Review of Contemporary Philosophy
ISSN: 1841-5261, e-ISSN: 2471-089X
Vol 22 (1), 2023
Pp 4557 - 4567

The Role of Social Services in Promoting Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities: Review

[1]-Nazih Khalil Kamili,[2]- Abdo Balghaith Abdo Muhammad,[3]- Khalid Khlil Galfan Kamli,[4]- Hassan Yahya Salem Khard,[5]-Haya Brahim A Albati,[6]-Maram Hussin Mohammed Banajiah,[7]- Thamer Marzouq Abdul Rahman Al Hammadi ,[8]-Saleh Abdullah Saeed Alqahtani ,[9]-Anwar Ali Hakami,[10]-Thamer Abdulaziz Alotaib,[11]-Faleh Ayed Alqahtani,[12]- Nasser Majed Ali Aldawsari,[13]- Nasser Ali Al Kebresh,[14]-Ali Atiah Ageeli

[1] Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Erada Mental Health Hospital For In Jizan
[2] Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Mental Health And Social Service
[3] Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Erada Mental Health Hospital For In Jizan
[4] Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Erada Mental Health Hospital For In Jizan
[5] Ksa, Ministry Of Health
[6] Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Irada Hospital For Mental Health
[7] Ksa, Ministry Of Health
[8] Ksa, Ministry Of Health
[9] Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital And Mental Health- Jazan
[10]Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Riyadh ,Saudi Arabia
[11]Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Complex And Mental Health-Riyadh
[12]Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Wadi Al-Dawasir General Hospital
[13]Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Aljazzera Primary Health Care
[14]Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Hospital Al Ardah

Abstract

Background: The shift towards inclusive education has become a significant focus in educational policy, aiming to integrate children with disabilities into mainstream classrooms. Despite extensive research on the benefits of inclusion for students with disabilities, less attention has been given to its impact on typically developing peers.

Methods: This review synthesizes existing literature on the academic and social outcomes of inclusive education for students without disabilities. A comprehensive analysis was conducted, focusing on studies that assess the effects across various educational stages, including preschool, primary, and secondary levels.

Results: Findings indicate that the academic impact of inclusion on typically developing students is predominantly neutral or positive, with some studies highlighting slight advantages in academic performance, particularly in elementary settings. Socially, students without disabilities often benefit from enhanced tolerance, acceptance, and understanding of diversity. However, variations in outcomes were noted based on the proportion of students with disabilities and the specific educational context.

Conclusion: Overall, inclusive education appears to foster a supportive learning environment that benefits both children with and without disabilities. While adverse effects on academic performance were minimal, further research is needed to explore the nuanced impacts of inclusion on different student populations, particularly high and low achievers.

Keywords: Inclusive education, children with disabilities, academic outcomes, social outcomes, educational policy.

Received: 16 October 2023 **Revised**: 29 November 2023 **Accepted**: 13 December 2023

1. Introduction

Educational methodologies are transitioning towards inclusive education in the United States and several places worldwide. Inclusive education is the integration of children with special educational needs into general education courses alongside their normally developing counterparts [2]. Certain children with impairments were excluded from the school system. Nonetheless, due to changes in policy and legislation, 95% of children with disabilities were educated in mainstream schools in fall 2017 [3]. Approximately 65% of students with disabilities in general education spend 80% or more of their time in general education classes. Conversely, just 2.8% of children with disabilities were enrolled in specialized schools, while an additional 2.2% got education in ordinary private institutions, separate residential facilities, at home, in hospitals, or penal facilities [3].

Moreover, data about the inclusion of students with disabilities differ according to the degree of impairment, indicating that children with mild or moderate disabilities are more inclined to obtain education in inclusive environments [1]. A succession of legislative measures started a transformation in the education of kids with special needs over fifty years ago. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) was adopted in 1975, followed by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990, which was reauthorized in 1997. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) was passed in 2004. The IDEA was an expanded iteration of the EAHCA, while the IDEIA was an enlarged version of the IDEA. This legislation mandated that schools provide all children with disabilities a free and suitable public education in the least restrictive setting to the fullest degree feasible. There are six continua of placement options, ranging from the most inclusive to the least inclusive: general education classroom with specialist consultation; general education classroom with co-teaching; part-time placement in a special education classroom; full-time special education classroom in a general education school, special school, or residential school; treatment center; and homebound instruction [4-7].

Inclusive education necessitates learning settings that foster the growth and development of all learners; hence, research must assess the effects of inclusion on both students with disabilities and their normally developing peers [7]. Nevertheless, much research exists about the benefits of inclusion on students with disabilities, whereas there is comparatively little focus on students without disabilities in inclusive environments [8]. For kids with impairments, the academic and social impacts of inclusive policies are mostly beneficial [9]. Oh-Young and Filler [10] performed a meta-analysis to examine the impact of placement on the academic and social competencies of students with disabilities. Twenty-four research completed between 1980 and 2013 were examined, and the results were integrated with two earlier meta-analytic studies to substantiate data spanning over 80 years. Findings indicated that the majority of students with disabilities in more inclusive settings surpassed their peers in less inclusive situations in terms of academic and social results.

