"Challenging Misconceptions in Inclusive Education: Aligning Pedagogy with Practice at the Innovative University of Enga"

Maliye John1

Innovative University of Enga,
P. O. Box 387,
Wabag, Enga
Province, Papua New Guinea.

Abstract

Inclusive education seeks to provide equitable learning opportunities for all students, regardless of ability, by integrating them into mainstream classrooms. However, the effective implementation of inclusive pedagogy is often hindered by persistent misconceptions and systemic misalignments.

This paper explores common misunderstandings in teaching approaches—such as the belief in one size-fits-all instruction, the isolation of special needs students, and the assumption that inclusion lowers academic standards—and clarifies the realities supported by research and best practices. It further examines structural challenges, including inadequate teacher training, rigid curricula, and poor collaboration among educators, which limit the successful enactment of inclusive education policies. The consequences of these gaps ranging from learner exclusion to teacher burnout and inequitable outcomes—highlight the urgent need for responsive, flexible, and collaborative pedagogical strategies. Drawing from the context of the Innovative University of Enga, this analysis underscores the importance of shifting educator mindsets, enhancing professional development, and fostering systemic support to realize the full potential of inclusive education.

Key words:

Inclusive Education, Pedagogy, Differentiated Instruction, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Misconceptions, Equity, Collaboration, Teacher Training, Curriculum Flexibility, Educational Policy.

Introduction

Inclusive education is an educational philosophy and practice that aims to ensure equitable access to quality learning opportunities for all students, regardless of their physical, cognitive, emotional, linguistic, or socio-economic background. It promotes the integration of learners with diverse needs into mainstream classrooms, emphasizing the value of diversity, equity, and the full participation of every student (UNESCO, 2009). The fundamental goal of inclusive Education is not merely physical placement but meaningful engagement and progress for all learners through tailored support, responsive instruction, and a barrier-free learning environment (Ainscow & Miles, 2008). Despite its wide recognition as a foundational principle of educational equity, the practical application of inclusive pedagogy remains inconsistent across institutions. Many educational settings still operate on outdated or limited understandings of inclusion, often reducing it to compliance rather than a transformative shift in teaching and learning. Aligning pedagogy with Inclusive principles is therefore critical—not only to fulfil legal and ethical obligations but to foster learning environments that are responsive, adaptive, and just (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). Pedagogy in this context must reflect inclusive values through differentiated instruction,

universal design for learning (UDL), and culturally sustaining practices that empower both learners and educators.

This paper focuses on the Innovative University of Enga (IUE), a higher education institution in Papua New Guinea that has expressed a strong commitment to inclusive

education in its mission and policy frameworks. However, as with many universities globally, there exists a notable gap between policy aspirations and classroom realities. Faculty members, while supportive of inclusive goals, often report a lack of training, resources, and institutional support to implement inclusive strategies effectively.

The purpose of this paper is to critically examine the prevailing misconceptions surrounding inclusive pedagogy and to explore the structural barriers that hinder its effective implementation at IUE. Drawing from institutional experiences, scholarly literature, and best practices, the paper aims to offer recommendations for aligning educational practice with inclusive philosophy.

Through this analysis, the paper contributes to broader discussions on fostering meaningful inclusion in higher education settings, particularly within developing and culturally diverse contexts like the South Pacific.

Understanding Inclusive Education

The concept of inclusive education has evolved over several decades, grounded in global

movements for human rights, educational equity, and social justice. Historically, education

systems tended to segregate students with disabilities or other learning differences, often placing them in separate institutions or specialized programs. However, landmark international frameworks, such as the *Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education* (UNESCO, 1994), marked a paradigm shift by asserting that regular schools with inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes and building inclusive societies. More recently, **Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4)**, established by the United Nations, emphasizes the need to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" by 2030 (UN, 2015). Inclusive education is rooted in several core principles that guide both policy and practice. These principles include **equity**, ensuring that all students have the support they need to succeed; **accessibility**, removing

physical, curricular, and systemic barriers to learning; **diversity**, recognizing and valuing the unique backgrounds and needs of every learner; and **participation**, which promotes the full and active engagement of all students in academic and social aspects of school life (Booth & Ainscow, 2011). Together, these principles challenge educators and institutions to redesign learning environments in ways that are flexible, responsive, and

respectful of learner variability. Despite these well-established foundations, inclusive education continues to be misunderstood and misrepresented in many educational settings. A common misinterpretation is that inclusion means treating all students the same, which leads to the implementation of uniform teaching strategies that fail to address individual needs. This contradicts the very essence of inclusive pedagogy, which emphasizes *differentiated instruction* and *universal design for learning (UDL)* to accommodate diverse learners (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). Another misconception is that inclusion is primarily concerned with students with disabilities; in reality, inclusive

education is broader, encompassing gender, ethnicity, language, socioeconomic status, and other dimensions of diversity (Slee, 2011). Clarifying these distinctions is essential for aligning pedagogical approaches with the transformative aims of inclusive education.

