establish the causal effectiveness of the proposed framework.

· The reviewed literature includes theoretical papers, systematic reviews, qualitative studies and quantitative studies with different methodological strengths.

· Recent direct evidence is concentrated in particular contexts, especially higher education, so generalisation should be cautious.

· Neuroeducational principles cannot be assumed to produce identical outcomes for all learners or settings.

· the framework should be empirically tested and validated by experts thus making it a validated evidence model.

17. Future Research Directions

· Validate the NIIEF through expert consensus or Delphi methods.

· Develop and validate measures of teacher neuro-literacy and neuroeducation-informed inclusive competence.

· Conduct mixed-methods studies examining how teachers translate neuroeducational evidence into classroom decisions.

· Use quasi-experimental and longitudinal studies to test selected framework components on participation, engagement, conceptual understanding and learning.

· Examine implementation across school, teacher-education and higher-education settings and culturally diverse contexts.

18. Conclusion

Inclusive education requires more than placing diverse learners in the same physical environment. It requires learning environments in which learners can access content, participate meaningfully, receive appropriate support, demonstrate learning and experience belonging. Neuroeducation can contribute to this goal by providing an evidence-informed perspective on cognitive and affective processes relevant to learning.

The Neuroeducation-Informed Inclusive Education Framework proposed in this paper connects neurocognitive and affective foundations with contemporary pedagogical models and inclusive classroom practices. UDL provides a particularly strong bridge because it anticipates learner variability, while differentiated instruction, inclusive pedagogy, technology-enhanced learning and social-emotional learning extend the framework across instructional, relational and accessibility dimensions.

The originality of the paper lies in this conceptual integration. It does not claim that neuroeducation has already been proven to cause inclusive educational outcomes. Instead, it organises existing evidence into a coherent pathway and identifies expert validation, teacher research and intervention studies as the next steps. The framework may therefore serve as a conceptual foundation for future research, teacher education and policy-oriented discussion on evidence-informed inclusive education.

REFERENCE

Almeqdad, Q. I., Alodat, A. M., Alquraan, M. F., Mohaidat, M. A., & Al-Makhzoomy, A. K. (2023). The effectiveness of universal design for learning: A systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis. Cogent Education, 10(1), 2218191. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2218191

Baddeley, A. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4(11), 417–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01538-2

Espinoza-Casco, R. J., Mescua-Figueroa, C. A., Narváez-Araníbar, T., Clemente-Castillo, C. D. P., & Romero-Carazas, R. (2026). Predicting inclusive education training through neuroeducation and universal design for learning. Frontiers in Education, 11, Article 1859627. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1859627

Frei-Landau, R., Grobgeld, E., & Guberman, R. (2023). Implementing digital neuroscience in special-needs-teacher education: Exploring student-teachers' multifaceted learning outcomes related to teaching children with neurodevelopmental disorders. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, Article 1232315. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1232315

Howard-Jones, P. A. (2014). Neuroscience and education: Myths and messages. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 15(12), 817–824. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3817

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affective and social neuroscience to education. Mind, Brain, and Education, 1(1), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-228X.2007.00004.x

Karpicke, J. D., & Blunt, J. R. (2011). Retrieval practice produces more learning than elaborative studying with concept mapping. Science, 331(6018), 772–775. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1199327

Le Cunff, A.-L., Wood, H. C., Kis-Herczegh, P., & Dommett, E. J. (2024). Research priorities in neuroeducation: Exploring the views of early career neuroscientists and educators. Education Sciences, 14(10), 1117. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101117

Rusconi, L., & Squillaci, M. (2023). Effects of a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) training course on the development teachers' competences: A systematic review. Education Sciences, 13(5), 466. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13050466

Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. G. W. C. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. Educational Psychology Review, 10, 251–296. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022193728205

Tomlinson, C. A., Brighton, C., Hertberg, H., Callahan, C. M., Moon, T. R., Brimijoin, K., Conover, L. A., & Reynolds, T. (2003). Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 27(2–3), 119–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320302700203

UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education: A tool on whose terms? UNESCO.