While much research examines the academic and social impacts of inclusion on students with special needs, there is a paucity of literature addressing the academic and social benefits of inclusion on students without special needs. This review aims to organize and synthesize literature regarding the academic and social outcomes of inclusion for students without disabilities, thereby enhancing the understanding of its impacts and improving the educational experiences of these students in inclusive classrooms.

2. Academic Impact of Inclusion on Students without Disabilities

The academic impact of inclusion on kids without impairments has been inconsistent, necessitating more study on normally developing students [11,12]. This section reviews the research and examines the academic performance of normally developing kids in inclusive environments. Research is categorized into two primary segments. Initially, prior evaluations of the academic performance of kids without impairments are delineated. The following studies are classified according to educational stages, since the evidence suggests varying effects of inclusion on the academic performance of normally developing kids across various educational levels [13].

Peltier [14] examined seven research on the academic progress of adolescents without disabilities in inclusive environments and determined that there were no adverse effects on academic performance and no significant disparities in developmental outcomes. Salend and Garrick Duhaney [15] conducted a literature analysis and based on four research with normally developing kids, concluded that inclusion in a classroom did not hinder the academic performance of these individuals.

Kalambouka et al. [16] conducted a thorough literature analysis and discovered 26 research concerning the academic and social outcomes of kids without special needs in inclusive classrooms, with 21 of these studies concentrating on academic success mostly among primary school-aged pupils. Academic outcomes in elementary schools were either favorable or neutral, with four research indicating good results and twelve reporting neutral effects. At the secondary school level, two research had neutral results, while one study indicated negative consequences. The results indicated that the academic performance of usually developing kids was not negatively impacted, with 81% of the outcomes being mostly good or neutral [16].

Ruijs and Peetsma [12] examined the academic and socio-emotional impacts of inclusion on students with and without impairments, focusing only on research published since 1999. The authors examined six papers that investigate the academic impacts on usually developing kids. Despite the challenges in reaching definitive conclusions, the majority of research suggested favorable or neutral benefits, with just one study documenting negative results. Nonetheless, findings indicated a varied effect on high- and low-achieving pupils. kids with lower academic performance seemed to gain from the curriculum and supplementary assistance in inclusive classrooms, whereas kids with higher academic performance may encounter negative consequences. The neutral outcomes would therefore follow from this differential impact [12].

Hehir et al. [9] performed an extensive analysis of 280 papers across 25 nations to synthesize the data on inclusive education for both children with and without disabilities. Identified research demonstrated neutral or favorable impacts on the academic performance of individuals without impairments. A limited number of research indicated a minor adverse effect. The authors found that the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms did not adversely impact those without impairments and may provide academic advantages. Beneficial outcomes were more prevalent in classrooms where general education instructors exhibited favorable views toward inclusive practices and used adaptive instruction alongside collaborative teaching with special education teachers. [9].

Recently, Szumski et al. [13] performed a meta-analysis on the academic performance of kids without impairments in inclusive classes. Forty-seven research published since 1980 fulfilled the inclusion criteria, including roughly four million eight hundred thousand K-12 pupils in Europe and North America, of which 36 studies were from the United States. Thirty research concentrated on elementary school children, while the rest studies were executed at secondary educational institutions. The impact size for the academic success of kids without impairments was positive, and statistically significant, but small ($d = 0.12$, $SE = 0.053$, 95% CI: 0.02, 0.23, $p = 0.02$). This indicates a two-point discrepancy in a regular normal distribution (mean = 100 and standard deviation = 15). The authors further examined six moderating variables. For instance, research done in the United States and Canada had more pronounced results. The method of implementation served as the subsequent moderator (assessment of interventions compared to studies of standard educational procedures), with only the impacts of intervention studies being significant. The impact of educational team composition, whether including a full-time or part-time special education teacher, was not significant. Furthermore, classes including kids with moderate impairments had favorable impacts, however no such effects were seen in classrooms with students with severe disabilities. The last moderator was the instructional phase. Statistically significant albeit modest impacts were detected at the primary school level, whereas no significant effects were noted at the secondary education level [13]. In conclusion, prior research mostly identified neutral or somewhat favorable impacts of inclusion on the academic performance of usually developing kids.