Common Misconceptions in Inclusive Teaching

Despite the growing acceptance of inclusive education policies globally, misconceptions about inclusive teaching remain widespread, often impeding their practical implementation. These misunderstandings not only distort the intent of inclusive education but also affect how teachers design instruction, interact with students, and assess learning outcomes. One of the most persistent misconceptions is the belief that inclusive teaching requires a **one size- fits-all approach**. This assumption suggests that all students should be taught using the same methods and materials, regardless of their individual learning needs. In practice, this notion runs counter to the foundation of inclusive pedagogy, which emphasizes responsiveness to learner diversity through

differentiated instruction and flexible teaching strategies. As Florian and Black-Hawkins (2011) argue, inclusive pedagogy is grounded in the principle of "teaching all learners" by planning for variation from the outset, rather than creating accommodations retroactively. Tools such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provide frameworks for proactive planning that address the diverse learning preferences, interests, and challenges of students (CAST, 2018).

A second misconception is the idea that students with special educational needs (SEN) are best served in separate or specialized settings. While specialized instruction and support are sometimes necessary, extensive research has shown that, when properly supported, students with SEN can thrive academically and socially in mainstream classrooms. Inclusive environments promote peer interactions, foster social integration, and enhance the sense of belonging among all students (Hehir et al., 2016). Segregation, on the other hand, can contribute to stigma, isolation, and reduced expectations for academic achievement (Slee, 2011). Inclusive teaching is not about ignoring the specific needs of students with disabilities but about ensuring those needs are met within a shared, equitable learning environment. The third misconception is that inclusive education lowers academic standards or compromises the performance of students without disabilities. This concern is often rooted in assumptions that additional support for some learners dilutes the overall academic rigor of instruction. However, empirical studies have consistently refuted this belief. Inclusive classrooms, when effectively implemented, have been shown to improve academic outcomes for both students with and without disabilities. These improvements stem from the adoption of high-impact teaching

strategies such as cooperative learning, formative assessment, and scaffolded instruction, which benefit all learners (Mitchell, 2014). Moreover, inclusive classrooms foster the development of empathy, collaboration, and critical thinking—skills essential for success in diverse societies and workplaces. Addressing these misconceptions requires a commitment to evidence-based professional development and a shift in educator mindset. Teachers must be equipped not only with practical strategies but also with a

deep understanding of the values underpinning inclusive education. By challenging false assumptions and embracing inclusive pedagogy, educators can create learning environments where every student is valued, engaged, and supported to achieve their potential.

Structural and Systemic Barriers

While the philosophical and policy foundations of inclusive education are well established, the practical realization of inclusive practices within institutions continues to be hindered by persistent structural and systemic barriers. These challenges are not necessarily a result of resistance to inclusion but often stem from the limitations of institutional capacity, entrenched practices, and gaps in educational policy frameworks. One of the most critical barriers is inadequate teacher training and professional development in inclusive pedagogy. Many pre-service teacher education programs still treat inclusive education as a peripheral topic rather than integrating it as a core component of pedagogical preparation (Sharma et al., 2018). Consequently, teachers often enter the workforce lacking the knowledge, skills, and confidence to address diverse learning needs within a single classroom. Even among in-service teachers, opportunities for ongoing professional development in inclusive methods are frequently limited, poorly resourced, or disconnected from classroom realities. Without sustained and contextually relevant training, teachers may default to traditional, exclusionary methods that fail to support all learners effectively (Forlin, 2010). A second major obstacle is the rigidity of curricula and standardized assessment frameworks,which often leave little room for differentiated instruction or alternative forms of student engagement. Many education systems prioritize uniform content delivery and high-stakes testing, which tend to marginalize learners who do not conform to the dominant academic norms. Inclusive education requires curricular flexibility and assessment practices that recognize multiple ways of knowing, learning, and demonstrating understanding (Florian, 2014). However, when institutional frameworks do not accommodate such flexibility, teachers may feel constrained in their

efforts to adapt lessons for diverse learners. Another significant barrier is fragmented collaboration among teaching staff, particularly in higher education contexts. Inclusive education is most effective when it is a collective responsibility shared by all educators, rather than relegated to a few specialists or support staff. Unfortunately, many institutions lack the collaborative structures and cultures necessary to support team teaching, co-planning, and interdisciplinary approaches (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010).

The absence of shared planning time, cross-departmental dialogue, and inclusive leadership often results in isolated efforts that fail to address the broader needs of students. Finally, a persistent disconnect between policy and practice undermines the effective implementation of inclusive education in universities. While institutional mission statements and strategic plans may reference inclusion as a guiding principle, these aspirations are not always translated into concrete policies, resource allocation, or accountability measures (Slee, 2011). At the Innovative University of Enga, for example, inclusive education is acknowledged in institutional policy, but its operationalization remains uneven due to gaps in leadership, monitoring, and staff support. Without alignment between institutional commitments and day-today

practice, inclusive education risks becoming symbolic rather than transformative.

Impacts of Misalignment

The misalignment between inclusive education policies and their practical implementation has

profound negative effects on multiple stakeholders within the educational system. One of the most significant impacts is on student learning and inclusion outcomes. When inclusive pedagogical practices are inconsistently applied or misunderstood, students with diverse needs may experience exclusion, reduced engagement, and limited academic progress (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). The failure to provide appropriate supports and

accommodations hinders equitable access to the curriculum, perpetuating disparities rather than addressing them (Liasidou, 2013).

This misalignment also contributes to increased teacher stress, burnout, and low confidence in delivering inclusive education. Educators often feel ill-equipped to manage the complexities of diverse classrooms, especially when professional development is insufficient and institutional support is lacking (McLeskey & Waldron, 2011). The pressures of balancing curriculum demands, administrative expectations, and the needs of all students can lead to emotional exhaustion and reduced job satisfaction, further compromising the quality of instruction (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). At an institutional level, the disconnect between inclusive education ideals and actual practice can undermine institutional credibility and impede progress toward achieving broader equity goals**.** Universities that espouse inclusion in their mission statements but fail to operationalize these commitments risk being perceived as symbolic or performative rather than genuinely transformative (DeLuca & Klinger, 2010). This gap can also affect student recruitment, retention, and satisfaction, particularly among marginalized groups who may feel unsupported or alienated. Specific feedback from faculty and students at the Innovative University of Enga (IUE) echoes these broader trends. Faculty members have reported feeling inadequately prepared to implement inclusive strategies and have expressed frustration with the lack of institutional guidance and resources. Similarly, students with diverse learning needs have indicated experiences of isolation and limited access to accommodation, which affect their academic confidence and sense of belonging. These observations highlight the urgent need for systemic reforms that bridge policy and practice, fostering an inclusive culture that benefits the entire university community.

Aligning Pedagogy with Practice: The IUE Perspective

The Innovative University of Enga (IUE) embodies both the challenges and opportunities typical of higher education institutions striving to implement inclusive education

effectively. One of the main institutional challenges is bridging the gap between inclusive education policy and classroom practice. Structural limitations, such as limited resources and insufficient professional development, have constrained educators' ability to fully embrace inclusive pedagogy (Sharma et al., 2018). Nevertheless, the university's commitment to inclusion presents an opportunity to pioneer contextually relevant strategies that reflect the unique cultural and educational landscape

of the region.

A critical component for successful alignment between pedagogy and practice at IUE is the need for a mindset shift among educators and administrators**.** This shift involves moving beyond compliance-based inclusion toward genuinely embracing diversity as a strength and recognizing the potential of every student to contribute meaningfully to the learning community (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). Cultivating this mindset requires leadership that models inclusive values and encourages reflective practice among faculty members.

To operationalize inclusive pedagogy, ongoing, contextualized professional training is essential.

Training programs at IUE must be designed to respond to the specific challenges educators face, incorporating locally relevant case studies and practical strategies. As Forlin (2010) notes, professional development that is sustained, interactive, and embedded in teachers' work contexts is more effective in promoting inclusive practices than one-off workshops. This approach can

build teachers' confidence and equip them with tools such as differentiated instruction and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles. Another promising avenue is the promotion of collaborative teaching models**,** including coteaching, peer support, and shared lesson planning. Collaborative approaches foster a culture of mutual learning and distributed responsibility, enabling educators to pool expertise and provide more

comprehensive support to diverse learners (Friend & Cook, 2013). Such models also mitigate isolation and workload stress, enhancing teacher efficacy and sustainability.

Finally, recommendations for IUE include advancing curricular flexibility and the adoption of Universal Design for Learning**.** Curricular flexibility involves allowing modifications in content, process, and assessment to accommodate diverse learner profiles without compromising academic standards (CAST, 2018). Universal Design for Learning, by proactively designing curricula that anticipate learner variability, can minimize the need for reactive accommodations and promote equity. Together, these strategies can help translate inclusive policies into effective, equitable classroom practices that empower all students.

Policy and Institutional Recommendations

To advance the effective implementation of inclusive education, it is essential to embed inclusive values explicitly within institutional policy frameworks. Policies should clearly articulate commitments to equity, diversity, and accessibility, ensuring that inclusion is recognized not just as an ideal but as a fundamental institutional priority (Ainscow, 2020). Embedding such values in official documents helps create accountability and guides decision-making across all levels of the university.