3. Academic Performance of Students without Disabilities Across Various Educational Levels

Due to the possible variable impact of educational stages, studies are classified into preschool, primary, and secondary school levels. Warren et al. [17] conducted one-year mixed methods research examining an

effective inclusive preschool curriculum on the intellectual and social development of preschool children, both with and without impairments. The participants consisted of 46 youngsters aged 3 or 4, together with their parents. The curriculum prioritized language and literacy learning, including adjustments and tailored training to address individual needs. The full-inclusion program had quality indicators such as goal-oriented emphasis, experiential learning, integration of cognitive skills, continuous assessment of student progress, and elevated expectations for all participants. The initiative had a beneficial effect on all kids, families, and the school community. Students without impairments shown improvements in all eight domains evaluated in the statewide standardized exam, including language, learning, cognitive ability, mathematics, and literacy. These adolescents substantially ($p < 0.05$) surpassed the anticipated development for usually developing peers.

Rhoad-Drogalis and Justice [1] investigated the language and literacy accomplishments of preschool children over a year, as well as the correlation between the proportion of preschoolers with mild to moderate special needs in classes. 516 preschool children were participating, 42% of whom had impairments. The proportion of children with impairments in classes ranged from 7% to 92%. Fall assessments indicated that students with special needs achieved markedly lower scores compared to their non-disabled peers; however, both cohorts exhibited comparable progress in language and print concepts, with the exception of alphabet knowledge, which was superior among children without disabilities, throughout the academic year. The percentage of students with impairments or peer scores was shown to be unrelated to kids' spring success in language, print-concept knowledge, and alphabet knowledge across all three categories. Consequently, preschoolers with impairments did not adversely impact the accomplishments of children without disabilities. In conclusion, inclusion does not negatively impact the intellectual development of preschoolers without impairments and may even be advantageous for them.

Huber et al. [18] examined the varying impact of inclusion on general education pupils. Over two years, 477 kids from grades one to five participated in this research, and the school system lacked prior experience with inclusive methods. Students were instructed in classes that included or excluded individuals with impairments. The researchers examined the scores of high, medium, and low performers to see if these scores were influenced by the presence of children with impairments in classes. Students' abilities were shown to have statistically significant influence on reading and mathematics outcomes. The low-achieving group saw the most advantage, but moderate and high achievers suffered little and significant losses, respectively. The inclusion of kids with impairments had a little impact on the reading scores of normally developing classmates, whereas the influence on arithmetic results was inconsistent.

Research conducted by Cole et al. [19] included 429 kids with moderate impairments and 606 students without disabilities, both in grades 2 to 5, from both inclusive and non-inclusive environments. The academic performance in reading and mathematics of pupils was assessed by curriculum-based metrics in both the autumn and spring semesters. The findings indicated that the reading and mathematics scores of pupils without impairments in inclusive environments surpassed those of their normally developing counterparts in conventional (non-inclusive) settings.

Demeris et al. [20] examined the achievement results of all usually developing third-grade pupils in Ontario and analyzed the correlation with the proportion of students with special needs in classes. The authors used extensive evaluations in reading, writing, and mathematics, while accounting for socioeconomic background and class size. The number of students with impairments in courses varied from 0 to 10, while class sizes ranged from 16 to 37 students. Class size had a negative correlation with all three scores, whereas better socioeconomic level was linked to elevated scores; however, the presence of students with impairments did not provide statistically significant impacts on the scores of normally developing classmates. The data indicated that the presence of kids with disabilities did not negatively impact the success scores of pupils without impairments.

Gruner Gandhi [21] examined the correlation between inclusion and the reading performance of third-grade pupils without impairments using representative data from the United States. It was determined that, with few exceptions, the reading performance of kids without impairments in inclusive classes remained

unaffected when accounting for background characteristics. In many instances, their scores seemed to improve relative to classmates in non-inclusive classes, facilitated by factors such as the presence of a hired helper for kids with autism or regular consultations between the general education instructor and the special education teacher. Nonetheless, the absence of a hired helper in the classroom for kids with autism negatively impacted the reading results of ordinarily developing pupils.

Fletcher [22] investigated the spillover effects of inclusion on the reading and mathematics scores of normally developing children in early elementary schools using a longitudinal survey of kindergartners in the United States. The study discovered that the reading and mathematics performance of kids with a classmate experiencing an emotional disturbance declined by almost ten percent of a standard deviation after kindergarten and first grade. Nevertheless, a reduction of 3 to 10 percent was not substantial, leading one to infer that the impacts were negligible.

Ruijs et al. [23] investigated the achievements in inclusive education of 27,745 primary school students from a representative sample of a large cohort study in the Netherlands, examining the differential effects based on the intelligence levels of typical students and the types of disabilities among the included students. The findings indicated no disparities in the academic performance of kids without disabilities in inclusive vs non-inclusive classrooms. Furthermore, there was no varying impact of inclusion on usually developing pupils of differing intelligence levels. Furthermore, the performance of kids without impairments did not significantly vary from that of students with disabilities, regardless of disability type.

Dessemontet and Bless [24] examined the impact of inclusion on the academic performance of low, medium, and high-performing normally developing kids in classes with peers exhibiting mild or moderate intellectual disabilities in Switzerland. A total of 280 children with intellectual impairments and 500 pupils without disabilities participated in the pretest. A final study sample of 202 pairs was established among participants, considering gender, socioeconomic position, mother tongue, age, and pretest scores. The findings indicated no statistically significant difference in the accomplishment scores (literacy and numeracy) of children without disabilities in inclusive vs non-inclusive classrooms. No substantial effects of inclusion on the advancement of low, medium, and high-achieving kids without impairments were seen.

Krammer et al. [25] used multi-level regression modeling to examine the national mathematics success of fourth-grade pupils without impairments in inclusive environments in Austria. Approximately 75,000 standard scores served as the dependent variable, while the independent factors included socioeconomic level, ethnic origin, age, gender, and the number of pupils with impairments. The results indicated little impact of the presence of students with impairments on the standard mathematical performance of their non-disabled classmates, even when accounting for background characteristics. Nonetheless, it had no practical consequences for the mathematical performance of usually developing kids, rendering the direction inconsequential. The adverse impact resulted in a reduction of 0.73 points in mathematics scores, which had a mean of 533 and a standard deviation of 100. Consequently, the inclusion of students with impairments did not negatively impact the mathematical performance of their peers.

Rangvid [26] investigated the impact of reintegrating pupils from segregated environments into inclusive schools on the reading scores of normally developing students and assessed whether a significant influx of such returnees adversely affected other students. The author used six years of population data from Denmark, including grades 2 to 8, with several observations of longitudinal test score improvements for each kid. The findings indicated a little negative impact (−0.04 SD) on the reading performance of pupils without impairments, with the effect size representing 5% of the original test score disparity. The substantial influx of responses did not significantly impact peer ratings. Nevertheless, more pronounced impacts were seen in schools lacking expertise in the inclusion of children with impairments. Consequently, the findings indicated that inclusive educational systems must be structured to support students with disabilities in order to alleviate the adverse impacts on the academic performance of their classmates.

In conclusion, with some exceptions, prior research suggests that the inclusion of students with disabilities in primary school classrooms did not adversely affect the academic performance of students

without disabilities, and that neutral effects were unlikely to result from the varying impacts of inclusion on low- or high-achieving students.

Rouse and Florian [27] examined the impact of varying numbers of students with disabilities on the academic performance of secondary school students without impairments in England. A nationwide dataset was used to assess the performance of pupils throughout the five years of secondary education, commencing at age 11 during key stage 2. No evidence was discovered to substantiate that a larger number of kids with impairments in a school diminishes the academic achievement of normally developing classmates. There was data indicating that inclusion might facilitate the success of other pupils.

Farrell et al. [28] examined the correlation between academic performance and inclusive education using nationally representative data from all children in England throughout the four key stages (ages 7, 11, 14, and 16). At each key stage, there was no substantial correlation between the inclusivity of the local authority and the academic performance of its children. A substantial correlation between school diversity and academic performance was identified. The academic performance of pupils was diminished in schools with a greater proportion of children with impairments; yet this impact was minimal (0.25 points or one percent). The association is likely not causative; other reasonable reasons may exist concerning schools with a large population of kids with disabilities that might hinder academic progress.

St. John and Babo [29] assessed the academic performance of middle school children in co-taught inclusive classes, using results from the New York State Assessment for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. The research also examined the impact of other factors like gender, socio-economic position, attendance, prior academic achievement, and ethnicity. The suburban school system included a single middle school with over 2,100 pupils, who were enrolled in either regular general education or co-taught inclusive classes. One hundred sixty-six corresponding pairings were established based on analogous qualities. The findings indicated that placement in a co-taught inclusive classroom adversely affected the academic performance of middle school pupils. Students in grades 6–8 without impairments in conventional general education had a significantly higher likelihood of achieving proficiency in both English Language Arts (ELA) (5.5 times greater chance, representing a 454% increase in probability) and mathematics (2 times greater chance, indicating a 92% increase in probability).

Fruth and Woods [30] conducted group comparison research to investigate the impact of inclusion on the academic performance of 10th-grade students without impairments, contrasting their performance with that of classmates in a non-inclusive setting. Two hundred and three students from a suburban high school participated, using data from the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT). The OGT is a criterion-referenced evaluation in the domains of reading, science, mathematics, and social studies. The results indicated no significant differences in the reading, science, and social studies accomplishments of students without impairments in inclusive compared to non-inclusive settings. Students in non-inclusive contexts had much superior arithmetic scores, with a mean difference of 10.14 points higher.

Brown and Babo [31] examined the academic performance of 11th-grade children without disabilities in inclusive environments. The language arts literacy component of the 2013 New Jersey High School Proficiency Assessment (NJ HSPA) was used, and 214 students were paired according to controlled factors. After adjusting for background characteristics, attendance, and prior performance, the implementation of an inclusive environment adversely affected the language arts performance of 11th-grade students without impairments in a statistically significant manner. Nonetheless, the impact was minimal, with inclusion accounting for about 1.37% of the variation in language arts performance, indicating that school-based variables had a greater influence on academic outcomes.

Ruijs [32] investigated the impact of students with disabilities on the academic performance of their non-disabled peers within the framework of elementary and secondary education in the Netherlands. Administrative data on all Dutch students were used for both educational levels. The findings demonstrated that the inclusion of children with special needs did not have a statistically significant impact on the academic performance of general education students in primary and secondary schools. No difference impact of inclusion was seen between high and low performing pupils.

Hienonen et al. [33] investigated the impact of the ratio of students with disabilities in lower secondary mainstream education classrooms on the academic performance of students, both at the individual and class levels. The researchers used longitudinal data from Finland and accounted for other covariates. At the individual level, individuals without disabilities in inclusive classrooms had somewhat inferior performance compared to their counterparts in non-inclusive environments. At the classroom level, a small negative correlation was seen between 9th-grade test results and large numbers of students with impairments. Nonetheless, the disparity within courses led to increased impacts, and class-level effects might be mitigated by adequate assistance and differentiated training. The findings indicate neutral or marginally adverse impacts of inclusion on the academic performance of children without impairments at the secondary education level [34].

4. Social Impacts of Inclusion on Students without Disabilities

Staub and Peck [35] examined research about the impact of inclusion on pupils without impairments, revealing favorable outcomes. The five primary results for kids without impairments were enhancement of social conditions, advancement in self-concept, formulation of personal ideals, nurturing and supportive friendships, and less apprehension about human diversity. Peltier [14] examined five research on the social impacts of inclusion on students without impairments, and the results corroborated the findings of Staub and Peck [35]. Peltier [14] asserts that kids without exceptional needs get advantages by being educated alongside pupils with special needs. The primary findings for students without disabilities in inclusive classrooms were enhanced comprehension of others, heightened personal development, improved readiness to confront disability in their own lives, and diminished fear alongside increased tolerance towards the behavior and appearance of others. The papers examined by Peltier [14] included various age groups and used diverse research approaches.

Hehir et al. [9] examined six research on the social effects of inclusion on usually developing pupils. The results indicated that the placement of kids without disabilities in inclusive classes reduced their antagonism, prejudice, and discrimination towards students with special needs. Salend and Garrick Duhaney [15] examined research on the social consequences of inclusion for adolescents without special needs, yielding mostly favorable results. The primary beneficial results were heightened acceptance, comprehension, and tolerance of individual differences, as well as enhanced chances for friendships with individuals with disabilities. Nonetheless, pupils without special needs said that they had discomfort and communication challenges with peers with moderate or severe impairments [15].

Kalambouka et al. [16] also examined research on the social effects of inclusion for students without impairments and found inconclusive findings. At the primary school level, four research reported favorable outcomes, three studies yielded neutral results, and two studies indicated poor outcomes for kids without special needs in inclusive classes alongside students with cognitive and learning difficulties. Two research reported favorable social results, two studies indicated neutral outcomes, and one study revealed poor social outcomes for normally developing adolescents in inclusive classes with students with behavioral, emotional, and social challenges. Two studies indicated favorable results for kids without disabilities in inclusive classes alongside students with sensory and physical challenges. One research identified favorable affects, while another revealed neutral effects on kids without special needs in inclusive classes alongside students with communication challenges. No research were discovered at the secondary school level on the social impact of include kids with behavioral, emotional, social, or communication issues, as well as sensory and physical impairments, on their peers without disabilities. The authors identified three neutral outcomes and one bad result for students without disabilities in inclusive classes that included students with cognitive and learning difficulties. In general, inclusive classrooms had marginally beneficial social benefits on children without special needs [16].

Schwab [36] conducted survey research with 1115 Austrian schoolchildren aged 10 to 14 years. Only 129 of these pupils have difficulties, whereas the others do not. Approximately 37% of the entire student population consisted of fourth graders, while approximately 63% were seventh graders. roughly 55% of the participants were enrolled in general education courses devoid of students with disabilities, whereas

roughly 45% were in inclusive classes that had at least one student with disabilities. The authors discovered that in inclusive classes, kids without special needs had a greater number of friends compared to those in non-inclusive classrooms. Furthermore, among kids without impairments, the rates of friendship and peer acceptability were much lower in non-inclusive classes compared to inclusive classrooms.

Noggle and Stites [37] examined the experiences of three typically developing preschool kids in inclusive classes alongside students with special needs. The writers conducted observations, interviewed parents and educators, and used artifacts for data collecting. The authors assert that pupils without special needs gained advantages from inclusive preschool programs alongside students with special needs. All three preschool pupils demonstrated improvement in social skills and peer acceptance.

Nakken and Pijl [38] conducted a study of five research concerning the social benefits of inclusion on usually developing kids, revealing favorable outcomes. Students without impairments had favorable opinions about their peers with disabilities. For example, they exhibited more tolerance and knowledge of diversity. The authors emphasized the significance of interaction with children with special needs since increased contact between normal pupils and those with special needs fostered a more favorable attitude among the former. Consiglio et al. [39] examined the influence of contact and non-contact experiences on the attitudes of students without disabilities toward their peers with impairments in Italy. Eighty kids participated in the research, with ages ranging from nine to twelve years. The authors discovered that children who interacted with peers with special needs had a favorable attitude towards them.

Georgiadi et al. [40] examined students' views towards peers with intellectual disabilities in relation to the sort of school they attended in Greece. A total of two hundred fifty-six kids participated in the research, with one hundred thirty-five of them in inclusive settings. The participants' ages ranged from 9 to 10 years. Research indicates that pupils in inclusive environments had more favorable views towards peers with intellectual impairments compared to those in non-inclusive environments. Soulis et al. [41] indicated that the majority of pupils without impairments in Greece had favorable opinions towards their peers with disabilities, notwithstanding their opposition to inclusion. Sirlopu et al. [42] investigated the change in attitudes of students without special needs towards individuals with Down syndrome according to school placement in Chile. One hundred twenty kids from grades 6 to 8 participated in the research. Students in inclusive environments had more positive sentiments toward peers with Down syndrome compared to those in non-inclusive environments.

Additionally, Ruijs and Peetsma [12] examined research about the social implications of inclusion for kids without special needs, revealing mostly favorable results. Research indicated that pupils without impairments exhibited reduced biases towards their peers with disabilities. Opponents said that kids without impairments would emulate undesirable conduct shown by pupils with disabilities. Furthermore, two research indicated that some students without disabilities identified communication challenges as obstacles that adversely impacted their connections with students with disabilities [12].

5. Conclusions

The results of the previously listed research in this analysis indicate that the impact of inclusion on the academic and social outcomes of usually developing kids is diverse [12,16,22]. Nevertheless, other research suggests that inclusion is often linked to favorable or neutral effects on individuals. Although it is difficult to get definitive conclusions, and other variables may influence these ambiguous results, the negative consequences are mostly minimal in scale and may be deemed impractical. Institutional considerations seem to have a greater impact on student outcomes. Factors include insufficient teacher preparation, absence of administrative leadership and support for planning, monitoring, and adjusting education, lack of collaboration, and diminished expectations from students.

Despite the scarcity of studies on the social impacts on kids without special needs, evidence suggests that they may gain advantages from inclusive programs. Typically developing kids in inclusive environments exhibit reduced biases towards students with impairments and have a greater willingness to

engage in play with them. Furthermore, enhanced acceptance, tolerance, and respect for individual diversity are key social advantages derived from inclusive classrooms.

The academic advantages of inclusive education for kids without impairments are conceivable; nonetheless, more study is essential in this domain. The literature reveals a lack of data about the effects of inclusion on both high and low achievers, as well as pupils throughout various educational stages. Furthermore, the prevalence of students with impairments, together with the types and severity of disabilities among these students, need further research. Inclusive education may effectively benefit both kids with and without disabilities, and adverse effects may be mitigated by legislation and proactive engagement between researchers and school districts.

References

[1] Rhoad-Drogalis, A.; Justice, L.M. Is the proportion of children with disabilities in inclusive preschool programs associated with children's achievement? J. Early Interv. 2020, 42, 83–96.

[2] US Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Thirty-Five Years of Progress in Educating Children with Disabilities Through IDEA; Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services: Washington, DC, USA, 2010.

[3] National Center for Education Statistics. Students with Disabilities, Inclusion of. Available online: https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=59.

[4] American Printing House for the Blind. Annual Report: Distribution of Eligible Students Based on the Federal Quota Census; American Printing House for the Blind: Louisville, KY, USA, 2018.

[5] Vaughn, S.; Bos, C.; Schumm, J.S. Teaching Students Who Are Exceptional, Diverse, and at Risk in the General Education Classroom, 7th ed.; Pearson Education: New York, NY, USA, 2018; ISBN 9780134447896.

[6] UNESCO. The Salamanca Statement and framework for action on special needs education: Adopted by the world. In Proceedings of the Conference on Special Needs Education; Access and Quality, Salamanca, Spain, 7–10 June 1994.

[7] Katz, J.; Sokal, L.; Wu, A. Academic achievement of diverse K-12 students in inclusive three-block model classrooms. Int. J. Incl. Educ. 2019, 1–19.

[8] Francisco, M.P.B.; Hartman, M.; Wang, Y. Inclusion and Special Education. Educ. Sci. 2020, 10, 238.

[9] Hehir, T.; Grindal, T.; Freeman, B.; Lamoreau, R.; Borquaye, Y.; Burke, S. A Summary of the Evidence on Inclusive Education; Abt Associates: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2016.

[10] Oh-Young, C.; Filler, J. A meta-analysis of the effects of placement on academic and social skill outcome measures of students with disabilities. Res. Dev. Disabil. 2015, 47, 80–92.

[11] Luckner, J.L.; Urbach, J. Reading fluency and students who are deaf or hard of hearing: Synthesis of the research. Commun. Disord. Q. 2012, 33, 230–241.

[12] Ruijs, N.M.; Peetsma, T.T. Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed. Educ. Res. Rev. 2009, 4, 67–79.

[13] Szumski, G.; Smogorzewska, J.; Karwowski, M. Academic achievement of students without special educational needs in inclusive classrooms: A meta-analysis. Educ. Res. Rev. 2017, 21, 33–54.

[14] Peltier, G.L. The effect of inclusion on non-disabled children: A review of the research. Contemp. Educ. 2006, 68, 234–238.

[15] Salend, S.J.; Garrick Duhaney, L.M. The impact of inclusion on students with and without disabilities and their educators. Remedial Spec. Educ. 1999, 20, 114–126.

[16] Kalambouka, A.; Farrell, P.; Dyson, A.; Kaplan, I. The impact of placing pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools on the achievement of their peers. Educ. Res. 2007, 49, 365–382.

[17] Warren, S.R.; Martinez, R.S.; Sortino, L.A. Exploring the quality indicators of a successful full-inclusion preschool program. J. Res. Child. Educ. 2016, 30, 540–553.

[18] Huber, K.D.; Rosenfeld, J.G.; Fiorello, C.A. The differential impact of inclusion and inclusive practices on high, average, and low achieving general education students. Psychol. Sch. 2001, 38, 497–504.

[19] Cole, C.M.; Waldron, N.; Majd, M. Academic progress of students across inclusive and traditional settings. Ment. Retard. 2004, 42, 136–144.
[20] Demeris, H.; Childs, R.A.; Jordan, A. The influence of students with special needs included in grade-3 classrooms on the large-scale achievement scores of students without special needs. Can. J. Educ. 2007, 30, 609–627.
[21] Gruner Gandhi, A. Context matters: Exploring relations between inclusion and reading achievement of students without disabilities. Intl. J. Disabil. Dev. Educ. 2007, 54, 91–112.
[22] Fletcher, J. Spillover effects of inclusion of classmates with emotional problems on test scores in early elementary school. J. Policy Anal. Manag. 2010, 29, 69–83.
[23] Ruijs, N.M.; Van der Veen, I.; Peetsma, T.T. Inclusive education and students without special educational needs. Educ. Res. 2010, 52, 351–390.
[24] Sermier Dessemontet, R.; Bless, G. The impact of including children with intellectual disability in general education classrooms on the academic achievement of their low-, average-, and high-achieving peers. J. Intellect. Dev. Disabil. 2013, 38, 23–30.
[25] Krammer, M.; Gasteiger-Klicpera, B.; Holzinger, A.; Wohlhart, D. Inclusion and standards achievement: The presence of pupils identified as having special needs as a moderating effect on the national mathematics standards achievements of their classmates. Int. J. Incl. Educ. 2019, 1–17.
[26] Rangvid, B.S. Returning special education students to regular classrooms: Externalities on peers' reading scores. Econ. Educ. Rev. 2018, 68, 13–22.
[27] Rouse, M.; Florian, L. Inclusion and achievement: Student achievement in secondary schools with higher and lower proportions of pupils designated as having special educational needs. Int. J. Incl. Educ. 2006, 10, 481–493.
[28] Farrell, P.; Dyson, A.; Polat, F.; Hutcheson, G.; Gallannaugh, F. The relationship between inclusion and academic achievement in English mainstream schools. Sch. Eff. Sch. Improv. 2007, 18, 335–352.
[29] St John, M.M.; Babo, G. The probability of a general education student placed in a co-taught inclusive classroom of passing the 2014 New York State ELA and mathematics assessment in grades 6–8. Educ. Lead. Rev. Doc. Res. 2015, 2, 77–87.
[30] Fruth, J.D.; Woods, M.N. Academic performance of students without disabilities in the inclusive environment. Education 2015, 135, 351–361.
[31] Brown, J.E.; Babo, G. The influence of placement in an inclusive classroom on the academic performance of non-disabled eleventh grade students in a suburban New Jersey school district. Educ. Lead. Rev. Doc. Res. 2017, 5, 1–15.
[32] Ruijs, N. The impact of special needs students on classmate performance. Econ. Educ. Rev. 2017, 58, 15–31.
[33] Hienonen, N.; Lintuvuori, M.; Jahnukainen, M.; Hotulainen, R.; Vainikainen, M.P. The effect of class composition on cross-curricular competences–Students with special educational needs in regular classes in lower secondary education. Learn. Instr. 2018, 58, 80–87.
[34] Pearce, M.; Forlin, C. Challenges and potential solutions for enabling inclusion in secondary schools. Australas. J. Spec. Educ. 2005, 29, 93–105.
[35] Staub, D.; Peck, C.A. What are the outcomes for nondisabled students? Educ. Leadersh. 1995, 52, 36–40.
[36] Schwab, S. Social dimensions of inclusion in education of 4th and 7th grade pupils in inclusive and regular classes: Outcomes from Austria. Res. Dev. Disabil. 2015, 43, 72–79.
[37] Noggle, A.K.; Stites, M.L. Inclusion and preschoolers who are typically developing: The lived experience. Early Child. Educ. J. 2018, 46, 511–522.
[38] Nakken, H.; Pijl, S.J. Getting along with classmates in regular schools: A review of the effects of integration on the development of social relationships. Int. J. Incl. Educ. 2002, 6, 47–61.
[39] Consiglio, A.; Guarnera, M.; Magnano, P. Representation of disability. Verification of the contact hypothesis in school. Soc. Behav. Sci. 2015, 191, 1964–1969.

[40] Georgiadi, M.; Kalyva, E.; Kourkoutas, E.; Tsakiris, V. Young children's attitudes toward peers with intellectual disabilities: Effect of the type of school. J. Appl. Res. Intellect. Disabil. 2012, 25, 531–541.
[41] Soulis, S.G.; Georgiou, A.; Dimoula, K.; Rapti, D. Surveying inclusion in Greece: Empirical research in 2683 primary school students. Int. J. Incl. Educ. 2016, 20, 770–783.
[42] Sirlopu, D.; González, R.; Bohner, G.; Siebler, F.; Ordónez, G.; Millar, A.; Torres, D.; De Tezanos-Pinto, P. Promoting positive attitudes toward people with down syndrome: The benefit of school inclusion programs. J. Appl. Soc. Psychol. 2008, 38, 2710–2736.

دور الخدمات الاجتماعية في تعزيز التعليم الدامج للأطفال ذوي الإعاقة: مراجعة

الملخص

الخلفية :أصبح التحول نحو التعليم الدامج محورًا رئيسيًا في السياسات التعليمية، حيث يهدف إلى دمج الأطفال ذوي الإعاقة في الفصول الدراسية العادية. وعلى الرغم من البحث المكثف حول فوائد التعليم الدامج للطلاب ذوي الإعاقة، إلا أن الاهتمام بتأثيره على أقرانهم من الطلاب ذوي النمو الطبيعي كان أقل.

الطرق :تُلخص هذه المراجعة الأدبيات الحالية حول النتائج الأكاديمية والاجتماعية للتعليم الدامج بالنسبة للطلاب غير ذوي الإعاقة. أجريت مراجعة شاملة للدراسات التي تقيم التأثير عبر المراحل التعليمية المختلفة، بما في ذلك مرحلة ما قبل المدرسة، والابتدائية، والثانوية.

النتائج :تشير النتائج إلى أن التأثير الأكاديمي للتعليم الدامج على الطلاب ذوي النمو الطبيعي كان في الغالب محايدًا أو إيجابيًا، حيث سلطت بعض الدراسات الضوء على مزايا طفيفة في الأداء الأكاديمي، خاصة في المرحلة الابتدائية. وعلى الصعيد الاجتماعي، يستفيد الطلاب غير ذوي الإعاقة غالبًا من زيادة التسامح، والقبول، وفهم التنوع. ومع ذلك، لوحظت اختلافات في النتائج بناءً على نسبة الطلاب ذوي الإعاقة والسياق التعليمي المحدد.

الخلاصة :يبدو أن التعليم الدامج يعزز بيئة تعلم داعمة يستفيد منها كل من الأطفال ذوي الإعاقة وغير ذوي الإعاقة. وبينما كانت الآثار السلبية على الأداء الأكاديمي طفيفة، هناك حاجة إلى مزيد من البحث لاستكشاف التأثيرات الدقيقة للتعليم الدامج على فئات الطلاب المختلفة، خاصةً أصحاب التحصيل المرتفع والمنخفض.

الكلمات المفتاحية :التعليم الدامج، الأطفال ذوو الإعاقة، النتائج الأكاديمية، النتائج الاجتماعية، السياسات التعليمية.