Another critical recommendation is the investment in accessible learning environments and assistive technologies**.** Physical infrastructure, digital platforms, and classroom resources must be designed or adapted to meet the diverse needs of learners, including those with disabilities (Seale, 2013). Assistive technologies such as screen readers, speech-to-text software, and ergonomic tools can significantly enhance access to learning materials and participation for students with specific challenges, reducing barriers and promoting independence (Burgstahler, 2015).

Institutions should also focus on incentivizing inclusive teaching through recognition and career advancement opportunities. Rewarding educators who demonstrate excellence and innovation in inclusive pedagogy can motivate others to adopt similar practices. This

may include awards, promotion criteria that value inclusive teaching, and opportunities for leadership in inclusion initiatives (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). Incentives signal institutional commitment and encourage sustained engagement with inclusive education principles.

Finally, effective monitoring and evaluation of inclusive teaching practices are crucial for ongoing improvement. Systematic assessment of how inclusion is enacted in classrooms and its impact on student outcomes allows institutions to identify gaps, share best practices, and allocate resources strategically (Booth & Ainscow, 2016). Data-driven feedback loops foster a culture of reflective practice and continuous development, ensuring that inclusion remains dynamic and responsive to emerging challenges.

Conclusion

This paper has highlighted several key insights regarding the implementation of inclusive education, particularly within the context of the Innovative University of Enga (IUE). It has underscored those persistent misconceptions about inclusive pedagogy, coupled with structural and systemic barriers such as inadequate teacher training and rigid curricula, hinder the full realization of inclusion in higher education (Sharma et al., 2018; Florian, 2014). Furthermore, the impacts of these misalignments manifest in diminished student learning outcomes, increased teacher stress, and compromised institutional credibility (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; McLeskey & Waldron, 2011). Addressing these challenges requires intentional efforts to align pedagogy with inclusive principles through professional development, collaborative teaching, and curricular flexibility.

The imperative for systemic change is clear: meaningful inclusion cannot be achieved through piecemeal adjustments or isolated initiatives alone. Instead, it demands a comprehensive transformation that redefines institutional policies, resources, and cultures to prioritize equity and diversity at every level (Ainscow, 2020). This transformation involves not only structural reforms but also a fundamental shift in educator and administrator mindsets, emphasizing shared responsibility and continuous learning.

Finally, the experiences and reflections drawn from IUE serve as a microcosm of the broader challenges and opportunities facing higher education institutions globally. By embracing inclusive education as a dynamic, evolving practice rather than a fixed endpoint, universities can create more responsive, equitable learning environments that empower all students to succeed. The journey toward inclusion is ongoing, but with concerted effort and commitment, transformative change is achievable both at IUE and beyond.

References

1. Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1714377

2. Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2008). *Making education for all inclusive: Where next?* Prospects, 38(1), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-008-9055-0

3. Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(4), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903

4. Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17(2), 129–

147. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056

5. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for Inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (3rd ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE).

6. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2016). *The Index for Inclusion: A guide to school development led by inclusive values* (4th ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

7. Burgstahler, S. (2015). Universal design in higher education: From principles to practice. *Harvard Education Press*.

8. CAST. (2018). *Universal Design for Learning guidelines version 2.2*. Center for Applied Special Technology. http://udlguidelines.cast.org

9. DeLuca, C., & Klinger, D. A. (2010). Towards an inclusive framework for postsecondary education research: Conceptions of inclusion by students with learning disabilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(7), 661–677. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903291288

10. Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 286–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933551

11. Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 286–294.

https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933551

12. Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828.

https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

13. Forlin, C. (2010). Developing and implementing quality inclusive education in Hong Kong: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 10(1), 177–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2010.01161.x

14. Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2013). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (7th ed.). Pearson.

15. Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). *A summary of the evidence on inclusive education*. Instituto Alana. https://alana.org.br/wpcontent/

uploads/2016/12/A_Summary_of_the_evidence_on_inclusive_education.pdf

16. Liasidou, A. (2013). *Inclusive education, politics and policymaking*. Routledge.

17. McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2011). Inclusive education in action: A research-basedapproach. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 95(1), 41–56.https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636511402651

18. McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2011). Inclusive education in action: A research-basedapproach. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 95(1), 41–56.https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636511402651

19. Mitchell, D. (2014). *What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

20. Seale, J. (2013). *E-learning and disability in higher education: Accessibility research and practice*. Routledge.

21. Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Macanawai, S. (2018). Factors contributing to the implementation of inclusive education in Pacific Island countries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1514751

22. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy aspredictors of engagement, emotional exhaustion, and motivation to leave the teachingprofession. *Creativity Research Journal*, 28(1), 1–8.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2016.1133948

23. UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427

24. UNESCO. (2009). *Policy guidelines on inclusion in education*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000177849

25. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda